



HAL
open science

Recent intensification of wetland methane feedback

Zhen Zhang, Benjamin Poulter, Andre F Feldman, Qing Ying, Philippe Ciais,
Shushi Peng, Xin Li

► **To cite this version:**

Zhen Zhang, Benjamin Poulter, Andre F Feldman, Qing Ying, Philippe Ciais, et al.. Recent intensification of wetland methane feedback. *Nature Climate Change*, 2023, 13, pp.430-433. 10.1038/s41558-023-01629-0 . hal-04042347

HAL Id: hal-04042347

<https://hal.science/hal-04042347v1>

Submitted on 23 Mar 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Recent intensification of wetland methane feedback

Received: 7 September 2022

Accepted: 10 February 2023

Published online: 20 March 2023

 Check for updatesZhen Zhang^{1,2}✉, Benjamin Poulter³, Andrew F. Feldman^{3,4}, Qing Ying², Philippe Ciais⁵, Shushi Peng⁶ & Xin Li¹

The positive response of wetland methane (CH₄) emissions to climate change is an important yet uncertain Earth-system feedback that amplifies atmospheric CH₄ concentrations. Here, using a wetland model, we report intensified wetland CH₄ emissions during 2000–2021, corresponding with 2020 and 2021 being exceptional years of growth. Our results highlight the need for sustained monitoring and observations of global wetland CH₄ fluxes to document emerging trends, variability and underlying drivers.

Methane (CH₄) is a potent greenhouse gas with a warming potential that is 84 times stronger than CO₂ on a 20-year horizon¹. Because of its relatively short lifetime (~10 years) in the atmosphere, anthropogenic methane emission reductions are an important mitigation option for limiting near-term warming well below a 1.5 °C or 2 °C increase in global temperature^{2,3}. The rapidly rising atmospheric methane concentrations in recent decades in addition to the record-high growth rates in 2020 and 2021 (hereafter, 2020/2021) raise concerns, however, that climate change is amplifying natural CH₄ emissions. The reason for the recent rise of methane is still unclear because of the limited understanding of the interplay between methane sources and sinks. However, the continuously depleting trend of atmospheric ¹³C-CH₄ suggest probably strong contributions from increasing biogenic sources^{4–8}, pointing to either constant increases from agricultural and waste sectors or wetland CH₄ feedback, or both. Here we report synergies between climate change and the rapid increase in global wetland CH₄ emissions in recent years.

Paleoclimate records suggest that positive warming–wetland CH₄ feedbacks can increase atmospheric methane during rapid, decadal, time scales^{9,10}. The wetland CH₄ feedback to global warming is mainly hypothesized to be a result of (1) the effect of rising temperatures on microbial activities (for example, methanogenesis) and on thawing permafrost and (2) the expansion of wetlands with increased total precipitation, to the first order due to the physical relationship (that is, the Clausius–Clapeyron relationship) between rising temperatures and atmospheric water content¹¹. Future climate projections^{12,13} suggest that wetland emissions will increase by 30–50 TgCH₄yr⁻¹ globally by

2050 with respect to the 2010 level in the Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP8.5) scenario, in which warming follows emissions trajectories that exceed 3–5 °C. Assuming that anthropogenic methane emissions must decline by 30–60%¹⁴ (~122 TgCH₄yr⁻¹) for warming to stay below 1.5 °C, this projected increase of wetland emissions could offset 25–40% of the reduction. Recent observational studies suggest that the tropical hydrological cycle has already intensified due to strengthened Walker circulation¹⁵. In higher latitudes, long-term warming¹⁶ appears to be driving increases in growing-season emissions of wetland methane¹⁷. Satellite-based observations suggest increases in tropical biogenic CH₄ emissions may already be driving the atmospheric CH₄ upward^{18–20} due to intensified rainfall and rising temperature.

