



**International Journal of Environment and Climate Change**

**Volume 14, Issue 10, Page 458-472, 2024; Article no.IJECC.124251**

**ISSN: 2581-8627**

*(Past name: British Journal of Environment & Climate Change, Past ISSN: 2231-4784)*

# **Achieving Carbon Neutrality in Agriculture: Strategies for Mitigating Climate Change and Enhancing Sustainability**

**Sneha S R. <sup>a\*</sup>, Rajasree G. <sup>a</sup>, Shalini Pillai P. <sup>a</sup>  
and Sheeja K Raj. <sup>a</sup>**

<sup>a</sup> *Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, Kerala Agricultural University, Vellayani, Thiruvananthapuram 695 522, Kerala, India.*

## **Authors' contributions**

*This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.*

## **Article Information**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.9734/ijecc/2024/v14i104499>

## **Open Peer Review History:**

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/124251>

**Review Article**

**Received: 26/07/2024**

**Accepted: 28/09/2024**

**Published: 04/10/2024**

## **ABSTRACT**

Global warming and climate change have become a burning issue due to the hike in atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases (GHG). The rising GHG emissions over the past two centuries have caused significant changes in the global climate. Agriculture plays a prominent role in contributing to these emissions, yet its potential for reducing GHGs remains underutilized. Agriculture serves as both a source and a potential sink for GHGs, making it a critical area for intervention in climate change mitigation efforts. Current agricultural practices, however, face several limitations in addressing GHG emissions. Conventional farming often relies heavily on synthetic fertilizers, leading to substantial nitrous oxide emissions, while livestock farming remains a major source of methane. Additionally, unsustainable

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: [snehasraju2@gmail.com](mailto:snehasraju2@gmail.com);

**Cite as:** S R., Sneha, Rajasree G., Shalini Pillai P., and Sheeja K Raj. 2024. "Achieving Carbon Neutrality in Agriculture: Strategies for Mitigating Climate Change and Enhancing Sustainability". *International Journal of Environment and Climate Change* 14 (10):458-72. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ijecc/2024/v14i104499>.

land-use practices, such as deforestation and soil degradation, further reduce the capacity of agricultural land to act as an effective carbon sink. These practices, combined with inefficient use of inputs like energy and water, contribute to agriculture's unsustainable carbon footprint. Carbon neutral farming addresses these gaps through a range of practices that maintain and enhance the carbon levels in soils, minimize GHG emission from crop and livestock production, and adoption of farming systems like mixed farming and agro-forestry that reduces emissions while promoting biodiversity. Efficient utilization of fertilizers, energy sources and other farm inputs is crucial, alongside efforts to revitalize soil health. Carbon neutral farming aims to balance the carbon emissions produced by farming activities with equivalent carbon removals or sequestration, resulting in a net-zero carbon footprint. Carbon neutral farming offers a promising pathway to transform agriculture into a sustainable, climate-resilient sector. By reducing emissions, enhancing sequestration, and offsetting remaining carbon footprints, this approach significantly contributes to global climate change mitigation efforts while also improving soil health, increasing biodiversity, and fostering economic viability in farming communities.

*Keywords: Carbon neutral farming; greenhouse gas emission; methane; fossil fuel; carbon dioxide equivalent.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The increase in atmospheric greenhouse gas (GHG) levels has intensified global concern over climate change and its impacts. The surge in GHG emissions during the last couple of centuries has led to notable alterations in global climate, leading to environmental catastrophes such as extensive flooding, prolonged droughts, and devastating wildfires.

According to FAO [1] the global agriculture and associated land use have contributed to an emission of  $9.3 \times 10^9$  tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>-eq), and more than half of this ( $5.3 \times 10^9$  tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>-eq) is attributed to crop and livestock activities within the farm gate, while land use and land use change activities account for nearly  $4 \times 10^9$  tonnes CO<sub>2</sub>-eq. The food production is anticipated to rise by 70 per cent between 2005 and 2050 in order to feed an estimated global population of 9.1 billion individuals while maintaining present dietary habits. This growth is expected to have significant consequences, including a 30 per cent rise in global GHG emissions from agriculture [2]. Based on empirical evidence, in the long run, a one per cent increase in agricultural land, crop production index, livestock production index, fisheries production, energy use in agriculture, and fertilizer consumption, GHG emissions will be increased by 0.25, 0.29, 0.40, 0.18, 0.46, and 0.28 per cent respectively [3].

## 2. CONCEPT OF CARBON NEUTRAL FARMING

Agriculture sector plays a dual role in decarbonizing economy, serving both as a

source and a sink for GHGs. According to the Carbon Cycle Institute [4], agriculture stands out as the only sector which can switch from a net CO<sub>2</sub> emitter to net CO<sub>2</sub> sequesterer, a potential unmatched by any other human managed domain. The estimated global mitigation potential from agriculture (excluding fossil fuel offsets from biomass) by 2030 is nearly 5500-6,000 MtCO<sub>2</sub>-eq y<sup>-1</sup> [5].

Carbon neutral farming aims to balance the carbon emissions produced by farming activities with equivalent carbon removals or sequestration, resulting in a net-zero carbon footprint. Carbon-neutral farming involves implementing a scientifically proven methodology that effectively reduce carbon emissions while maintaining agricultural productivity.

## 3. SOURCES OF EMISSION OF GHG IN AGRICULTURE

Agricultural activities release three primary GHGs viz., carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide and methane. Among all anthropogenic sources, agriculture is the major cause for 39 per cent of CH<sub>4</sub> and 76 per cent of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions [6]. The radiative forcing potential of CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O are considerably higher than that of CO<sub>2</sub> over short time frames, intensifying their impact on global warming potential (GWP).

### 3.1 Emission from the Livestock Sector

#### 3.1.1 Enteric fermentation

The emissions from agriculture sector are primarily attributed to enteric fermentation in

livestock, constituting nearly 63 per cent of the sector's total emissions [7]. Enteric fermentation is an inherent aspect of the digestion in ruminants, involving fermentation and break down of plant biomass eaten by animals through the actions of bacteria, fungi, and protozoa in the rumen. The resulting gaseous by products, mainly CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> are released from the rumen by eructation. Methane plays a significant role in global warming, as it effectively traps infrared radiation leading to significant increase in mean surface temperatures. Around 30 to 50 percent of recent rise in temperature has been linked to methane emissions [8].

### 3.1.2 Manure management

Decisions made regarding storage and disposal of manure can affect emissions of CH<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O, which are formed during the decomposition process of manures. In India, management of manure contributes to annual emissions of 120.44 thousand tonnes of CH<sub>4</sub> and 0.08 thousand tonnes of N<sub>2</sub>O [9].

## 3.2 Emission from the Rice Fields

Rice farming in India is a significant contributor to GHG emissions, releasing an estimated 97 Mt CO<sub>2</sub>-eq into the environment [10].

### 3.2.1 Methane emission

Organic materials upon anaerobic decomposition in flooded rice fields generates CH<sub>4</sub>. Globally, emissions of CH<sub>4</sub> from paddy fields range from 31 to 280 Tg y<sup>-1</sup>, constituting for 10 to 20 per cent of anthropogenic CH<sub>4</sub> emissions [11]. Methane emissions from major paddy growing regions of the country under different rice environments were assessed for the whole cropping period, and estimated CH<sub>4</sub> emission from paddy cultivation in India is approximately 4 million tonnes per year [12].

