

Adaptation strategies strongly reduce the future impacts of climate change on crop yields

Rose Z Abramoff¹, Philippe Ciais², Peng Zhu³, Toshihiro Hasegawa⁴, Hitomi Wakatsuki⁴, and David Makowski⁵

¹Oak Ridge National Laboratory

²Laboratory for Climate Sciences and the Environment (LSCE)

³LSCE

⁴National Institute for Agro-Environmental Sciences

⁵2. Université Paris-Saclay, AgroParisTech, INRAE, Unit Applied mathematics and computer science

November 22, 2022

Abstract

Simulations of crop yield due to climate change vary widely between models, locations, species, management strategies, and Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs). To understand how climate and adaptation affects yield change, we developed a meta-model based on 8703 site-level process-model simulations of yield with contrasting future adaptation strategies and climate scenarios for maize, rice, wheat and soybean. We tested 10 statistical models, including some machine learning models, to relate the percentage change in future yield relative to the baseline period (2000-2010) to explanatory variables related to adaptation strategy and climate change. We used the best model to produce global maps of yield change for the RCP4.5 scenario and identify the most influential variables affecting yield change using Shapley additive explanations. For most locations, adaptation was the most influential factor determining the yield change for maize, rice and wheat. Without adaptation under RCP4.5, all crops are expected to experience average global yield losses of 6–21%. Adaptation alleviates this average loss by 1–13%. Maize was most responsive to adaptive practices with a mean yield loss of -21 % [range across locations: -63%, +3.7%] without adaptation and -7.5% [range: -46%, +13%] with adaptation. For maize and rice, irrigation method and cultivar choice were the adaptation types most able to prevent large yield losses, respectively. When adaptation practices are applied, some areas may experience yield gains, especially at northern high latitudes. These results reveal the critical importance of implementing adequate adaptation strategies to mitigate the impact of climate change on crop yields.

1 **Adaptation strategies strongly reduce the future impacts of** 2 **climate change on crop yields**

3 Rose Z. Abramoff^{1,2}, Philippe Ciais¹, Peng Zhu¹, Toshihiro Hasegawa³, Hitomi Wakatsuki³, David
4 Makowski⁴

5 ¹Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement, LSCE/IPSL, CEA-CNRS-UVSQ, Université Paris-
6 Saclay, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France rose.abramoff@lsce.ipsl.fr, philippe.ciais@lsce.ipsl.fr,
7 peng.zhu@lsce.ipsl.fr

8 ²Environmental Sciences Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37830, USA
9 abramoffrz@ornl.gov

10 ³Institute for Agro-Environmental Sciences, National Agriculture and Food Research Organization, Tsukuba, Ibaraki,
11 305-8604, Japan thase@affrc.go.jp, kawatsuki55@affrc.go.jp

12 ⁴Université Paris-Saclay, AgroParisTech, INRAE, UMR 518, Palaiseau, 91120 France david.makowski@inrae.fr

13 *Correspondence to:* Rose Abramoff, abramoffrz@ornl.gov; David Makowski, david.makowski@inrae.fr

14 Note: This manuscript has been authored by UT-Battelle, LLC under Contract No. DE-AC05-00OR22725 with the
15 U.S. Department of Energy. The United States Government retains and the publisher, by accepting the article for
16 publication, acknowledges that the United States Government retains a non-exclusive, paid-up, irrevocable, world-
17 wide license to publish or reproduce the published form of this manuscript, or allow others to do so, for United States
18 Government purposes. The Department of Energy will provide public access to these results of federally sponsored
19 research in accordance with the DOE Public Access Plan (<http://energy.gov/downloads/doe-public-access-plan>).