Despite the potential for positive methane–climate feedbacks from global wetlands, most Earth System Models (ESMs) and Integrated Assessment Models (IAMs) that informed the last Assessment Report of the IPCC do not directly incorporate this process. These models focus on long-term atmospheric methane concentration increases coming from human activities such as industry and agriculture. From a modelling perspective, wetland emissions are considered to impact mainly the interannual variability (IAV) in the atmospheric CH₄ growth rate (except for years with severe fire events when biomass burning emissions play a larger role), which is regulated by climate phenomena such as the El Niño–Southern Oscillation²¹.

Here we apply a wetland methane model developed to represent tropical and permafrost wetlands with two different climate datasets, one based on ground meteorological stations and one from reanalysis, to evaluate climate-change-driven wetland CH₄ emissions from

¹National Tibetan Plateau Data Center (TPDC), State Key Laboratory of Tibetan Plateau Earth System, Environment and Resource (TPESER), Institute of Tibetan Plateau Research, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China. ²Earth System Science Interdisciplinary Center, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA. ³NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Biospheric Sciences Laboratory, Greenbelt, MD, USA. ⁴NASA Postdoctoral Program, NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD, USA. ⁵Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement, IPSL-LSCE, CEA-CNRS-UVSQ-UPSACLAY, Gif sur Yvette, France. ⁶Sino-French Institute for Earth System Science, College of Urban and Environmental Sciences, Peking University, Beijing, China.

✉e-mail: yuisheng@gmail.com




Fig. 1 | Temporal trends and variations in wetland CH₄ emissions during 2000–2021 relative to the baseline of 2000–2006 level in comparison to future projections¹². Shaded areas present 1σ range of the estimates from each future RCP. Annual total emissions from two estimates based on two climate forcing datasets, a ground-based dataset from the CRU at the University of East Anglia and a reanalysis-based MERRA2. Coloured lines represent ensemble mean of each future projection scenario.

2000 to 2021. The CH₄ emission parameterizations are calibrated against a benchmark dataset of wetland fluxes from an independent atmospheric inversion²² and thus differ with the two climate datasets (Methods). This treatment is for consistency with the setup of a previous future projection study¹², which used the same land surface model driven by a full ensemble of bias-corrected Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 5 (CMIP5) climate datasets.

We estimate that the wetland CH₄ emissions from simulations based on ground-based and reanalysis-based climate forcing significantly increased ($P < 0.01$; linear regression) at a rate of 1.3–1.4 TgCH₄yr⁻¹ from 2000 to 2021 (Fig. 1). The estimated increase is higher than the ensemble average under the high warming climate scenario RCP8.5 (at 0.9 TgCH₄yr⁻¹)¹². The larger wetland CH₄ increases from the observational-based simulations are probably due to the differences in temperature and precipitation between the CMIP5 models and observation-based climate datasets for the wetland regions. This indicates that global wetlands in high-latitude and tropical regions are experiencing stronger impacts of climate change than predicted in the most intensive climate warming in the CMIP5 models. The simulated wetland dynamics based on a prognostic hydrologic approach shows a good agreement with the land-water mass anomalies from the Gravity Recovery and Climate Experiment satellite (Supplementary Fig. 1).

Global mean annual emissions for 2007–2021 due to climate change impacts on wetlands increased by 5–6% (8–10 TgCH₄yr⁻¹) relative to the 2000–2006 baseline (Fig. 2a). The positive anomalies




Fig. 2 | Regional changes in wetland CH₄ emissions. **a**, Anomaly of annual emissions (%) from 2000–2021 ($n = 22$) relative to the mean of its 2000–2006 level for major regions. **b**, Detrended and deseasonalized annual emission anomaly and linear fitted trends for 2000–2021 ($n = 22$). The spread of data represents IAV of corresponding metrics. The central mark and the bottom and top edges of the box indicate the median, and the 25th and 75th percentiles,

respectively. The black whiskers extend to the most extreme data points not considered outliers, which are denoted as dots. The black dots are outliers for individual years that are not 2020/2021. The region mask is defined in Supplementary Fig. 2. GL, Global; NH, Northern Hemisphere; SH, Southern Hemisphere; NAm, North America; SAm, South America; Afr, Africa; NAs, North Asia; SAs, South Asia; SEAs, Southeast Asia.

are 14–26 TgCH₄ yr⁻¹ in 2020 and 13–23 TgCH₄ yr⁻¹ in 2021, each of which has a 5% probability of occurring in the 20-year horizon when excluding the positive trend. The uncertainties of annual estimates reflect different IAV across regions, with reanalysis-based estimates generally giving a higher variability than observational-based estimates. Both simulations suggest that tropical wetlands dominated the increase, although with diverse regional differences (Extended Data Fig. 1), mainly due to uncertainty in spatiotemporal patterns of precipitation between the two climate forcing datasets (Extended Data Fig. 2). The simulations driven by the ground-based climate forcing data indicate trends over South America as the single largest contributor, while the reanalysis-based simulations suggest that trends over Africa, South Asia and Southeast Asia are also responsible for high emissions. Despite the difference in estimated emissions magnitudes and regional changes, both simulations agree that tropical wetlands are emerging hotspots, with 2020 and 2021 being highly anomalous years. This finding is in line with recent atmospheric inversions^{18,20,23}, which suggest that tropical methane emissions contributed to a large portion of the atmospheric methane growth rate in 2020 and 2021.

The detrended and deseasonalized time series (Fig. 2b) shows that the global annual anomalies in 2020 and 2021 are larger than 1 σ for the period of 2000–2021 in the reanalysis-based simulation. Even though no strong peak anomalies are detected by the ground-based run, the positive trends are higher than those of the reanalysis-based run (Extended Data Fig. 3). This is mainly due to different parameterization schemes against the different climatic forcings, which results in higher temperature sensitivity and lower wetland extent in the ground-based run compared to the reanalysis-based run (Supplementary Table 3). The reanalysis-based simulation suggests that Africa has a 3 σ anomalous peak CH₄ emission in 2019 due to extremely large rainfall events, which coincides with strong XCH₄ (that is, column-averaged CH₄ concentration) enhancement during 2019 over East Africa recorded by two satellite datasets²⁴. This pattern is not captured by the ground-based run, highlighting the influence of precipitation inputs on CH₄ estimation for regions with sparse measurements (see Methods for the descriptions about climatic inputs).

Our results suggest the probable emergence of a strong positive wetland CH₄ feedback under current climate-change-driven warming and changes in precipitation. With the uncertainty in climate datasets, it is unclear whether rising temperature or strengthened precipitation plays a more prominent role in the rise of wetland CH₄. Further evidence of intensified wetland CH₄ emissions from top-down inversions would help constrain the representation of processes and parameter uncertainties in the land surface models. Sustained and enhanced multiscale monitoring and observations will also help track sources and changes of methane emissions, particularly in remote areas^{25,26} that have sparse measurement coverage and strong potential for climate feedbacks, like many tropical wetlands. While the high-latitude wetlands appear to have only moderate CH₄ increases, the climate–permafrost thaw feedback on future CH₄ emissions remains a concern¹². The emergence of a wetland–climate feedback emphasizes that coordination between the scientific community on integrating rapidly changing biospheric processes within remaining carbon budgets is a priority for staying below 1.5 °C and 2.0 °C.

Online content

Any methods, additional references, Nature Portfolio reporting summaries, source data, extended data, supplementary information, acknowledgements, peer review information; details of author contributions and competing interests; and statements of data and code availability are available at <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-023-01629-0>.

References

- IPCC *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis* (eds Stocker, T. F. et al.) (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2013).
- Dreyfus, G. B., Xu, Y., Shindell, D. T., Zaelke, D. & Ramanathan, V. Mitigating climate disruption in time: a self-consistent approach for avoiding both near-term and long-term global warming. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci.* **119**, e2123536119 (2022).
- Ocko, I. B. et al. Acting rapidly to deploy readily available methane mitigation measures by sector can immediately slow global warming. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **16**, 054042 (2021).
- Nisbet, E. G. et al. Very strong atmospheric methane growth in the 4 Years 2014–2017: implications for the Paris Agreement. *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles* <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GB006009> (2019).
- Schaefer, H. et al. A 21st-century shift from fossil-fuel to biogenic methane emissions indicated by ¹³CH₄. *Science* **352**, 80–84 (2016).
- Lan, X. et al. Improved constraints on global methane emissions and sinks using $\delta^{13}\text{C-CH}_4$. *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles* **35**, e2021GB007000 (2021).
- Zhang, Z. et al. Anthropogenic emission is the main contributor to the rise of atmospheric methane during 1993–2017. *Natl Sci. Rev.* <https://doi.org/10.1093/nsr/nwab200> (2021).
- Oh, Y. et al. Improved global wetland carbon isotopic signatures support post-2006 microbial methane emission increase. *Commun. Earth Environ.* **3**, 159 (2022).
- Hopcroft, P. O., Valdes, P. J., O'Connor, F. M., Kaplan, J. O. & Beerling, D. J. Understanding the glacial methane cycle. *Nat. Commun.* **8**, 14383 (2017).
- Kleinen, T., Gromov, S., Steil, B. & Brovkin, V. Atmospheric methane since the LGM was driven by wetland sources. *Clim. Past Discuss.* **2022**, 1–30 (2022).
- Trenberth, K. E., Dai, A., Rasmussen, R. M. & Parsons, D. B. The changing character of precipitation. *Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc.* **84**, 1205–1218 (2003).
- Zhang, Z. et al. Emerging role of wetland methane emissions in driving 21st century climate change. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci.* **114**, 9647–9652 (2017).
- Koffi, E. N., Bergamaschi, P., Alkama, R. & Cescatti, A. An observation-constrained assessment of the climate sensitivity and future trajectories of wetland methane emissions. *Sci. Adv.* **6**, eaay4444 (2020).
- Shindell, D. & Smith, C. J. Climate and air-quality benefits of a realistic phase-out of fossil fuels. *Nature* **573**, 408–411 (2019).
- Barichivich, J. et al. Recent intensification of Amazon flooding extremes driven by strengthened Walker circulation. *Sci. Adv.* **4**, eaat8785 (2018).
- Rantanen, M. et al. The Arctic has warmed nearly four times faster than the globe since 1979. *Commun. Earth Environ.* **3**, 168 (2022).
- Rößger, N., Sachs, T., Wille, C., Boike, J. & Kutzbach, L. Seasonal increase of methane emissions linked to warming in Siberian tundra. *Nat. Clim. Change* **12**, 1031–1036 (2022).
- Feng, L., Palmer, P. I., Zhu, S., Parker, R. J. & Liu, Y. Tropical methane emissions explain large fraction of recent changes in global atmospheric methane growth rate. *Nat. Commun.* **13**, 1378 (2022).
- Basu, S. et al. Estimating emissions of methane consistent with atmospheric measurements of methane and $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ of methane. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **22**, 15351–15377 (2022).
- Feng, L., Palmer, P. I., Parker, R. J., Lunt, M. F. & Boesch, H. Methane emissions responsible for record-breaking atmospheric methane growth rates in 2020 and 2021. *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.* **2022**, 1–23 (2022).
- Bousquet, P. et al. Contribution of anthropogenic and natural sources to atmospheric methane variability. *Nature* **443**, 439–443 (2006).
- Spahni, R. et al. Constraining global methane emissions and uptake by ecosystems. *Biogeosciences* **8**, 1643–1665 (2011).

23. Peng, S. et al. Wetland emission and atmospheric sink changes explain methane growth in 2020. *Nature* **612**, 477–482 (2022).
24. Lunt, M. F. et al. Rain-fed pulses of methane from East Africa during 2018–2019 contributed to atmospheric growth rate. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **16**, 024021 (2021).
25. Shaw, J. T. et al. Large methane emission fluxes observed from tropical wetlands in Zambia. *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles* **36**, e2021GB007261 (2022).
26. France, J. L. et al. Very large fluxes of methane measured above Bolivian seasonal wetlands. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci.* **119**, e2206345119 (2022).