### 3.2.2 Nitrous oxide emission due to unscientific nitrogen management

Agriculture accounts for 75 per cent of anthropogenic N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. Nitrous oxide is formed as an intermediate product of microbial nitrogen conversion in the soil i.e., nitrification and denitrification. Flushes of N<sub>2</sub>O can occur when soils, which are previously well-aerated, become moistened or saturated due to precipitation or irrigation. The main driver of N<sub>2</sub>O emission is the lack of synchronisation between

N supply and N demand by plants, leading to excess N in soil.

## 3.3 Emission Due to Land Use Changes

Alterations in land use, such as deforestation for agricultural expansion also lead to release of GHGs. Land use and land use change activities contribute to an emission of about 4 Gt CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent [1]. If current patterns continue, with richer nations intensifying agricultural practices and poorer nations engaging in extensive land clearing, nearly 1 billion ha of land are projected to undergo clearance globally by 2050, which would result in GHG emissions reaching nearly 3 Gt CO<sub>2</sub>-C equivalent y<sup>-1</sup> [13].

## 3.4 Emissions from the Crop Residue Burning

Indian agriculture generates approximately 500 to 550 million tonnes (Mt) of crop residues each year. About 90-140 Mt of these residues are burned on-farm annually mainly to clear the field for sowing the next crop, making this practice is a major source of CO<sub>2</sub> emission from agriculture sector [9]. In India, burning of crop residues in fields result in emissions of 257.21x10<sup>3</sup> tonnes of CH<sub>4</sub> and 6.67x10<sup>3</sup> tonnes of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions annually [14].

## 3.5 Emission from the Fossil Fuel

According to FAO, the emissions arising from energy use in agriculture were 0.9 Gt CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent in 2018, marking a 23 per cent rise since 2000 [1]. Use of LPG, natural gas, residual fuel oil and other bituminous coal in the agriculture and fisheries sector together with use of electricity result in an emission of more than 1 billion tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent per year [15].

## 4. HOW TO ACHIEVE CARBON NEUTRALITY

Carbon neutrality in agriculture can be achieved through various practices that maintain and enhance the carbon levels in soils, minimize GHG emission from crop and livestock production, and adoption of farming systems like mixed farming and agro-forestry that reduces emissions while promoting biodiversity. Efficient utilization of fertilizers, energy sources and other farm inputs is crucial, alongside efforts to revitalize soil health. The lifecycle perspective of the carbon balance in a farming system

encompasses both direct emissions that occur in the farm and indirect emissions that originate from the inputs utilized on the farm. Achieving carbon neutrality necessitates an integrated approach focused on mitigating emissions, enhancing carbon sinks, and minimizing the overall carbon footprint of agricultural operations. Methods and tools to evaluate emissions and carbon sequestration at farm level are also required.

## 4.1 Reducing Emission from Cropland

### 4.1.1 Agronomic intervention

Improved agronomic practices have significant role in reducing emission from cropland.

#### 4.1.1.1 Crop varieties

Crop varieties with improved resource use efficiency, pest and disease tolerance, climate resilience, indirectly result in lowering GHG emission. Crop varieties possessing resistance to pests and diseases can decrease the dependency on chemical pesticides. Heimpel et al. [16] reported that the manufacture, transport, and application of insecticides against soybean aphid results in a GHG emission of 10.6 kg CO<sub>2</sub>-eq ha<sup>-1</sup> being emitted per hectare of soybeans treated. By using fewer pesticides, farmers can help mitigate emissions linked to the production and usage of such chemicals. Crop varieties with improved nutrient and water use efficiency reduce the need for synthetic fertilizers and irrigation, indirectly leading to lower emissions associated with such practices.

Rice varieties affect soil CH<sub>4</sub> emission by facilitating the movement of CH<sub>4</sub> and O<sub>2</sub> through the aerenchyma [17], as well as by providing substrates for methanogens and methanotrophs through root exudates [18]. Hence, the genetic characters of the rice cultivars could significantly influence the regulation of soil CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from paddy fields. Zou et al. [19] reported that, cultivation of rice varieties with poor aerenchyma tissue is an important mitigation strategy for reducing soil CH<sub>4</sub> emission. Mutant rice plant (osld1.1-m12) recorded significant reductions in several traits; aerenchyma formation (20–60 per cent), root development (25 per cent), diffusion of O<sub>2</sub> (50 per cent) and emission of methane (27–36 per cent) as compared to wild type [20].

According to Bloom and Swisher [21] super rice varieties exhibit lower CH<sub>4</sub> emission compared to

conventional rice and hybrid rice. This difference may be attributed to the ability of super rice varieties to retain more substrates within rice plants, thus reducing soil CH<sub>4</sub> emissions. Certain research findings indicate that the cultivation of early maturing varieties significantly altered the abundance of methanogens and methanotrophs in soil, consequently affecting CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes [22]. Biochemists in Sweden, China and the United States have collaborated on the development of a novel rice cultivar named SUSIBA2, hailed as world's first 'climate-friendly rice'. Introduction of barley SUSIBA2 gene in rice resulted in a change in carbon flux, directing more photosynthates towards aboveground biomass instead of roots, and suppressed methanogenesis, mainly through a reduction in root exudates [23].

#### 4.1.1.2 Sowing methods

Compared with transplanting, throwing of rice seedlings significantly reduced seasonal total CH<sub>4</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 15-40 per cent and 19-33 per cent for early rice, and by 38-47 per cent and 19-22 per cent for late rice, respectively [24].

Susilawati et al. [25] noted that compared to transplanted rice, CH<sub>4</sub> emissions and GWP were reduced by 47 per cent and 46.4 per cent in direct seeded rice, and no significant differences were observed among crop establishments on N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. Since the above crop-establishment methods did not influence grain yield, direct seeding was suggested as an alternative method of establishing lowland rice with low GHG emissions. Continuous flooding under transplanted rice created anaerobic condition resulting in higher CH<sub>4</sub> emission.

#### 4.1.1.3 Spacing/ seed rate

Increasing row width or decreasing the seed rate could lead to greater exposure of surface soils to precipitation, solar radiation and wind, leading changes in microclimate that affect soil temperature and moisture, influencing GHG emissions. O'Neill, et al. [26] reported that cumulative CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were greater in rape seed when planted at a density of 10 seeds m<sup>-2</sup> compared to 60 seeds m<sup>-2</sup> for both variety Compass and Troy. This disparity was attributed to increased decomposition of organic matter, likely caused by reduced shading at lower seed densities.

#### 4.1.1.4 Tillage/residue management

Conventional tillage involves physically turning soils and residues, altering the physical, chemical, and biological properties of the soil, and hastening organic matter decomposition. Ploughing results in better distribution of crop residues and its exposure to oxygen thereby increasing CO<sub>2</sub>-evolution [27].