20 **Abstract.** Simulations of crop yield due to climate change vary widely between models, locations, species,
21 management strategies, and Representative Concentration Pathways (RCPs). To understand how climate and
22 adaptation affects yield change, we developed a meta-model based on 8703 site-level process-model simulations of
23 yield with contrasting future adaptation strategies and climate scenarios for maize, rice, wheat and soybean. We tested
24 10 statistical models, including some machine learning models, to relate the percentage change in future yield relative

25 to the baseline period (2000-2010) to explanatory variables related to adaptation strategy and climate change. We used
26 the best model to produce global maps of yield change for the RCP4.5 scenario and identify the most influential
27 variables affecting yield change using Shapley additive explanations. For most locations, adaptation was the most
28 influential factor determining the yield change for maize, rice and wheat. Without adaptation under RCP4.5, all crops
29 are expected to experience average global yield losses of 6–21%. Adaptation alleviates this average loss by 1–13%.
30 Maize was most responsive to adaptive practices with a mean yield loss of -21 % [range across locations: -63%,
31 +3.7%] without adaptation and -7.5% [range: -46%, +13%] with adaptation. For maize and rice, irrigation method and
32 cultivar choice were the adaptation types most able to prevent large yield losses, respectively. When adaptation
33 practices are applied, some areas may experience yield gains, especially at northern high latitudes. These results reveal
34 the critical importance of implementing adequate adaptation strategies to mitigate the impact of climate change on
35 crop yields.

36 **Plain Language Summary.** Computer simulations are commonly used to predict how crop yield may change under
37 future climate conditions and land management practices. We tested different statistical methods to merge the findings
38 of many different computer simulations of crop yield change under future climate into one model which can be used
39 to predict crop yield at any location where that crop is grown. We created and selected the best model for four major
40 crops: maize, rice, wheat and soybean. We then predicted the change in crop yield under a likely future climate
41 scenario (Representative Concentration Pathway 4.5) and identified which variables most explained the crop yield
42 change. Considering both adaptive management status (whether or not adaptation practices were applied) and climate
43 factors (average temperature, change in temperature, average precipitation, change in precipitation, CO₂
44 concentration), we found that adaptation status was the most influential factor determining yield change for most
45 crops. Managing land adaptively in the future can reduce yield losses by 1-13% relative to maintaining the same
46 management practices. We discuss which types of management practices may be the most useful for different crops,
47 as well as which areas of the world are expected to gain or lose crop yield in the future.

48 **Key Points.**

- 49 • Under future climate scenario RCP4.5, maize, rice, wheat, and soybean are expected to decrease in average
50 global yield by 6-21%.
- 51 • Implementing adaptive management practices reduces this loss by 1-13% relative to maintaining the same
52 management practices.

- 53 • Some areas of the world, such as northern high latitudes, may see future yield increases if adaptation practices
54 are applied.

55 **Keywords.** Crop yield, agriculture, crop model, climate change, management, adaptation

56 **1 Introduction**

57 Food security faces increasing threats from anthropogenic climate change (Wheeler and von Braun 2013), with
58 current assessment methods predicting between 8 and 80 million additional people at risk of hunger by 2050 (Mbow
59 et al. 2019). While there is general consensus that climate change will undermine food security by causing production
60 losses (Tomoko Hasegawa et al. 2021; Zhu et al. 2021), there is little consensus on the magnitude and even direction
61 of yield response to different climate change factors, as well as the extent to which yield losses can be mitigated by
62 adaptive management. Model projections of yield changes also vary widely from study to study and from region to
63 region, and there is therefore an urgent need to provide reliable large-scale but regionally specific estimates inferred
64 from multiple sources of information. This kind of information can help inform stakeholders of expected impact to
65 crops and potential adaptation strategies at local and regional scales.

66 Typically, future yields are projected using either statistical or process-based models that relate the climate,
67 environment and management practices to plant production and subsequent yield. Projected yields show large
68 variation not only between sites and climate change scenarios but also between crop yield models (Makowski et al.
69 2015). In order to understand the variation in yield predictions due to model structure, the Agricultural Model
70 Intercomparison and Improvement Project (AgMIP) was founded in 2010 to run and compare process-based
71 agricultural models using standardized inputs (Rosenzweig et al. 2013). Though AgMIP primarily makes yield
72 predictions using process-based models, statistical models are also commonly used (Zhao et al. 2017; Lobell and
73 Asseng 2017).