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

© The Author(s) 2023

Methods

LPJ-wsl model

The Lund–Potsdam–Jena–Wald, Schnee and Landschaft (LPJ-wsl) model applied in this study is a process-based dynamic global vegetation model developed for carbon cycle applications. This study extends the Zhang et al.²⁷ analysis, which ended in 2016, through to 2021. The LPJ-wsl model accounts for the major global processes controlling wetland CH₄ emissions such as soil permafrost, the rate of microbial decomposition and wetland extent dynamics. The version of the LPJ-wsl model applied in this study includes a hydrology model, TOPMODEL, to determine the wetland area and its inter- and intra-annual dynamics²⁸, a permafrost and dynamic snow model²⁹, and a wetland CH₄ emission model³⁰, each of which is incorporated into the LPJ-wsl framework with explicit representation of the effects of snow and freeze–thaw cycles on soil temperature and moisture, and thus CH₄ emissions. The permafrost module simulates the freeze–thaw cycle for eight discrete layers of soil thickness, where the soil heat capacity and its thermal conductivity are affected by the volumetric fractions of the soil physical components, such as the water–ice fraction, mineral soil or peat.

Wetland CH₄ module

Generally, wetland CH₄ emissions are modelled as a function of the CH₄ emitting factor, soil temperature at the upper soil depth (0–50 cm), ecosystem heterotrophic respiration and wetland extent. The CH₄ emitting factor (F) for grid cell X is calculated as a combination of latitudinal scaling factors and surface temperature using the equation:

$$F(X) = \sigma(X)F_T + (1 - \sigma(X))F_B \quad (1)$$

where $\sigma(X)$ is $\exp(T(X) - T_{\max})$, $T(X)$ is the mean soil temperature between 1960 and 1990 at 0–50 cm depth, and maximum temperature $T_{\max} = 303.35$ K. F_T and F_B are two latitudinal factors representing typical tropical and boreal wetlands, respectively. F_T and F_B were fit to match a benchmark of wetland CH₄ fluxes from an independent atmospheric inversion study²² for consistency with the magnitude of the future projection study¹², which estimated global wetland emissions at -172 TgCH₄ yr⁻¹ in 2004. For Climatic Research Unit (CRU) runs, monthly climatic inputs for temperature, precipitation, number of wet days and cloud cover are used, while for Modern-Era Retrospective analysis for Research and Applications Version 2 (MERRA2) runs, daily climatic inputs for temperature, precipitation, shortwave radiation and longwave radiation are used. The calibrated F_T and F_B are 0.0851 and 0.0333, respectively, for MERRA2 runs and 0.1281 and 0.0109, respectively, for CRU runs. The modelled coefficient Q10 that represents the soil temperature dependency of the net CH₄ flux was compared with the values that are extracted from the FLUXNET-CH4, a global database of 47 eddy-covariance measurements^{31–33} covering global wetlands, to evaluate the effect of temperature on CH₄ emission predictions. The Q10 metric is extracted from the exponential fit of CH₄ emissions to soil temperature at a 0–50 cm depth using the following equation:

$$Q10 = (R_2/R_1)^{\left(\frac{10}{T_2-T_1}\right)} \quad (2)$$

where R_1 and R_2 are the CH₄ flux at temperatures T_1 and T_2 , respectively. The results suggest that the LPJ-modelled temperature dependence for each season (Supplementary Fig. 3) is generally comparable with the observational estimates and is slightly lower than the measurements during spring (March, April, May), summer (June, July, August) and autumn (September, October, November). The LPJ-wsl model is shown to have relatively low weighted root mean square error compared to satellite-constrained top-down wetland CH₄ estimates among process-based wetland CH₄ models when compared with atmospheric measurements³⁴. Notably, recent studies show that process-based

wetland models underestimate the magnitude of annual total emissions for some of the underrepresented tropical wetland hotspots, such as African wetlands²⁵ and South American wetlands²⁶.

Model simulations

Two gridded meteorological datasets were used for the simulations. The ground-based input dataset was a monthly climatic observation (denoted as CRU) based on meteorological stations that was developed by the CRU at the University of East Anglia. The reanalysis-based climate dataset was a daily climatic dataset from one-hourly reanalysis MERRA2 from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Global Modeling and Assimilation Office. The CRU dataset is formed by interpolation of site-level measurements to cover land worldwide, while the MERRA2 reanalysis relies on atmospheric models that assimilate multiple sources from satellite observations and ground measurements. The difference in methodology between these two types of climatic inputs results in different spatiotemporal variability in climate variables, especially for precipitation which determines the spatiotemporal patterns of wetland inundation dynamics. Two sets of factorial runs for the period of 2007–2021 were conducted with the climatology data of CRU and MERRA2 to disentangle the drivers of post-2007 wetland methane emissions on CH₄ emissions (Supplementary Table 2). Each set of factorial runs included four runs forced with climatological values (average monthly and/or daily fields for 2000–2006) for air temperature, precipitation and CO₂ concentration. The difference between the baseline simulation and factorial runs provides the individual contributions of climate variables to the anomaly of CH₄ emissions in the post-2007 period.

Decomposition of the time series

The changes in wetland emissions were due to a combination of long-term trends, seasonal cycles and anomalies (IAV, peak emission of a year is especially notable). The components were calculated using equation (3):

$$Y[t] = T[t] + S[t] + r[t] \quad (3)$$

The function first determines the trend component $T[t]$ for time t using a 12-month moving average with equal weights. The seasonal component $S[t]$ is then centred. The residual $r[t]$ is the anomaly that is determined by removing trends and seasonal cycles from the original time series.

Reporting summary

Further information on research design is available in the Nature Portfolio Reporting Summary linked to this article.

Data availability

All the wetland CH₄ emission data³⁵ and regional masks used in this study are available in the publicly accessible Zenodo repository (<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7595223>).

Code availability

Code and documentation for the LPJ-wsl model³⁶ is publicly available at https://github.com/ben-poulter/LPJ-wsl_v2.0.git.

References

- Zhang, Z. et al. Enhanced response of global wetland methane emissions to the 2015–2016 El Niño–Southern Oscillation event. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **13**, 074009 (2018).
- Zhang, Z., Zimmermann, N. E., Kaplan, J. O. & Poulter, B. Modeling spatiotemporal dynamics of global wetlands: comprehensive evaluation of a new sub-grid TOPMODEL parameterization and uncertainties. *Biogeosciences* **13**, 1387–1408 (2016).

29. Wania, R., Ross, I. & Prentice, I. C. Integrating peatlands and permafrost into a dynamic global vegetation model: 2. Evaluation and sensitivity of vegetation and carbon cycle processes. *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles* **23**, GB3015 (2009).
30. Hodson, E. L., Poulter, B., Zimmermann, N. E., Prigent, C. & Kaplan, J. O. The El Niño-Southern Oscillation and wetland methane interannual variability. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **38**, L08810 (2011).
31. Knox, S. H. et al. FLUXNET-CH₄ synthesis activity: objectives, observations, and future directions. *Bull. Am. Meteor. Soc.* **100**, 2607–2632 (2019).
32. Delwiche, K. B. et al. FLUXNET-CH₄: a global, multi-ecosystem dataset and analysis of methane seasonality from freshwater wetlands. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* **13**, 3607–3689 (2021).
33. Chang, K.-Y. et al. Substantial hysteresis in emergent temperature sensitivity of global wetland CH₄ emissions. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 2266 (2021).
34. Ma, S. et al. Satellite constraints on the latitudinal distribution and temperature sensitivity of wetland methane emissions. *AGU Adv.* **2**, e2021AV000408 (2021).
35. Zhang, Z. Global wetland CH₄ emissions for 2000–2021. *Zenodo* <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7595223> (2023).
36. Poulter, B. LPJ-wsl Dynamic global vegetation model v.2.0. GitHub https://github.com/benpoulter/LPJ-wsl_v2.0 (2022).
37. Zhang, Z. et al. Development of the global dataset of Wetland Area and Dynamics for Methane Modeling (WAD2M). *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* **13**, 2001–2023 (2021).

Acknowledgements

This research was funded by National Natural Science Foundation of China Basic Science Center for Tibetan Plateau Earth System project (NSFC BSCTPES No. 41988101), the NASA CYGNSS grant no. 20-CYGNSS20-0038, and Woodwell Climate Research Center

Subaward no. #WOODWELL-3PAU01-01. We acknowledge support from NASA's Terrestrial Ecology Program and Carbon Monitoring System. A.F.F. was supported by an appointment to the NASA Postdoctoral Program at the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, administered by Oak Ridge Associated Universities under contract with NASA. Correspondence and request for materials should be addressed to Z.Z. (email: yuisheng@gmail.com).

Author contributions

Z.Z. and B.P. designed the study. Z.Z. performed the simulations and analysed the data. Z.Z., B.P., A.F.F., Q.Y., P.C., S.P. and X.L. wrote the paper.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Additional information


Extended data is available for this paper at <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-023-01629-0>.

Supplementary information The online version contains supplementary material available at <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-023-01629-0>.


Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to Zhen Zhang.

Peer review information *Nature Climate Change* thanks Xin Lan, Jacob Shaw and the other, anonymous, reviewer(s) for their contribution to the peer review of this work.


Reprints and permissions information is available at www.nature.com/reprints.



Extended Data Fig. 1 | Cumulative monthly wetland CH₄ emissions for individual years by region. (a) the reanalysis-based estimate forced by MERRA2 and (b) the ground-based estimate forced by CRU.



Extended Data Fig. 2 | Temporal variations of major climatic variables for 2000-2021. (a) annual mean temperature (°C) and (b) annual total precipitation (mm yr⁻¹) for wetland regions from CRU and MERRA2. The wetland mask is defined by maximum areal extent of a wetland extent product Wetland Area and Dynamics for Methane Modeling (WAD2M)³⁷.



Extended Data Fig. 3 | Attribution of the changes in wetland CH₄ emissions for 2007–2021. Three major factors (P: Precipitation; T: Temperature; CO₂: atmospheric CO₂ concentration) are used for 2007–2021 relative to mean of 2000–2006 calculated from the factorial experiments (Supplementary Table 1).

Reporting Summary

Nature Portfolio wishes to improve the reproducibility of the work that we publish. This form provides structure for consistency and transparency in reporting. For further information on Nature Portfolio policies, see our [Editorial Policies](#) and the [Editorial Policy Checklist](#).

Statistics

For all statistical analyses, confirm that the following items are present in the figure legend, table legend, main text, or Methods section.

n/a | Confirmed

- | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | The exact sample size (n) for each experimental group/condition, given as a discrete number and unit of measurement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | A statement on whether measurements were taken from distinct samples or whether the same sample was measured repeatedly |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | The statistical test(s) used AND whether they are one- or two-sided
<i>Only common tests should be described solely by name; describe more complex techniques in the Methods section.</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | A description of all covariates tested |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | A description of any assumptions or corrections, such as tests of normality and adjustment for multiple comparisons |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | A full description of the statistical parameters including central tendency (e.g. means) or other basic estimates (e.g. regression coefficient) AND variation (e.g. standard deviation) or associated estimates of uncertainty (e.g. confidence intervals) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | For null hypothesis testing, the test statistic (e.g. F , t , r) with confidence intervals, effect sizes, degrees of freedom and P value noted
<i>Give P values as exact values whenever suitable.</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | For Bayesian analysis, information on the choice of priors and Markov chain Monte Carlo settings |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | For hierarchical and complex designs, identification of the appropriate level for tests and full reporting of outcomes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Estimates of effect sizes (e.g. Cohen's d , Pearson's r), indicating how they were calculated |

Our web collection on [statistics for biologists](#) contains articles on many of the points above.

Software and code

Policy information about [availability of computer code](#)

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| Data collection | Dynamic global vegetation model LPJ-wsl was used for the simulations. |
| Data analysis | Code and documentation for the LPJ-wsl model is publicly available at https://github.com/benpoulter/LPJ-wsl_v2.0.git . All the analyses were conducted with R 4.0.2 for Mac OS High Sierra 10.13.6. The R package used for the zonal analysis are freely available on CRAN at: https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/raster/index.html . |

For manuscripts utilizing custom algorithms or software that are central to the research but not yet described in published literature, software must be made available to editors and reviewers. We strongly encourage code deposition in a community repository (e.g. GitHub). See the Nature Portfolio [guidelines for submitting code & software](#) for further information.

Data

Policy information about [availability of data](#)

All manuscripts must include a [data availability statement](#). This statement should provide the following information, where applicable:

- Accession codes, unique identifiers, or web links for publicly available datasets
- A description of any restrictions on data availability
- For clinical datasets or third party data, please ensure that the statement adheres to our [policy](#)

All the wetland CH₄ emission data and regional masks used in this study are available in the publicly accessible Zenodo repository (doi: 10.5281/zenodo.7595223).

Human research participants

Policy information about [studies involving human research participants and Sex and Gender in Research](#).

Reporting on sex and gender	<input type="text" value="N/A"/>
Population characteristics	<input type="text" value="N/A"/>
Recruitment	<input type="text" value="N/A"/>
Ethics oversight	<input type="text" value="N/A"/>

Note that full information on the approval of the study protocol must also be provided in the manuscript.

Field-specific reporting

Please select the one below that is the best fit for your research. If you are not sure, read the appropriate sections before making your selection.

Life sciences Behavioural & social sciences Ecological, evolutionary & environmental sciences

For a reference copy of the document with all sections, see [nature.com/documents/nr-reporting-summary-flat.pdf](https://www.nature.com/documents/nr-reporting-summary-flat.pdf)

Ecological, evolutionary & environmental sciences study design

All studies must disclose on these points even when the disclosure is negative.

Study description	<input type="text" value="The study analyze the spatio-temporal variations of terrestrial wetland methane (CH4) for 1980-2021."/>
Research sample	<input type="text" value="The data used in this study are from dynamic global vegetation model LPJ-wsl."/>
Sampling strategy	<input type="text" value="All the data available were used."/>
Data collection	<input type="text" value="Data were recorded using numeric model."/>
Timing and spatial scale	<input type="text" value="The dataset used are monthly and we use the results for 1980-2021. The wetland CH4 estimates cover global land. The spatial resolution is 0.5 deg."/>
Data exclusions	<input type="text" value="We did not exclude any simulated results from the wetland methane model."/>
Reproducibility	<input type="text" value="We did not collect measurements directly but use a dynamic global vegetation model that is publicly available on Github. We will also release a reproducibility work flow for the data processing."/>
Randomization	<input type="text" value="Permutation and randomization were not used in this study because the wetland CH4 model is a deterministic model."/>
Blinding	<input type="text" value="Blinding was not needed in this study because we do not have treatments."/>

Did the study involve field work? Yes No

Reporting for specific materials, systems and methods

We require information from authors about some types of materials, experimental systems and methods used in many studies. Here, indicate whether each material, system or method listed is relevant to your study. If you are not sure if a list item applies to your research, read the appropriate section before selecting a response.

Materials & experimental systems

- | n/a | Included in the study |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Antibodies |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Eukaryotic cell lines |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Palaeontology and archaeology |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Animals and other organisms |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Clinical data |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Dual use research of concern |

Methods

- | n/a | Included in the study |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> ChIP-seq |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Flow cytometry |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> MRI-based neuroimaging |