Reducing tillage intensity is likely to enhance soil organic carbon storage compared to conventional tillage, as these practices minimize soil erosion by promoting the development of a protective litter layer. In fact, reduced tillage retains at least 30 per cent of crop residue on the soil surface leading to an increase in soil carbon. No-tillage minimizes soil disturbance resulting in slower decomposition of residues on the soil surface. Conservation tillage practices even require farmers to reduce the frequency of tractor passes and reliance on fossil fuels. Improved soil porosity and gas diffusivity facilitates the transport of CH<sub>4</sub> to methanotrophs, potentially reducing CH<sub>4</sub> emissions [28]. Factors such as improved soil structure, reduced soil temperature, limited pool of decomposable organic carbon and lower mineral nitrogen availability due to slower soil organic matter (SOM) mineralization can contribute to a decrease in N<sub>2</sub>O emissions [29].

Transitioning to minimum tillage has been shown to decrease C emissions from farm during soil preparation by 0.1 t C ha<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup> [30]. A meta-analysis, comprising 90 peer-reviewed articles was carried out to evaluate the effect of no-tillage on GHG emissions, and GWP of major cereal cropping systems. The results shows that, compared to conventional tillage no tillage recorded lower GHG emissions in dry climate and lower GWP in areas with acidic soils. No-tillage resulted in 22 per cent reduction in the GWP of rice fields by lowering both CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions [31].

#### 4.1.1.5 Diversified cropping system

Diversified cropping systems involving crop rotation, cover crops, and climate resilient crops can boost soil organic carbon. This increase is attributed to the greater amount of crop residue incorporated in to the soil compared than that of less diversified systems, like monocropping, crop-fallow, and those without cover crops [32].

#### 4.1.1.6 Crop rotation

Crop rotation particularly when integrated with legumes has the potential to promote climate

targets compared to monoculture practices. The favourable climate outcomes associated with legumes in crop rotations can be linked to their nitrogen fixing ability. Legumes reduces the need for synthetic nitrogen fertilizers which are energy intensive to produce [33], and avoid the associated emissions of N<sub>2</sub>O. Reckling et al. [34] also reported that cropping systems involving legumes exhibit lower nitrate-nitrogen runoff and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions than systems without legumes. The addition of nitrogen-rich residues from pulse crops improves soil organic carbon content, thereby promoting long-term carbon storage in agricultural soils. Pulse crop residues contribute to enhancement in soil structure and microbial activity, reducing the susceptibility of soils to erosion and degradation. This indirectly prevents the release of stored carbon as CO<sub>2</sub>.

#### 4.1.1.7 Cover crops

Through photosynthesis cover crops absorb carbon dioxide from atmosphere and store the carbon in the soil, contributing to climate change mitigation efforts. Studies suggest that approximately 8.1 million hectares of cover crops have the ability to annually sequester over 66 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent, equal to the emissions generated by around 13 million vehicles [35].

#### 4.1.1.8 Cultivation of climate resilient crops

Millets and tuber crops have been considered as climate resilient crops with low carbon foot prints. In comparison to wheat and rice, millets have low carbon footprint of 3,218- kg CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent ha<sup>-1</sup>, as against 3,968 kg and 3,401 kg, for wheat and rice respectively [36].

A study by John et al. [37] revealed the potential of cassava in C sequestration and GHG mitigation. The long term fertilizer experiment (LTFE) (over 20 years) revealed that the crop has shown the ability to sustain a yield of 10-15 t ha<sup>-1</sup> without the application of any manures and fertilizers in the same field, which could be attributed to the climate resilient traits and C sequestration potential, such as high leaf dry matter production, leaf shedding in response to water stress and high nutrient content of leaves. By assimilating 60.38 ppm of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>, crop attained a leaf dry matter production of 3.573 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, concurrently lowering the atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> level to 317 ppm while increasing the SOC by 2780 ppm.

#### 4.1.1.9 Nutrient management

Efficient utilization of applied nitrogen by crop is not always achieved, leading to surplus N susceptible to emission as N<sub>2</sub>O. Losses of nitrogen through N leaching, NH<sub>4</sub> volatilization, and urea hydrolysis can also offset the mitigation potential [38]. As a result, enhancing N use efficiency can decrease the emission of N<sub>2</sub>O as well as indirectly mitigate GHG emissions from the manufacturing of N fertilizer.

Fertilizer plays significant role in influencing methane emissions from paddy fields. This influence is mainly due to the increase in substrate sources for methanogens, and decrease in soil redox potential, both of which provides favourable environmental conditions for methanogens [39]. Compared with no fertilizer application, the use of fertilizer promoted soil CH<sub>4</sub> emissions, resulting in a notable increase of 32.98 per cent [40].

#### 4.1.1.10 Fertilizer dose

In rice, N<sub>2</sub>O emission was positively correlated with application rate of N [41]. N application at 200 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> reduced methane emissions from rice crop by 25–30 per cent compared to N application at 400 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> [42]. Sapkota et al. [43] reported that site-specific nutrient management (SSNM) using nutrient expert tool in rice and wheat could lead to a reduction in GWP by about 2.5 per cent in rice, and 12-20 per cent in wheat over conventional farmers' fertilization practices.

#### 4.1.1.11 Method of application

Application of fertilizer in multiple split doses at various crop stages ensures continuous N availability, leading to improved NUE and decreased N<sub>2</sub>O emissions. Split application of fertilizer at different growth stages of wheat (30 per cent at planting and 70 per cent at GS<sub>4</sub>) resulted in lower cumulative N<sub>2</sub>O flux (0.49 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>) compared to application of 100 per cent of fertilizer at planting (0.53 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>) [44]. Rutkowska et al. [45] observed a significant reduction in N<sub>2</sub>O emission from sandy soils upon deep placement of N fertilizers.

#### 4.1.1.12 Time of fertilizer application

Delaying fertilizer application until a week after sowing, rather than applying fertilizers prior to sowing, results in better utilization of applied N by crop instead of getting lost to atmosphere and ground water.

#### 4.1.1.13 Selection of suitable fertilizer

Vinzent et al. [46] found that selecting the suitable form of N and use of nitrification inhibitors aid in reducing nitrous oxide emissions. Application of ammonium sulphate nitrate resulted in higher nitrate values in soil compared to the treatment urea along with nitrification inhibitor, and might be reason for higher N<sub>2</sub>O emissions in the ammonium sulphate nitrate treatment, particularly flowering to harvest stage of crop.

#### 4.1.1.14 Nitrification inhibitors

Nitrification inhibitors (NI) or slow-release N fertilizers can lower both N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> emissions [47]. The nitrification inhibitors not only reduces N<sub>2</sub>O emission by inhibiting nitrification but also by reducing NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> availability for denitrification [48]. Gilsanz et al. [49] reported a reduction potential of 42 per cent for the NI Dicyandiamide which varied significantly depending on soil and management factors.

#### 4.1.1.15 Organic amendments

Biochar derived from plant biomass contains significant quantity of carbon which can be sequestered in soil with a mean residence time of 2000 years [50]. The modification of soil pH, aeration and water-holding capability by biochar is responsible for lowering N<sub>2</sub>O emission [51]. Biochar application in rice reduced the emission of N<sub>2</sub>O and NH<sub>3</sub> by 16.10 per cent and 89.60 per cent, respectively, compared to control [52].

Pallavi [53] evaluated the CO<sub>2</sub> evolution from different nutrient sources and found that organic sources resulted significantly higher CO<sub>2</sub> evolution (14.44 to 42.27 per cent) than chemical fertilizers, and was maximum for poultry manure (344.43 mg of CO<sub>2</sub> 100 g<sup>-1</sup> soil). Khosa et al. [54] reported the effectiveness of FYM in reducing CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from rice fields while also improving soil fertility and crop productivity.

#### 4.1.1.16 Biofertilizers

As per the findings of Senthilraja et al. [55], the addition of BGA + Azolla in rice resulted in the most substantial reduction in CH<sub>4</sub> emission (37.9 per cent) compared to the control followed by application of BGA alone. The same treatment had a 50 per cent and 43 per cent increase in redox potential and dissolved oxygen content, respectively, over the control. Utilization of BGA

and Azolla in flooded rice helps to reduce global warming by enhancing dissolved oxygen content and by suppressing the activity of methanogens.

#### 4.1.1.17 Irrigation

While irrigation in intensive agriculture system result in higher yield, it also have adverse environmental impacts such as GHG emissions [13]. GHG emission attributed to fuel or electricity usage for irrigation purposes were found to be high [56].

Lagomarsino et al. [57] reported that alternate wetting and drying resulted in 97 per cent reduction in CH<sub>4</sub> emission, while simultaneously causing a five fold increase in N<sub>2</sub>O emission in clayey soil.

Gu et al. [40] found that, water efficient irrigation methods significantly decreased soil CH<sub>4</sub> emissions by 71.25 per cent compared to traditional irrigation such as long-term flood irrigation. Among the practices, rainfed system had shown the greatest reduction (151.45 per cent), followed by moist irrigation (117.88 per cent). In contrast, the emission reduction rate of intermittent irrigation was the lowest (25.78 per cent). In a study conducted at Kerala Agricultural University by Jinsy [58], the effectiveness of aerobic rice cultivation in mitigating GHG emission from rice fields was evident from the significantly lower methane efflux (3.03 mg m<sup>-2</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>) under aerobic rice compared to flooded rice (6.16 mg m<sup>-2</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>). Though CH<sub>4</sub> emission did not exhibit significant variations among the varieties under flooded conditions, the variety Sarada recorded the lowest methane efflux (14.08 mg m<sup>-2</sup> h<sup>-1</sup>) under aerobic system.

#### 4.1.2 Agroforestry

Agroforestry serves as a polycultural land use management system, where various combinations of trees are cultivated around or among crops or pasture. Agroforestry offers a promising alternative system for reducing and mitigating atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels through carbon sequestration. As per the IPCC [59] report agroforestry systems possess a mitigation potential of 1.1-2.2 Pg C in terrestrial ecosystems over the forthcoming 50 years. Carbon stored in agroforestry range from 0.29-15.2 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup> above ground, and from 30-300 Mg C ha<sup>-1</sup> up to 1 m below ground [60]. Carbon sequestration in agroforestry systems take place in both in aboveground biomass including stem, branch,

and foliage, as well as in belowground biomass, such as roots and within soil. C sequestration primarily involves the uptake of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> during photosynthesis and subsequent transfer of captured C into vegetation, detritus, and soil pools for long-term storage [61].

Saha et al. [62] compared soil C sequestration across different land-use systems and found that, overall SOC content up to 1m depth decreased in the order, forest (176.6 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>) > small home garden (<0.4 ha area) (119.3 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>) = rubber (119.2 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>) ≥ large home garden (> 0.4 ha area) (108.2 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>) ≥ coconut (91.7 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>) > paddy (55.6 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>). Mina et al. (2023) found that, rubber plantations exhibited highest tree carbon sequestration (13.8 t C ha<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup>) followed by homestead AFS (2.68 t C ha<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup>) and coconut tree plantation (2.08 ± 0.53 t C ha<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup>). Regarding the SOC content, highest was recorded in homestead AFS (2.48 per cent).

#### 4.1.3 Farm power intervention

The agricultural sector have significant contribution in global carbon emissions due to various practices, including the use of fossil fuels for machinery and equipment. Conventional farm machinery depends fossil fuels for operation, contributing to carbon emissions.

Carbon-neutral farms prioritize the use of renewable energy sources such as wind, solar, and bioenergy. Wind turbines and solar panels can be installed on-farm to generate electricity, which can power various farm operations, including irrigation systems, lighting, and machinery. Bioenergy, such as biogas generated from organic waste and livestock manure, can be harnessed for both electricity and heat production. Ou et al. [63] reported that biofuels derived from grain-based feedstock emit significantly lower carbon compared to conventional fuels. Biofuel produced from *Jatropha* also significantly reduced GHG emissions (by up to 90 per cent) compared to fossil diesel fuels. Replacing electrical energy with solar powered irrigation pumps and diesel-based machinery with biofuel-based machinery the total agricultural carbon footprint was reduced by 8.1 per cent and 3.9 per cent respectively in cotton cultivation [64].

Carbon-neutral farms invest in energy-efficient machinery and equipment. This includes using electric tractors, precision agriculture technologies, and smart irrigation systems that

optimize water and energy usage. Electric motors for irrigation resulted in lower GHG emissions than diesel motors due to their greater pump efficiency. The energy required to pump one mm water per hectare was 36 MJ for electricity and 44 MJ for diesel [65].

## 4.2 Reducing Emissions due to Changes in Land Use

Promoting the conversion of cropland back to land cover resembling native vegetation is found to be an effective method for mitigating GHG emission. The conversion can take place over the entire land area ('set-asides'), or in localized areas, like grassed waterways, field margins, or shelter belts [66]. Converting arable cropland to grassland enhances the soil carbon level as a result of lower soil disturbance and lower carbon removal in harvested products. Grasslands exhibit lower N<sub>2</sub>O emissions compared to cultivated lands because of lower N inputs, as well as higher CH<sub>4</sub> oxidation rates [67].

## 4.3 Reducing Emission from Livestock Sector

The global livestock sector is a major contributor to anthropogenic GHG emissions. According to FAO [6] beef and dairy production are the primary contributors accounting for 41 per cent and 20 per cent of the sector's direct emissions respectively. These figures are much higher compared to poultry and pig production, which accounts for 9 and 8 per cent respectively. Apart from the environmental concerns, enteric CH<sub>4</sub> production in ruminants also impacts their energy efficiency negatively. Around 11 per cent of the total energy in cattle feed can be lost through eructated CH<sub>4</sub> [68].

### 4.3.1 Feed and nutrition

Low-quality and low-digestibility feeds lead to relatively high enteric emissions per unit of meat or milk. Forages with high protein content and digestibility have lowered CH<sub>4</sub> emissions by 15-30 per cent in beef production [69]. Grazing management and enhancing forage quality through introduction of different forage species offer a proper diet formulation in extensive systems, leading to a reduction in emission intensity by 30 per cent [70]. Supplementing feed with antimethanogenic agents (e.g. antibiotics reducing methanogen populations) or electron (H<sup>+</sup>) acceptors (e.g. nitrate salts) or dietary lipids

also helps in reducing methanogenesis. Recent research in cattle has shown that, with nitrate supplementation (21.5 g nitrate kg<sup>-1</sup> dry matter intake), enteric CH<sub>4</sub> production was reduced by 17 per cent (4.43 g kg<sup>-1</sup> dry matter intake), especially when supplemented with forage-based diets [71].

### 4.3.2 Animal genetics and breeding

Enhancing resource efficiency in animals and selecting those with lower GHG emissions per unit of feed intake are primary objectives through which breeding and genetics can aid in mitigating GHG emissions. Selective breeding for animals with low methane emissions per unit of feed consumed can lead to sustained 10 per cent reduction in methane emission without compromising productivity.

### 4.3.3 Rumen Modification

A practical and efficient option to reduce methane emissions is by modifying the rumen microbial ecosystem using vaccines which would stimulate the production of antibodies against methanogens in the host. Vaccination in an Australian sheep targeting specific methanogens resulted in reduction of CH<sub>4</sub> production by nearly 8 per cent [72].

### 4.3.4 Manure Management

Manure management includes the handling, storage and disposal of urine and faeces produced by livestock. Efficient collection and proper storage of manure are simple measures which can prevent nutrient leaching into the environment and reduce GHG emission. Manipulation of storage temperature, diet management, manure covering, anaerobic digestion of manure etc. were found to have significant influence on GHG emission.

## 5. CARBON NEURAL FARMING- A KERALA PERSPECTIVE

Through the transformation of atmospheric carbon into plant biomass and soil organic carbon, carbon sequestration significantly reduces the effects of climate change. Perennial plantations play a crucial role in mitigating climate adversities due to the ability of trees to sequester more carbon in their biomass compared to other plant types. Kerala has a predominance of plantation-based cropping systems with coconut,



rubber, pepper, coffee as the major cash crops. Studies have shown that these cropping systems have carbon sequestration potential and unexploited potential for paving way towards a carbon neutral ecosystem.

### 5.1 Coconut based Cropping System

Coconut, a perennial crop with a life expectancy of 50-60 years, has the ability to store carbon for an extended period of time, particularly in the stem. The average carbon sequestration potential of coconut trees varies between 37 kg tree<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup> (dwarf variety) up to 56 kg tree<sup>-1</sup> y<sup>-1</sup> (tall variety) [73]. The carbon sequestration potential of coconut plantation can be boosted through better utilisation of the space and solar radiation available in the understory. Cultivation of coconut with other crops like tubers, vines, food crops, and tree crops can enhance the overall carbon sequestration potential [74]. Bhagya et al. [75], compared the carbon sequestration potential among coconut based cropping systems and found that cultivation of coconut in combination with jamun recorded the highest carbon sequestration (140.06 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) followed by coconut with mango (138.91 t ha<sup>-1</sup>), coconut with garcinia (131.72 t ha<sup>-1</sup>), and the least under coconut monocrop (98.2 C t ha<sup>-1</sup>).

### 5.2 Rubber Plantations

Choudhary et al. [76] suggested the potential of rubber plantation in carbon sequestration, with a total C stock of 202.48 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>. The carbon stock of bulk soil, a measure of the sequestration potential, varied among different land use categories in the order; rubber > rice > vegetable > banana > homestead > tapioca > coconut [77]. The carbon sink loss was greatly affected by the removal of rubber plantation and the total sink loss for 23 and 30 year old rubber plantation were 214.2 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and 342.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> respectively [78].

### 5.3 Coffee Plantations

A study by Niguse et al. [79] revealed the carbon sequestration contribution of coffee in the entire coffee agroforestry system. On average coffee plants contributed 37.5 t C ha<sup>-1</sup>, representing nearly 12.8 per cent of the total carbon sequestered within the coffee agroforestry systems.

Recently Government of Kerala has conceptualized the carbon neutral coffee park

under carbon neutral Wayanad programme. The fundamental rationale of the coffee park is to double tribal and small coffee farmer's income sustainably through branding coffee as carbon neutral coffee. The main aim of the project is to establish an integrated coffee and agri-produce processing park in a 100 acre site near Kalpetta. Adopting sustainable agricultural practices will significantly improve the price for the produce.

### 5.4 Integrated Farming Systems and Wetland ecosystems

Integrated farming system (IFS) includes components such as dairy, fishery, poultry and duckery and hence often found to have increased emissions of GHGs. Conversely, the systems with a greater variety of complementary enterprises exhibited lower greenhouse gas intensity (GHGI) [80]. In the study, the integration of crop, dairy, poultry, fishery, apiary, duckery, boundary plantation, vermicompost and biogas unit demonstrated notably higher energy output (517.6 × 10<sup>3</sup> MJ ha<sup>-1</sup>), and the lowest GHGI (0.164 kg CO<sub>2</sub> eq. per kg food production).

Recently, scientists have identified immense potential for C sequestration in paddy soils than upland soils. This is mainly attributed to the slower decomposition of organic matter under submergence. Nideesh et al. [81] reported that entire *Kole* land wetland ecosystem in Kerala have the potential to sequester approximately 229.63 Tg organic carbon in its 150 cm top soil layer.

### 5.5 Carbon Neutral Kerala -Case studies

The State of Kerala is gearing to make it completely carbon neutral by the year 2050 and efforts are being taken in this direction by the Government. In the first phase, carbon-neutral farming will be initiated across 13 farms under the Agriculture Department and tribal areas and in the second phase, model carbon-neutral farms will be established in all the 140 Assembly Constituencies.

#### 5.5.1 Carbon neutral meenagadi

Wayanad district, identified as a "climate change hotspot" in the state, was chosen for a community-driven initiative named "Carbon Neutral Wayanad". This project aimed to transform the Meenangadi Gram Panchayat of Wayanad district as the first 'Carbon Neutral

Panchayat'. The objective of this project is to suggest sector-wise adaptation and mitigation strategies in Meenangadi by assessing its GHG emissions and carbon sequestration for the baseline year of 2017. The estimate indicated a net GHG emission (the difference between total emissions and total sequestration) of 11,412.57 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent in 2016-17. The implementation of the 'Tree-banking scheme' has resulted in financial gains for farmers by providing incentives for individuals who plant and protect trees. Bamboo is also being encouraged due to its high carbon sequestration potential, particularly in riverbanks for soil and water conservation. Meenangadi has also initiated adoption of energy-efficient measures like energy audit, promotion of LED bulbs, waste management plants and vermicomposting, etc.

#### **5.5.2 Kerala seed farm declared as first carbon neutral farm in the country**

On December 10, 2022 Kerala's State Seed Farm in Aluva was officially declared as carbon neutral. The seed farm has achieved the carbon neutrality through a significant reduction in carbon emissions. Estimates showed that the farm emitted 43 tonnes of carbon and while storing 213 tonnes, indicating that the farm is not only carbon neutral but also carbon negative. Organic agricultural activities which improves soil health, intercropping systems, integrated farming system (comprising crop (mainly rice), livestock, ducks and fishes), proper waste management through composting, and usage of renewable energy (solar) were the practices followed for carbon neutrality.

### **6. BENEFITS AND CHALLENGES**

As agriculture is a significant contributor to emissions, adoption of practices that offset or balance emissions with carbon removal helps in limiting the accumulation of atmospheric GHGs. Many carbon sequestration practices, improve soil structure, soil fertility, and soil organic matter content. Carbon neutral farming practices often involve planting trees, maintaining diverse landscapes, and creating habitat niches for various species. Improved soil fertility, reduced input costs, and access to carbon offset markets can enhance farm profitability and financial stability. Carbon neutral farming can enhance the marketability of agricultural products and cater to consumer demand for environmentally friendly choices.

The major challenges in scaling up of carbon farming are ensuring accurate monitoring, reporting and verification. The carbon sequestered can be intentionally or unintentionally released back into the atmosphere thus diminishing the benefits from carbon farming. Effectiveness of the management practices is determined by several factors like soil and climatic conditions. A practice that effectively reduce emissions at one site may not yield same results elsewhere. Therefore it is essential to evaluate practices for individual agricultural systems based on climate, soil characteristics, social context, and historical land use patterns and management. Accurate measurement and tracking of emissions and sequestration are essential for achieving carbon neutrality. Advanced tools such as carbon footprint calculators, remote sensing, and soil carbon assessment methods aid in quantifying progress.

### **7. CONCLUSION**

Agriculture's role in climate change is significant due to its substantial greenhouse gas emissions. As climate change continues to pose challenges, the agricultural sector must adopt sustainable practices that simultaneously ensure food security and reduce emissions. Carbon neutral farming presents a promising pathway to transform agriculture into a sustainable, climate-resilient sector. Carbon neutrality in agriculture can be achieved through various practices that maintain and enhance the carbon levels in soils, minimize GHG emission from crop and livestock production, and adoption of farming systems like mixed farming and agro-forestry that reduces emissions while promoting biodiversity. Efficient utilization of fertilizers, energy sources and other farm inputs is also crucial. By reducing emissions, enhancing sequestration, and offsetting remaining carbon footprints, this approach contributes to global climate change mitigation efforts while also improving soil health, increasing biodiversity, and fostering economic viability in farming communities.

### **DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)**

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc.) and text-to-image generators have been used during the writing or editing of this manuscript.

## COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

## REFERENCES

1. Food and Agriculture Organization. Emissions Due To Agriculture. Global, Regional and Country Trends 2000–2018. FAOSTAT, Analytical Brief Series No 18. Rome; 2020.
2. Sapkota TB, Khanam F, Mathivanan GP, Vetter S, Hussain SG, Pilat, AL. Quantifying opportunities for greenhouse gas emissions mitigation using big data from smallholder crop and livestock farmers across Bangladesh. *Sci Total Environ*. 2021b;786:147344. Accessed 5 September 2023. Available:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.147344>.
3. Raihan A, Muhtasim DA, Farhana S, Hasan MAU, Pavel MI, Faruk O, et al. An econometric analysis of Greenhouse gas emissions from different agricultural factors in Bangladesh. *Energy Nexus* 9. 2023;100179. Accessed on: 7 September 2023. Available:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nexus.2023.100179>.
4. Carbon Cycle Institute. Carbon Farming; 2020. Accessed 19 August 2023. Available:<http://www.carboncycle.org/%20carbon-farming/>.
5. Smith PD, Martino Z, Cai D, Gwary H, Janzen P, Kumar B. Agriculture. In: Metz B, Davidson OR, Bosch PR, Dave R, Meyer LA. editors. Climate change mitigation. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York: USA; 2007.
6. Food and agriculture organisation. mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions in livestock production. a review of technical options for non-CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. FAO: Rome; 2014.
7. Indian network for climate change assessment. India: Greenhouse Gas Emissions 2007. Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India, New Delhi; 2010.
8. IPCC [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change]. Special report on climate change Desertification, land degradation, sustainable land management, food security, and greenhouse gas fluxes in terrestrial ecosystems: Summary for Policymakers. Geneva: Switzerland; 2019.
9. Sharma SK, Choudhary A, Sarkar P, Biswas S, Singh A, Dadhich PK. Greenhouse gas inventory estimates for India *Curr Sci*. 2011;101:405-415.
10. FAO [Food and Agriculture Organization]. FAOSTAT-Agricultural Emissions; 2017. Accessed on:5 September 2023. Available: <http://faostat3.fao.org/home/E>.
11. Chen YH, Prinn RG. Estimation of atmospheric methane emissions between 1996 and 2001 using a three-dimensional global chemical transport model. *J Geophys Res Atmos*. 2006;111(D10). Accessed 5 September 2023. Available:<https://doi.org/10.1029/2005JD006058>.
12. Gupta PK, Gupta V, Sharma C, Das SN, Purkait N, Adhya TK. Development of methane emission factors for Indian paddy fields and estimation of national methane budget. *Chemosphere*. 2009;74:590-598.
13. Tilman D, Balzer C, Hill J, Befort BL. Global food demand and the sustainable intensification of agriculture. *PNAS* 2011; 108(50):20260–20264.
14. NAAS [National Academy of Agricultural Science]. Carbon Economy in Indian Agriculture. Policy Paper No. 69, New Delhi; 2014.
15. Flammini A, Pan X, Tubiello FN, Qiu SY, Rocha Souza L, Quadrelli R. Emissions of greenhouse gases from energy use in agriculture, forestry and fisheries: 1970–2019. *Earth Syst Sci Data*. 2022;14(2): 811-821.
16. Heimpel GE, Yang Y, Hill JD, Ragsdale DW. Environmental consequences of invasive species: Greenhouse gas emissions of insecticide use and the role of biological control in reducing emissions. *PLoS One*. 2013;8(8):72293.
17. Aulakh MS, Wassmann R, Rennenberg H.. Methane transport capacity of twenty-two rice cultivars from five major Asian rice-growing countries. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 2002;91:59–71.
18. Kerdchoechuen O. Methane emission in four rice varieties as related to sugars and organic acids of roots and root exudates

- and biomass yield. *Agric Ecosyst Environ.* 2005;108:155–163.
19. Zou J, Huang Y, Jiang J, Zheng X, Sass RL. A 3-year field measurement of methane and nitrous oxide emissions from rice paddies in China: Effects of water regime, crop residue, and fertilizer application. *Glob Biogeochem Cycles* 19 GB2021; 2005. Accessed 5 September 2023. Available: doi:10.1029/2004GB002401.
  20. Iqbal MF, Liu S, Zhu J, Zhao L, Qi T, Liang J. Limited aerenchyma reduces oxygen diffusion and methane emission in paddy. *J Environ Manage.* 2021;279:111583.
  21. Bloom A, Swisher M. Emissions from Rice Production. In: *Encyclopedia of Earth*; 2010. Accessed 24 August 2023. Available: [http://www.eoearth.org/article/Emissions\\_from\\_Rice\\_Production?topic=54486](http://www.eoearth.org/article/Emissions_from_Rice_Production?topic=54486).
  22. Gutierrez J, Kim SY, Kim PJ. Effect of rice cultivar on CH<sub>4</sub> emissions and productivity in Korean paddy soil. *Field Crops Res.* 2013;146:16-24.
  23. Su CJ, Hu X, Yan Y, Jin Z, Chen Q, Guan Y. et al. Expression of barley SUSIBA2 transcription factor yields high-starch low-methane rice. *Nature.* 2015;523:602–606.
  24. Huang M, Ibrahim MD, Xia B, Zou YB. Significance, progress and prospects for research in simplified cultivation technologies for rice in China. *J Agric Sci.* 2011;149:487-496.
  25. Susilawati HL, Setyanto P, Kartikawati R, Sutriadi MT. The opportunity of direct seeding to mitigate greenhouse gas emission from paddy rice field. In IOP conference series: Earth and environmental science. 2019393(1): 012042. IOP Publishing.
  26. O'Neill M, Lanigan GJ, Forristal PD, Osborne BA. Greenhouse gas emissions and crop yields from winter oilseed rape cropping systems are unaffected by management practices. *Front Environ Sci.* 2021;9:716636.
  27. Muller E, Wildhagen H, Quintern M, Heb J, Wichern F, Joergensen RG. CO<sub>2</sub> evolution from a ridge tilled and a mouldboard ploughed Luvisol in the field. *Appl Soil Ecol.* 2009;43(1):89–94.
  28. Prajapati P, Jacinthe PA. Methane oxidation kinetics and diffusivity in soils under conventional tillage and long-term no-till. *Geoderma.* 2014;230:161–170.
  29. Ruan L, Robertson G. Initial nitrous oxide, carbon dioxide, and methane costs of converting conservation reserve program grassland to row crops under no-till vs. conventional tillage. *Glob Change Biol Bioenergy.* 2013;19:2478–2489.
  30. West TO, Marland G. A synthesis of carbon sequestration, carbon emissions, and net carbon flux in agriculture: comparing tillage practices in the United States. *Agric Ecosyst Environ.* 2002;91(1-3):217–232.
  31. Yawen H, Wei R, Lixin W, Dafeng H, Grovea, JH, Xiaojuan Y, et al. Greenhouse gas emissions and crop yield in no-tillage systems: A meta-analysis. *Agric Ecosyst Environ.* 2018;268:144-153.
  32. Sainju UM, Jabro JD, Caesar-Ton T. Tillage, cropping sequence and nitrogen fertilization effects on dryland soil carbon dioxide emission and carbon content. *J Environ Qual.* 2010;39(3):935–945.
  33. Postgate J. Nitrogen Fixation. Cambridge University Press, England; 1998.
  34. Reckling M, Hecker J, Bergkvist G, Watson CA, Zander P, Schläfke N, et al. A cropping system assessment framework—evaluating effects of introducing legumes into crop rotations. *Eur J Agron.* 2016;76: 186–197.
  35. Bertrand S, Roberts AS, Walker W. Cover crops for climate change adaptation and mitigation agriculture and climate series. 2022. Accessed 6 September 2023. Available: <https://www.eesi.org/articles/view/cover-crops-for-climate-change-adaptation-and-mitigation>.
  36. Tiwari H, Naresh RK, Kumar L, Kattaria SK, Tewari S, Saini A, et al. Millets for food and nutritional security for small and marginal farmers of north west india in the context of climate change: A review. *Int J Plant Soil Sci.* 2022;34(23):1694-1705.
  37. John KS, Beegum, SUS, Ravi V. Management of waste lands by exploiting the carbon sequestration potential and climate resilience of Cassava. *J Root Crops.* 2014;40:28-32.
  38. Crutzen PJ, Mosier AR, Smith KA, Winiwarter W. N<sub>2</sub>O release from agro-biofuel production negates global warming reduction by replacing fossil fuels. *Atmos Chem Phys Discuss.* 2007;7(4):11191-11205.

39. Inselsbacher E, Wanek W, Ripka K, Hackl E, Sessitsch A, Strauss J, et al. Greenhouse gas fluxes respond to different N fertilizer types due to altered plant–soil–microbe interactions. *Plant Soil*. 2011;343:17–35.
40. Gu X, Weng S, Li Y, Zhou X. Effects of water and fertilizer management practices on methane emissions from paddy soils: synthesis and perspective. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2022;19:7324.
41. Huang SH, Jiang WW, Lu J, Cao JM. Influence of nitrogen and phosphorus fertilizers on N<sub>2</sub>O emissions in rice fields. *China Environ Sci*. 2005;25:540–543.
42. Xu H, Zhu B, Liu J, Li D, Yang Y, Zhang K, et al. Azolla planting reduces methane emission and nitrogen fertilizer application in double rice cropping system in southern China. *Agron Sustain Dev*. 2017;37:29.
43. Sapkota TB, Jat ML, Rana DS, Khatri-Chhetri A, Jat HS, Bijarniya D, et al. Crop nutrient management using nutrient expert improves yield, increases farmers' income and reduces greenhouse gas emissions. *Sci Rep*. 2021a;11(1):1564. Accessed 5 September 2023. Available: doi: 10.1038/s41598-020-79883-x.
44. An H, Owens J, Beres B, Li Y, Hao X. Nitrous oxide emissions with enhanced efficiency and conventional urea fertilizers in winter wheat. *Nutr Cycling Agroecosyst*. 2021;119:307-322.
45. Rutkowska B, Szulc W, Sosulski T, Skowrońska M, Szczepaniak J. Impact of reduced tillage on CO<sub>2</sub> emission from soil under maize cultivation. *Soil Tillage Res*. 2017;180:21–28.
46. Vincent B, Fuss R, Maidl FX, Huelsbergen KJ. N<sub>2</sub>O emissions and nitrogen dynamics of winter rapeseed fertilized with different N forms and a nitrification inhibitor. *Agric Ecosyst Environ*. 2018;259:86-97.
47. Huerfano X, Fuertes-Mendizabal T, Fernandez-Diez K, Estavillo JM, González-Murua C, Menéndez S. The new nitrification inhibitor 3,4-dimethylpyrazolesuccinic (DMPSA) as an alternative to DMPP for reducing N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from wheat crops under humid Mediterranean conditions. *Eur J Agron*. 2016; 80:78–87.
48. Cayuela ML, Aguilera E, Sanz-Cobena A, Adams DC, Abalos D, Barton L. et al. Direct nitrous oxide emissions in Mediterranean climate cropping systems: Emission factors based on a meta-analysis of available measurement data. *Agric Ecosyst Environ*. 2017;238:25–35.
49. Gilsanz C, Baez D, Misselbrook TH, Dhanoa MS, Cardenas LM. Development of emission factors and efficiency of two nitrification inhibitors, DCD and DMPP. *Agric Ecosyst Environ*. 2016;216:1-8.
50. Kuz'yakov Y, Subbotina I, Chen H, Bogomolova I, Xu X. Black carbon decomposition and incorporation into soil microbial biomass estimated by 14C labeling. *Soil Biol Biochem*. 2009;41:210–219.
51. Bakken LR, Bergaust L, Liu B, Frostegard A. Regulation of denitrification at the cellular level: A clue to the understanding of N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from soils. *Philos Trans R Soc*. 2012;367:1226–1234.
52. He L, Xu Y, Li J, Zhang Y, Liu Y, Lyu, H, et al. Biochar mitigated more N-related global warming potential in rice season than that in wheat season: An investigation from ten-year biochar-amended rice-wheat cropping system of China *Sci Total Environ*. 2022; 821:153344.
53. Pallavi KN. Carbon dioxide evolution and yield responses in tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.) under organic nutrition. MSc(Ag) thesis, Kerala Agricultural University, Thrissur; 2023.
54. Khosa MK, Sidhu BS, Benbi DK. Methane emission from rice fields in relation to management of irrigation water. *J Environ Biol*. 2011;32(2):169-172.
55. Senthilraja K, Venkatesan S, Nandhini DU, Dhasarathan M, Prabha B, Boomiraj, K, et al. Mitigating Methane Emission from the rice ecosystem through organic amendments. *Agriculture*. 2023;13(5): 1037. Accessed 6 Sept 2023. Available:https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture13051037.
56. Pieragostini C, Aguirre P, Mussati MC. Life cycle assessment of corn-based ethanol production in Argentina. *Sci Total Environ*. 2014;472:212-225.
57. Lagomarsino A, Agnelli AE, Liguist B, Adviento-Borbe MA, Agnelli A, Gavina G, et al. Alternate wetting and drying of rice reduced CH<sub>4</sub> emissions but triggered N<sub>2</sub>O peaks in a clayey soil of Central Italy. *Pedosphere*. 2016;26:533–548.
58. Jinsy VS. Productivity analysis of aerobic rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) and its impact on greenhouse gas emission. Ph.D thesis,

- Kerala Agricultural University, Thrissur; 2014.
59. IPCC [Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change]. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Solomon S, Qin D, Manning M, Chen Z, Marquis M, Averyt KB, Tignor M, Miller HL, editors. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, New York: USA; 2007.
  60. Nair PKR. Methodological challenges in estimating carbon sequestration potential of agroforestry systems. In: Nair PKR, Kumar MB. editors. Carbon Sequestration Potential of Agroforestry Systems: Opportunities and Challenges. Book Series Adv Agroforest Vol.8, Springer Dordrecht Publication: USA; 2011.
  61. Labata MM, Aranico EC, Tabaranza ACE, Patricio JHP, Amparado RF. Carbon stock assessment of three selected agroforestry systems in Bukidnon, Philippines. *Adv Environ Sci.* 2012;4(1):5-11.
  62. Saha SK, Nair PKR, Nair VD, Kumar BM. Carbon storage in relation to soil size-fractions under some tropical tree-based-land-use system. *Plant soil.* 2010;328: 433-436.
  63. Ou X, Zhang X, Chang S. Scenario analysis on alternative fuel/ vehicle for China's future road transport: Life-cycle energy demand and GHG emissions. *Energy policy.* 2010;38(8):3943-3956.
  64. Hedayati M, Brock PM, Nachimuthu G, Schwenke G. Farm-level strategies to reduce the life cycle greenhouse gas emissions of cotton production: An Australian perspective. *J Clean Prod.* 2019;212:974-985.
  65. Grassini P, Cassman, KG. High yield maize with large net energy yield and small global warming intensity. *PNAS* 2012; 109(4):1074-1079.
  66. Falloon P, Smith P, Powlson DS. Carbon sequestration in arable land - the case for field margins. *Soil Use Manag.* 2004;20: 240-247.
  67. Paustian K, Babcock BA, Hatfield J, Lal R, McCarl BA, McLaughlin S, et al. Agricultural Mitigation of Greenhouse Gases: Science and Policy Options. CAST (Council on Agricultural Science and Technology) Report, R141; 2004.
  68. Moraes LE, Strathe AB, Fadel JG, Casper DP, Kebreab E. Prediction of enteric methane emissions from cattle. *Glob Change Biol.* 2014;20:2140–2148.
  69. Gurian-Sherman, D. Raising the steaks: Global warming and pasture-raised beef production in the United States. Union of Concerned Scientists, USA; 2011.
  70. Garg MR. Balanced feeding for improving livestock productivity: Increase in milk production and nutrient use efficiency and decrease in methane emission. *FAO Animal Production and Health Paper No. 173*, Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations: Rome; 2013.
  71. Troy SM, Duthie CA, Hyslop JJ, Roehe R, Ross DW, Wallace RJ. Et al. Effectiveness of nitrate addition and increased oil content as methane mitigation strategies for beef cattle fed two contrasting basal diets. *J Anim Sci.* 2015;93(4):1815–1823.
  72. Wright AD, Kennedy P, O'Neill CJ, Toovey AF, Popovski S, Rea SM, et al. Reducing methane emissions in sheep by immunization against rumen methanogens. *Vaccine.* 2004;22:3976–3985.
  73. Namitha VV, Raj SK, Prathapan K. Carbon sequestration potential in coconut based cropping system: A review. *Agric Rev.* 2022. Accessed 4 September 2023. Available: doi10.18805/ag.R-2553.
  74. Nair PKR, Kumar BM, Kumar NS. Climate change, carbon sequestration, and coconut-based ecosystems. In: Kumar BM, Kumar SN. *The Coconut Palm (Cocos nucifera L.) - Research and Development Perspectives*; 2019.
  75. Bhagya HP, Maheswarappa HP, Surekha P, Bhat R. Carbon sequestration potential in coconut-based cropping systems. *Indian J Hort.* 2017;74(1):1-5.
  76. Choudhary BK, Majumdar K, Datta BK. Carbon sequestration potential and edaphic properties along the plantation age of rubber in Tripura, North-eastern India. *Curr World Environ.* 2016;11(3): 756-766.
  77. Gladis R, Aparna B, Joseph B. Carbon dynamics in major soils of south Kerala. *J. Pharmacogn. Phytochem.* 2019;SP2:15-17.
  78. Ambily KK, Ulaganathan A, Sathisha GC. Impact of removal of rubber plantation – a high altitude ecosystem for urbanization on CO<sub>2</sub> mitigating capacity by loss of carbon sink. *Res Sq*; 2021. Accessed 5 September 2023. Available:DOI:<https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-858129/v1>.

79. Niguse G, Iticha B, Kebede G, Chimdi A. Contribution of coffee plants to carbon sequestration in agroforestry systems of South-western Ethiopia. *J Agric Sci.* 2022; 160(6):440-447.
80. Fatima A, Singh VK, Babu S, Singh RK, Upadhyay PK, Rathore SS. Et al. Food production potential and environmental sustainability of different integrated farming system models in northwest India. *Front Sustain Food Syst*; 2023.
81. Nideesh P, Sreelatha AK, Anilkumar KS. Sub-soil organic carbon sequestration and USDA Soil Taxonomy of coastal acid sulphate soils; constraints and their solution learned from a pedon study in the Kole land ecosystem of Kerala, India, *Commun Soil Sci Plant Anal.* 2021;52(10): 1089-1099.

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the publisher and/or the editor(s). This publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

*Peer-review history:*

*The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:*

<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/124251>