74 Studies assessing the effect of climate change on crop yields typically focus on warming temperatures and
75 precipitation changes. Warming temperatures are expected to decrease yields of the major staple crops maize, rice,
76 wheat, and soybean by 3 - 7% per °C warming on average depending on the crop (Zhao et al. 2017), with broad
77 agreement across field experiments, statistical models, and grid- and point-based process models. While yield losses
78 are typically <10% when averaged at large scales, losses and gains can be much larger at specific sites or grid-points.
79 For example, AgMIP models predict between -60% and +60% local change in plant production by the end of the

80 century for maize, rice, wheat, and soybean (Rosenzweig et al. 2014). More recent work still finds large variations in
81 modeled crop yield sensitivity to climate and other environmental factors (Franke et al. 2020).

82 Two recent modeling studies identified an important role of water stress on historical and projected yields, finding
83 that water limitation accounts for a greater proportion of yield loss in historical and in near-future periods, with
84 warming becoming relatively more important only at the end-of-century period (Zhu et al. 2021; Ortiz-Bobea et al.
85 2019). The importance of other environmental effects is not as well understood, such as the effect of CO₂ fertilization
86 on yield, which has been demonstrated to increase yields in ideal conditions, but have mixed effects depending on
87 sites and crop types (McGrath and Lobell 2013; Makowski et al. 2020; Wilcox and Makowski 2014). Similarly, many
88 studies find varying effects of different adaptive management strategies, such as using specialized cultivars or
89 irrigation techniques (Parent et al. 2018). These techniques are meant to mitigate yield losses due to climate change
90 by adjusting plant phenology, increasing plant hardiness to extreme temperature or provide deficient water and/or
91 nutrients. In general, adaptive management results in higher yield relative to no adaptive management, although not
92 always (Challinor et al. 2014; Wilcox and Makowski 2014; Makowski et al. 2020). These previous studies have
93 examined the effects of adaptive management, but have not extrapolated management effects on yield to regional and
94 global scales.

95 The variability of predictions of yield responses to climate change published in the scientific literature is very
96 high, and it is therefore necessary to better understand the conditions leading to positive or negative impacts of climate
97 change on the yields of major crops. In this study, we use information from multiple simulations in different locations
98 in order to build global meta-models and use them to map the effect of climate change on crop yields at the global
99 scale, the key novelty being to account for or ignore adaptation of management practices. Meta-models are useful to
100 synthesize large sets of model simulations because the central tendency of crop model ensembles is often more accurate
101 than most individual ensemble members (Bassu et al. 2014) and because they can be used to extrapolate yield values
102 for climate conditions and sites for which no simulation was done with the original crop models (Makowski et al.
103 2015). Here, we fit different types of meta-models to the largest existing dataset of site-level crop model yield
104 projections to answer to following research questions: (1) What distributions of yield losses and gains can be expected
105 on a global scale based on all the available agricultural model simulations? (2) What are the most important factors
106 explaining variability in yield change projections? (3) To what extent are adaptation strategies able to mitigate yield
107 losses? We focus on the staple crops maize, rice, wheat, and soybean, from which humans furnish two-thirds of their

108 calories (Zhao et al. 2017). Our analysis is conducted for the climate change scenario Representative Concentration
109 Pathway 4.5 (RCP 4.5) that projects a warming level (between 2.1 and 3.5 °C by the end of the century) and that is
110 most in line with our current trajectory given stated policies and announced pledges (IEA 2021; Arias et al. 2021).

111 **2 Methods**

112 **2.1 Dataset**

113 A recent literature review gathered 8703 process model simulations of crop yields from 202 studies in 91
114 countries under 21st century emissions scenarios with a variety of warming levels (Hasegawa et al. 2022). These
115 simulations recorded changes in projected yield with temperature in °C, change in temperature from a reference point
116 (i.e., the midpoint [2005] of the current baseline period [2001-2010]) in °C, change in precipitation from the baseline
117 period, average annual precipitation in millimeters (mm), CO₂ concentration in parts per million (ppm), geographical
118 location (Latitude, Longitude), simulation year (both historical and future), and adaptation status. Four crops were
119 represented: maize, rice, wheat, and soybean. The yield is expressed in relative terms, using the grain mass per unit
120 land area for a given projection relative to the baseline period yield to calculate the percentage change in yield from
121 the baseline period.

122 Adaptation status refers to whether or not any adaptation to land management was simulated. Adaptation
123 includes any change in the timing or amount of fertilizer application; any change in the timing or amount of irrigation
124 determined using indicators of crop growth, climate and soil moisture; the use of nonconventional (e.g., heat-adapted)
125 cultivars; any shift in planting time; soil organic matter management (i.e., compost application or crop residue
126 retention); reduced or no tillage; and other practices (e.g., switching crops, crop rotation, geographic shift, and crop
127 diversification such as agroforestry). Additional details about this dataset and access to the dataset itself can be found
128 in Hasegawa et al. (2022).

129 After removing rows with missing values in climate and management predictors, there was a total of 8501
130 predictions of yield change for the four crops combined from 370 unique locations, with over 1000 predictions for
131 each crop except for soybean (Table S1). For all crops other than soybean, simulations were available on most of the
132 continents: North America, South America, Europe, Africa, and Asia (Figure 1). Simulated yield changes ranged from
133 -100% to +136%, with a mean yield change ranging from -3% for Rice to -16% for Soybean (Figure S1).

134 2.2 Statistical and machine learning meta-models

135 2.2.1 Types of models

136 We tested multiple types of statistical and machine learning models to find the best model relating the
137 management and climate variables to the predicted yield change. We tested three categories of models: Random Forest
138 (RF), gradient-boosting (GB) models, and linear mixed models (LM), with and without spatial correlation (Table 1).
139 We compared RF and GB models using only spatial location data as predictors (Model 1, 2), using only climate and
140 management variables as predictors (Model 3, 4), and including climate, management, and spatial location as
141 predictors (Model 5, 6; Table 1). Climate and management variables included were the average local area-weighted
142 temperature in degrees Celsius (T_{avg}) measured around the year 2000, the average local area-weighted annual
143 precipitation in mm (P_{avg}) measured around the year 2000, projected global change in temperature from the current
144 baseline period (2000-2010) to the future mid-point year (ΔT), projected annual site-level change in precipitation (ΔP)
145 from the baseline period, the mean CO₂ concentration used for the simulation in parts per million (CO_2), and
146 *Adaptation* as a categorical variable indicating either (1) whether or not an adaptation measure was applied or (2) what
147 type of adaptation measure was applied. Adaptation as a Yes/No variable (1) was used to evaluate model performance,
148 calculate Shapley values (see 2.4), and predict future yield change. Adaptation as multiple categorical variables
149 representing different types of adaptation measures (2) was used to plot partial dependence plots (see 2.2.2) showing
150 the relative importance of different adaptation measures on the yield change. Spatial location (longitude, latitude) was
151 included in some of the models tested to account for all spatial factors not explicitly considered, such as the relationship
152 between global and local changes in temperature. We also defined four linear mixed (LM) models. The first LM
153 estimates the yield using climate and management variables as predictors and the study reference as a random effect
154 (Model 7). The second linear mixed model is similar to Model 7 but also includes all possible interaction effects
155 between pairs of variables (Model 8). Similar to the RF and GB models with spatial location as a predictor (Model 1,
156 2), we defined a LM model with a spatial correlation term defined using the Matérn correlation function which is used
157 to define the spatial correlation between two points based on their distance (Model 9), and lastly, we defined a LM
158 model with climate and management predictors and a spatial correlation term (Model 10).

159 All analyses were done in the R Statistical Language (R Version 4.0.4). RF models were fitted using the
160 *ranger* package (mtry=2, number of trees=1000; ranger version 0.12.1). GB models were fitted using the *caret*

161 package, choosing the best model of nine parameter combinations (interaction depth=1,2,3 and number of
162 trees=50,100,150; method= “gbm”; caret version 6.0-86). LM models were fitted using the *lme4* package (*lmer*
163 function; version 1.1-26), and the LM models with a spatial correlation term were fitted using the *spaMM* package
164 (*fitme* function; version 3.7.2).

165 2.2.2 Model evaluation

166 For all models, we split the dataset by location into a training (75% of data) and a testing dataset (25% of
167 data). Two types of data splitting procedures were implemented. First, the data split was done such that test locations
168 were the same as those of the training dataset. This type of evaluation is relevant when the meta-models are used to
169 predict yield changes at the same locations as those where the original simulations were performed. In this case, we
170 assessed the capabilities of the meta-models to predict yield changes for various scenarios without any spatial
171 extrapolation. Second, the data split was done such that all of the yield predictions in the testing dataset were from
172 different locations than those of the training dataset. This second type of model evaluation is relevant to evaluate the
173 capabilities of the meta-models to extrapolate to new locations where no yield simulation is available for training.
174 We performed these two types of random splitting 10 times to calculate means and standard errors of model
175 performance metrics. We calculated three model performance metrics for each meta-model, the root-mean-square
176 error (RMSE), the coefficient of determination (R^2), and the Akaike information criterion (AIC), by comparing the
177 yield change predictions obtained with each meta-model ($Y_{pred,i}$) to the original simulated yield change (Y_i). AIC is
178 calculated as:

$$179 \quad AIC = n \times \ln \left(\sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - Y_{pred,i})^2}{n}} \right) + 2p \quad [\text{Eq. 1}]$$

180 where p is the total number of model parameters. We reported the mean and standard deviation of the three model
181 performance metrics for each meta-model using the 10 test datasets. We chose the meta-model with the best
182 performance for each crop using the three metrics defined above (RMSE, R^2 , and AIC in Table S2) averaged over
183 the 10 test datasets, using the second type of model evaluation (i.e. different locations for testing than those used for
184 training). Here, the model rankings obtained with the three performance metrics were in agreement about the best
185 model for each crop, so we did not have to select one performance metric over another.

186 Partial dependence plots (PDPs) show the relationship between the yield change and each predictor
187 variable, averaging over the other predictors. This gives a sense of the marginal effect of each predictor on the
188 predicted yield change. To generate our PDPs, we calculated the partial contributions of each predictor variable
189 using the FeatureEffect function (package *iml*, method = “pdp”), and training the model using all the data available.

190 **2.3 Mapping yield changes at the global scale**

191 We used the best meta-model for each crop to predict global yield changes for different climate and
192 adaptation scenarios. We predicted the yield changes for RCP4.5 (Moss et al. 2010) for the year 2060 (+2°C, 506ppm
193 CO₂) with and without adaptation practices at the global scale. Yield change predictions were derived for every half-
194 degree grid cell where the relevant crop was grown today, according to the MIRCA 2000 dataset of harvested areas
195 around the year 2000 model, using the bias-corrected daily temperature and precipitation from the W5E5 dataset
196 (Lange 2019), also at half-degree resolution, averaged for the period 2001 to 2010 as in Hasegawa et al. (2022).

197 **2.4 Shapley values**

198 The influence of model predictors in machine learning algorithms can be analyzed using Shapley additive
199 explanations (Lundberg and Lee 2017), which for any given prediction in a given grid cell, estimates the contribution
200 of each predictor to the deviation of that grid-cell prediction from the mean yield change computed over the whole
201 dataset. For the purposes of this manuscript, we will define a yield anomaly as the deviation from the mean yield
202 change in a particular location (i.e., the predicted yield change at a given grid-cell – average yield change across the
203 dataset used to train the model). The Shapley value associated to a given predictor is the contribution of this predictor
204 to a yield anomaly at a given location. A positive Shapley value indicates that the predictor has a positive contribution
205 to the anomaly, while a negative value indicates that it has a negative contribution. Thus, Shapley values can be used
206 to understand the contributions of each predictor to the predicted yield anomalies. We used Shapley values, calculated
207 using the *DALEX* package (version 2.2.0), to identify the most influential variables for each grid cell’s prediction of
208 yield change under the RCP4.5 climate scenario where the relevant crop was grown, assuming either that adaptation
209 practices were applied or not. We considered climate and management factors affecting yield change: (1) annual mean
210 temperature during the baseline period, (2) change in global temperature from the baseline period, (3) change in
211 precipitation from the baseline period, (4) annual precipitation during the baseline period, (5) CO₂ concentration, and

212 (6) crop management adaptation. For each grid cell, we determined the factor that had the largest Shapley value, that
213 is, the largest effect on the predicted yield change anomaly for that grid cell. Using this method, we created global
214 maps highlighting regions where the yield change anomaly is most responsive to temperature, precipitation, CO₂
215 concentration, or adaptation.

216 **3 Results**

217 Of the 10 statistical models tested, the best models were generally RF and GB models (Table S2 and Table
218 S3). For spatial extrapolation (Table S2), Model 4 was the highest performing model for maize, while for rice and
219 soybean the best model was Model 5, and for wheat the best model was Model 6. Although they were outperformed
220 by RF and GB, the LM models revealed that adaptation management practices had a statistically significant effect on
221 yield changes (Table S4). For spatial extrapolation, the best maize model was able to explain the greatest amount of
222 variation in the dataset ($R^2 = 0.43$), significantly more than the extrapolation performance of the wheat and soybean
223 models (both $R^2 = 0.21$). The rice model extrapolation was very low ($R^2 = 0.12$) although its RMSE was lower than
224 that of other models. In other words, when forced to predict new locations, the statistical models explained 43% or
225 less of the yield change variation in the test dataset ($R^2 = 0.12-0.43$; Figure S2). Nevertheless, when we split the testing
226 and training datasets such that the testing dataset only contained locations from the same half-degree grid cells as the
227 training dataset, model performances were higher ($R^2 = 0.33-0.58$; Table S3, Figure S3), revealing that the models are
228 better able to predict yield changes for new scenarios at the same sites than to predict new sites. However, it is notable
229 that the maize model was not improved by restricting the testing sites to the same location as the training site,
230 suggesting that the maize dataset was large enough to be informative across spatially heterogenous locations.

231 Figure 2 shows the global distributions of the yield changes predicted by the selected meta-models. Under
232 the RCP4.5 scenario for the year 2060 and +2°C warming, the meta-models predict broad yield losses for maize (mean:
233 -21%; range across locations: -63%, 3.7%), rice (mean: -5.7%; range: -52%, +25%), soybean (mean: -11%; range: -
234 56%, +37%), and wheat (mean: -13%; range: -60%, +27%) when adaptation practices were not applied (Figure 2).
235 Applying adaptive practices increased yields for all crops relative to without adaptation, by 13%, 1%, and 5% on
236 average for maize, soybean, and wheat respectively, resulting in reduced net yield losses of -7.5% (mean; range: -
237 46%, +13%) for maize, -10.2% (mean; range: -57%, +33%) for soybean, and -8.1% (mean; range: -54%, +31%) for
238 wheat (Figure 2). With adaptation, rice yields were increased by 4% relative to without adaptation, resulting in a

239 predicted increase in yield of +1.4% (mean; range: -39%, +22%). There was large spatial variability in yield loss and
240 gain; for example, with adaptive management, rice yields were predicted to increase in South America and parts of
241 China, but not in North America or western Asia (Figure 3). Maize yield losses showed a strong latitudinal gradient,
242 with higher losses at low latitudes, while the other crops had patchier distributions suggesting a more complex spatial
243 effect for these crops than for maize.

244 The partial dependence plots show that yield decrease tended to be stronger in locations characterized by
245 high annual mean temperatures during the baseline period and high warming relative to the baseline year (Figure S4).
246 Conversely, there was relatively little effect of changes in CO₂ concentration for all crops except for wheat, for which
247 yield increased at higher concentrations of CO₂. Latitude and longitude were included in the best model for all crops
248 except maize; the location had non-monotonic effects for these crops, with a tendency towards improved yields at
249 northern high latitudes. Implementing one or more adaptation strategies tended to reduce yield losses but with a
250 distinct impact of different adaptation types. For example, maize yields were improved by irrigation, although they
251 were not very responsive to other adaptation strategies. Rice yields were responsive to multiple adaptation strategies,
252 especially modifying the cultivar, which was the only crop-specific adaptation strategy that resulted in increased yield
253 (others only reduced yield losses). Wheat was somewhat responsive to adaptive fertilizer use and adaptations that did
254 not fall into the other categories (i.e., “Others”), while soybean yields did not improve with any adaptation strategies.
255 In some cases, implementation of a crop-specific adaptation strategy resulted in even greater yield loss, as was the
256 case for soybean and adaptive fertilizer use (Figure S4). There was an interaction between adaptation and warming
257 level, such that the positive effect of implementing adaptation strategies increased with the warming level (Figure S5).

258 We used Shapley additive explanations to visualize the contribution of adaptation strategies and climate
259 variables to the yield change anomaly for each grid cell of the RCP4.5 yield change prediction to the year 2060 either
260 assuming that no adaptation practices were applied (Figure 4, Figure S6) or assuming that adaptation practices were
261 applied (Figure S7, Figure S8). In a projection of maize yield without adaptation practices, the lack of adaptation
262 results in a -9% [mean; range: -20%, -5.1%] reduction in the mean predicted yield change. Average temperature also
263 had a large effect, ranging from a 21% increase to a -26% decrease in yield change, with higher yield predicted at
264 northern latitudes (Figure S7a). The other crops showed similar general patterns, with the lack of adaptation
265 contributing to yield loss and with other predictors contributing to yield gain or loss depending on the latitude or
266 region (Figure S7b,c,d). For maize, adaptation practices can be seen to contribute to yield gain (Figure S8a).

267 In order to understand which factor (between adaptation, CO₂ concentration, warming level, annual
268 precipitation, and annual mean temperature during the baseline period) was dominant in each predicted location, we
269 assigned to each grid cell the predictor with the minimum (in case of predicted yield loss) or maximum (in case of
270 predicted yield gain) Shapley value. Figure 5 shows that the absence of adaptation was the dominant contributor to
271 yield losses when adaptation practices were not applied, for all crops except wheat where the change in precipitation
272 was also important, and soybean where several climate factors were more important than adaptation practices (Figure
273 S9). Conversely, Figure 6 shows that the application of adaptation strategies contributed strongly to yield gains, and
274 was the dominant contributor for rice and wheat (Figure S10). For maize, rice, and wheat, yield changes tended to be
275 influenced by adaptation, mean temperature and precipitation during the baseline period, as well as precipitation
276 change, depending on the location. For example, yield gains in these crops were often associated with low average
277 temperature during the baseline period at high latitudes, suggesting that warmer projected temperatures under RCP4.5
278 could alleviate temperature or temperature-driven growing season length restrictions on crop productivity, resulting
279 in yield gain at high latitude. For wheat, precipitation during the baseline period was a dominant factor explaining
280 yield losses in western North America where precipitation is expected to decline (Figure 5) and yield gains in eastern
281 North America where precipitation is expected to increase (Figure 6). Soybean had different drivers than the other
282 crops; soybean yield loss was most affected by the projected precipitation change and warming level and yield gain
283 by the average temperature and precipitation during the baseline period (Figure S9, S9).

284 **4 Discussion**

285 The meta-models we developed here for each of the four major crops are informed by climate, management and
286 location factors to map yield changes under the +2°C, +116 ppm RCP4.5 scenario in 2060. Our meta-models were
287 only able to explain a portion of the variability in yields simulated by the original crop models. This is due to the very
288 high variability of simulations between crop models reported in the literature. Even when these models are calibrated
289 with the same data and used with the same input variables, the differences between the simulations obtained with
290 different crop models is generally very large, which explains why our meta-models cannot explain more than half of
291 the variability of the simulations (Bassu et al. 2014; Makowski et al. 2015). However, our meta-models were able to
292 capture the effects of several key factors, in particular the effects of different adaptation strategies. Our study focused
293 on a single scenario, i.e. RCP 4.5 in 2060. We have chosen this scenario because it seems to be the most realistic given

294 the current socio-economic context (IEA 2021; Arias et al. 2021). However, the meta-models developed in this study
295 are not contingent on this scenario; they have been trained with a very large database including yield simulations
296 obtained with different climate change scenarios covering a wide range of temperature, precipitation, and CO₂
297 concentration changes (Hasegawa et al. 2022). They are therefore very generic and could be easily run for any other
298 climate change scenario. To facilitate their reuse, we have made the meta-models and analysis scripts freely available
299 (see code availability section).

300 Results clearly reveal that adaptation practice is a dominant factor with a strong, and previously overlooked,
301 impact on global yield change predictions. If we assume that the effect of temperature change is constant, then without
302 adaptation, each degree-Celsius increase in global mean temperature would, on average, reduce global yields of maize
303 by 10%, wheat by 6.5%, rice by 2.8%, and soybean by 5.4%. These are close to per degree-Celsius estimates of global
304 yield reduction estimated by Zhao et al. (2017) of 7.4%, for maize, 6.0% for wheat, 3.2% for rice, and 3.1% for
305 soybean, although these estimates were based on local rather than global changes in temperature. This study gives a
306 unique view into what particular adaptation practices could prevent these yield losses. We found that maize has the
307 greatest potential of yield loss reduction by adaptation, and that irrigation practices were more important relative to
308 the other adaptation practices in the dataset (i.e., adaptive cultivars, fertilizer application, planting time, others). Wheat
309 saw some yield benefit from both adaptive fertilization and other management practices, while rice yields were mainly
310 influenced by the choice of cultivar. In addition to benefits from improved yield, some adaptation-related management
311 practices can have co-benefits for soil health and soil carbon (Lessmann et al. 2022). While the management practices
312 that increase yield are often not the same as those meant to increase soil C storage, there is evidence that some practices
313 (e.g., reduced tillage, cover cropping, crop diversification, organic amendments) can improve both yield and soil C
314 stocks (Cooper et al. 2016; Lal 2006; Smith, Gross, and Robertson 2008).

315 After adaptation, temperature and precipitation during the baseline period, as well as local precipitation change
316 were the most influential climate factors on global yield for most crops. Ortiz-Bobea et al. (2019) found that projected
317 yields were primarily impacted by temperature (heat stress), followed by precipitation (water stress). Recent studies
318 have also demonstrated the compound or synergistic effects of heat and water stress on crops (Lesk et al. 2021;
319 Beillouin, Ben-Ari, and Makowski 2019). In this study we also found temperature and precipitation to be influential,
320 especially on maize and wheat yield (Figure 4), although yield changes were not always related to heat and drought.
321 In fact, yield gains projected for high-latitude regions (Figure 3) which are most influenced by temperature (Figure 6)

322 are rather due to an alleviation of cold limitation on productivity. A recent update of the Global Gridded Crop Model
323 Intercomparison (GGCMI) based on the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP) Phase 6, compared to the
324 earlier GGCMI run with CMIP Phase 5 atmospheric forcing, predicted higher sensitivity to warming but less of a CO₂
325 fertilization effect (Franke et al. 2020; Müller et al. 2021). Our study observed both sensitivity of crop yield to average
326 temperature during the baseline period (and specifically warming in the case of soybean), but little sensitivity to CO₂.
327 However, CO₂ fertilization effects can be difficult to compare across modeling studies that simulate many different
328 levels of CO₂ increase.

329 One major limitation of this study and its predecessors (Challinor et al. 2014; Aggarwal et al. 2019) is that model
330 results are not fully documented, making it difficult to know what types of adaptation practices were implemented
331 beyond broad categories. For example, adaptations to fertilizer application could modify the timing of application, the
332 amount of fertilizer, the type of fertilizer, application method, and other characteristics. As a result, a wide variety of
333 interventions are considered together and their effects averaged in our grouping into adaptation practices categories.
334 Yet, we know from experimental studies that small modifications in land management can have large effects on
335 productivity (Sandén et al. 2018; Bai et al. 2018). Second, most models do not simulate extreme events well, such as
336 temperature and precipitation extremes (Sun et al. 2021; