



The environmental costs and benefits of high-yield farming

Balmford, A.; Amano, T; Bartlett, H; Chadwick, David; Collins, A.; Edwards, D; Field, R; Garnsworthy, P; Green, R; Smith, P; Waters, H.; Whitmore, A; Broom, D M; Chara, J; Finch, T; Garnett, E; Gathorne-Hardy, A; Hernandez-Medrano, J; Herrero, M; Hua, F; Latawiec, A; Misselbrook, T; Phalan, B; Simmons, B I; Takahashi, T; Vause, J; zu Ermgassen, E; Eisner, R

Nature Sustainability

DOI:

[10.1038/s41893-018-0138-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-018-0138-5)

Published: 14/09/2018

Peer reviewed version

[Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication](#)

Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA):

Balmford, A., Amano, T., Bartlett, H., Chadwick, D., Collins, A., Edwards, D., Field, R., Garnsworthy, P., Green, R., Smith, P., Waters, H., Whitmore, A., Broom, D. M., Chara, J., Finch, T., Garnett, E., Gathorne-Hardy, A., Hernandez-Medrano, J., Herrero, M., ... Eisner, R. (2018). The environmental costs and benefits of high-yield farming. *Nature Sustainability*, 1, 477-485. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-018-0138-5>

Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy


If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 **Supplementary information for**

2 **The environmental costs and benefits of high-yield farming**


3 Balmford, A., T. Amano, H. Bartlett, D. Chadwick, A. Collins, D. Edwards, R. Field, P. Garnsworthy, R. Green, P.
4 Smith, H. Waters, A. Whitmore, D.M. Broom, J. Chara, T. Finch, E. Garnett, A. Gathorne-Hardy, J. Hernandez-
5 Medrano, M. Herrero, F. Hua , A. Latawiec, T. Misselbrook, B. Phalan, B. Simmons, T. Takahashi, J. Vause, E.
6 zu Ermgassen & R. Eisner.

7 **Supplementary Figures**




8

9 **Supplementary Figure 1. Externality costs of alternative production systems against land cost for five**
 10 **externalities in four agricultural sectors, showing uncertainty for statistically derived estimates. Plots are**
 11 **modified versions of those in Fig. 2, with pale grey lines in a, b, c and e representing 95% confidence**
 12 **intervals around our GLMM-derived predictions. All other notation as in Fig. 2.**



13

14 **Supplementary Figure 2. Sensitivity tests of associations between externality costs and land costs.** Plots
 15 are modified versions of those in Fig. 2. **a**, The effect in rotational paddy systems of allocating land and GHG
 16 costs between rice and co-products based on their relative contribution to production of energy (rather than
 17 of gross monetary value; Methods). **b**, The effect on the association between water cost and land cost of
 18 paddy rice of excluding early-season data from the only study reporting data for two seasons per year. **c-f**,
 19 The effects in European dairy systems of allocating land and externality costs between milk and its beef co-
 20 product in proportion to their relative contribution to production of protein per unit area of farmland (rather
 21 than of gross monetary value; Methods). Notation as in Fig. 2. Spearman's rank correlation coefficients (p-
 22 values) are **a**. rice-rice: -0.51 (0.002), rice-cereal: -0.32 (0.10), **b**. 0.17 (0.34), **c**. 0.90 (0.08), **d**. 0.60 (0.35), **e**.
 23 0.90 (0.08) and **f**. 0.90 (0.08).



24

25 **Supplementary Figure 3. Sensitivity tests of associations between overall GHG costs (including GHG**
 26 **opportunity costs of land use) and land costs.** Plots are modified versions of those in Fig. 3, but show the
 27 effects of assuming either that carbon sequestration rates of recovering habitat are half those given in IPCC
 28 guidelines or that half of the area potentially freed from farming because of higher yield is retained under
 29 agriculture (Methods); these assumptions have identical effects. Notation as in Fig. 3. Spearman's rank
 30 correlation coefficients (p values) are **a.** rice-rice: 0.07 (0.69), rice-cereal: 0.66 (< 0.001), **b.** 0.97 (< 0.001), **c.**
 31 0.98 (< 0.001) and **d.** 0.80 (0.13).

32

33

34 **Supplementary Tables**

35

36 **Supplementary Table 1. Types of data used for investigating each sector-externality combination, and (*in***
 37 ***italics*) combinations which were not considered important or which we were unable to assess. Cell entries**
 38 **also show where each sector-externality combination is plotted.**

39

externality	sector	Asian paddy rice (China)	European wheat (UK)	Latin American beef (Brazil)	European dairy (UK)
greenhouse gas emissions		multi-site experiments providing 147 estimates from 17 studies (Fig. 2a)	multi-site experiments providing 96 estimates from 3 studies (Fig. 2c)	8 LCA* studies providing 33 estimates + process-based model providing 144 estimates (Fig. 2e, f)	process-based model providing 5 estimates (Fig. 2g)
water use		multi-site experiments providing 123 estimates from 15 studies (Fig. 2b)	<i>irrigation not widespread in UK wheat production</i>	<i>irrigation not widespread in Brazilian beef production</i>	<i>insufficient data available</i>
nitrogen loss		<i>insufficient data available</i>	single-site experiment providing 7 estimates (Fig. 2d)	<i>insufficient data available</i>	process-based model providing 5 estimates (Fig. 2h)
phosphorus loss		<i>insufficient data available</i>	<i>insufficient data available</i>	<i>insufficient data available</i>	process-based model providing 5 estimates (Fig. 2i)
soil loss		<i>insufficient data available</i>	<i>insufficient data available</i>	<i>insufficient data available</i>	process-based model providing 5 estimates (Fig. 2j)

40 *LCA = Life Cycle Assessment

41

42

43 **Supplementary Table 2. Details of Generalised Linear Mixed Models for the effect of management**
44 **variables and covariates on land and externality costs.** Estimated coefficients are shown; those whose 95%
45 confidence intervals (in parentheses) did not overlap zero are in bold. Tillage in Rice-GHG models represents
46 the effect of a tillage regime (compared to a no-tillage regime). Irrigation in Rice-GHG models is for the effect
47 of episodic midseason drainage compared to continuous flooding. The effect of irrigation in Rice-Water
48 models is based on five levels compared to continuous flooding: continuous flooding with a drainage (CF-
49 drain), alternative wetting and drying (AWD), controlled irrigation (CI), mulches or plastic films (F-M) and
50 long periods of dry soil (Dry). In Beef-GHG models, improved breed represents the effect of using an
51 improved breed relative to an unimproved breed. Cell entries also show where the results of each GLMM
52 are plotted.
53

Model		Coefficients						
Rice - GHG		Inorganic N	Organic N	Tillage	PC1	PC2		
monoculture n = 60 # studies = 5 (Fig. 2a)	Land cost	-1.53 × 10⁻³ (-2.13 × 10 ⁻³ , -0.94 × 10 ⁻³)	-1.43 × 10⁻³ (-2.35 × 10 ⁻³ , -0.50 × 10 ⁻³)	-0.061 (-0.23, 0.11)	-0.052 (-0.071, -0.033)	0.038 (0.0026, 0.074)		
	Externality cost	-0.20 × 10 ⁻³ (-1.08 × 10 ⁻³ , 0.69 × 10 ⁻³)	1.76 × 10⁻³ (0.39 × 10 ⁻³ , 3.12 × 10 ⁻³)	0.19 (-0.062, 0.45)	-0.12 (-0.15, -0.092)	-0.029 (-0.082, 0.023)		
rotational n = 80 # studies = 12 (Fig. 2a)	Land cost	-1.46 × 10⁻³ (-1.70 × 10 ⁻³ , -1.22 × 10 ⁻³)	-0.89 × 10⁻³ (-1.54 × 10 ⁻³ , -0.25 × 10 ⁻³)	0.023 (-0.27, 0.31)	-0.018 (-0.21, 0.18)	0.081 (-0.016, 0.18)	-0.015 (-0.062, 0.032)	-0.022 (-0.068, 0.023)
	Externality cost	1.28 × 10 ⁻⁴ (-3.34 × 10 ⁻⁴ , 5.95 × 10 ⁻⁴)	1.56 × 10⁻³ (0.32 × 10 ⁻³ , 2.74 × 10 ⁻³)	-0.083 (-0.65, 0.45)	-0.51 (-0.89, -0.13)	0.086 (-0.038, 0.21)	-0.094 (-0.17, -0.011)	0.016 (-0.047, 0.081)
rotational with energy allocation (Supplementary Fig. 2a)	Land cost	-1.45 × 10⁻³ (-1.69 × 10 ⁻³ , -1.20 × 10 ⁻³)	-0.95 × 10⁻³ (-1.60 × 10 ⁻³ , -0.30 × 10 ⁻³)	-0.0084 (-0.30, 0.28)	-0.020 (-0.22, 0.17)	0.11 (0.012, 0.22)	-0.037 (-0.086, 0.011)	-0.013 (-0.063, 0.034)
	Externality cost	1.62 × 10 ⁻⁴ (-2.62 × 10 ⁻⁴ , 6.13 × 10 ⁻⁴)	1.50 × 10⁻³ (0.29 × 10 ⁻³ , 2.58 × 10 ⁻³)	-0.14 (-0.71, 0.43)	-0.52 (-0.90, -0.17)	0.11 (-0.032, 0.26)	-0.11 (-0.20, -0.028)	0.032 (-0.044, 0.10)
Rice – Water		Inorganic N	Irrigation CF-drain	Irrigation AWD	Irrigation CI	Irrigation F-M	Irrigation Dry	Rainfall
n = 123 # studies = 15 (Fig. 2b)	Land cost	-1.68 × 10⁻³ (-2.02 × 10 ⁻³ , -1.33 × 10 ⁻³)	0.021 (-0.056, 0.098)	-0.0076 (-0.066, 0.051)	0.088 (-0.010, 0.19)	0.041 (-0.071, 0.15)	0.066 (-0.039, 0.17)	-0.70 × 10 ⁻⁴ (-2.66 × 10 ⁻⁴ , 1.21 × 10 ⁻⁴)
	Externality cost	-1.26 × 10 ⁻³ (-2.64 × 10 ⁻³ , 0.13 × 10 ⁻³)	-0.095 (-0.41, 0.22)	-0.53 (-0.76, -0.28)	-0.88 (-1.28, -0.48)	-1.12 (-1.58, -0.65)	-1.29 (-1.72, -0.87)	-1.12 × 10⁻³ (-1.90 × 10 ⁻³ , -0.35 × 10 ⁻³)
excluding three records in ref. 68	Land cost	-1.67 × 10⁻³ (-2.02 × 10 ⁻³ , -1.32 × 10 ⁻³)	0.023 (-0.057, 0.10)	-0.0066 (-0.068, 0.055)	0.089 (-0.011, 0.19)	0.042 (-0.072, 0.16)	0.067 (-0.040, 0.17)	-1.02 × 10 ⁻⁴ (-3.94 × 10 ⁻⁴ , 1.87 × 10 ⁻⁴)
n = 120 # studies = 15 (Supplementary Fig. 2b)	Externality cost	-1.41 × 10⁻³ (-2.73 × 10 ⁻³ , -0.068 × 10 ⁻³)	-0.14 (-0.44, 0.17)	-0.53 (-0.77, -0.30)	-0.92 (-1.31, -0.54)	-1.19 (-1.64, -0.74)	-1.32 (-1.72, -0.91)	0.28 × 10 ⁻³ (-0.82 × 10 ⁻³ , 1.38 × 10 ⁻³)
Wheat - GHG		Ammonium N rate	Urea N rate	dicyandiamide rate				
n = 96 # regions = 3 (Fig. 2c)	Land cost	-4.17 × 10⁻³ (-4.87 × 10 ⁻³ , -3.47 × 10 ⁻³)	-3.97 × 10⁻³ (-4.92 × 10 ⁻³ , -3.02 × 10 ⁻³)	-0.0035 (-0.011, 0.0039)				
	Externality cost	1.10 × 10⁻³ (0.25 × 10 ⁻³ , 1.94 × 10 ⁻³)	-0.37 × 10 ⁻³ (-1.51 × 10 ⁻³ , 0.77 × 10 ⁻³)	-0.0080 (-0.017, 0.00086)				

Beef – GHG (empirical)		Improved breed	Supplementary feed	Improved pasture			
n = 33	Land cost	-0.41	-0.36	-1.26			
# studies = 8		(-1.01, 0.19)	(-0.92, 0.20)	(-1.81, -0.68)			
(Fig. 2e)	Externality cost	-0.022	-0.14	-0.38			
		(-0.26, 0.23)	(-0.34, 0.071)	(-0.57, -0.17)			

54

55

56 **Supplementary Table 3. Summary of input settings used to characterise contrasting Brazilian beef**
 57 **production systems in RUMINANT and DYNMOD.**

58

	pasture systems	silvopasture systems	feedlot-finishing systems
forage quality	very low (i.e. unimproved), low, moderate or high		high or very high
feed type	none, moderate quality grain or high quality grain (boosted in silvopasture systems to simulate access to <i>Leucaena</i>)		mixed ration while in feedlot, high quality grain while on pasture
feed quantity (kg/animal/day)	0, 0.5, 1 or 2		1.1-2.5 (over life, and adjusted in feedlot to meet target weight)
cattle breed	unimproved or improved	unimproved or improved	unimproved or improved
replacement rate (%/year)	7.5, 10 or 20	20	10 or 20
age at first calving (years)	3, 4 or 4.5	3	3 or 4
parturition rate (%/year/reproductive female)	55, 65 or 80	80	65 or 80
adult mortality (%/year)	2, 4 or 5	2	2 or 4
juvenile mortality (%/year)	5, 8 or 10	5	5 or 8

59

60

61 **Supplementary Table 4. Profile of the key features of our contrasting model systems of UK dairy**
 62 **production.**
 63

	conventional			organic	
	C1	C2	C3	O1	O2
grazing access (days/year)	270	180	0	270	200
milk yield (Energy-Corrected Milk kg/animal-year)	5500	7800	9200	4700	6300
proportion of forage when grazing					
<i>grazed grass</i>	1	0.5	n/a	1	1
<i>grass silage</i>	0	0.5	n/a	0	0
proportion of forage when housed					
<i>grass silage</i>	1	1	0.5	1	1
<i>maize silage</i>	0	0	0.5	0	0
replacement rate (%)	31	28	33	28	30
age at first calving (months)	26	30	26	34	34
mean live weight of replacements (kg)	340	372	340	404	404
area used (ha/animal*)					
<i>grazing</i>	0.367	0.122	0.039	0.472	0.326
<i>grass silage</i>	0.130	0.268	0.182	0.201	0.381
<i>maize silage</i>	0	0	0.096	0	0
<i>concentrates</i>	0.053	0.129	0.161	0.191	0.419
<i>total</i>	0.550	0.519	0.478	0.864	1.126
N excreted (kg/animal*-year)	110	105	116	106	109
P excreted (kg/animal*-year)	15.0	17.5	18.1	14.8	17.2
manure management – housing					
<i>dairy adults</i>	slurry	slurry	slurry	straw	slurry
<i>young stock</i>	straw	straw	straw	straw	straw
<i>beef</i>	straw	straw	straw	straw	straw
manure management – hardstanding (h/day)	4	4	0	4	4
manure management – storage					
<i>dairy slurry</i>		above-ground tank, no separator		farmyard	as C1-C3
<i>beef and youngstock</i>		farmyard manure heap		manure heap	as C1-C3
manure management – land spreading			50% grass trailing shoe, 50% on maize incorporated within 6h		
<i>dairy slurry</i>	trailing shoe	trailing shoe		surface	trailing shoe
<i>beef and youngstock</i>	surface	surface		surface	surface

64 *an animal is an adult cow plus her replacements

65

66

67 **Supplementary Table 5. Sources of values used to estimate the rate of accumulation of above- and below-**
68 **ground carbon when farmland recovers to natural habitat.**

69

variable	value(s) used	source
rate of recovery of above-ground biomass (tonnes dry matter/ha-year)	domain-, ecosystem- and continent-specific values	Table 4.9 in ref. 32
carbon content of biomass (tonnes C/tonne dry matter)	0.47	Table 4.3 in ref. 32
soil carbon content of natural habitat (tonnes C/ha)	climate- and soil-specific values	Table 2.3 in ref. 32
proportional change in soil carbon upon land-use transition	transition-specific values	Ref. 113

70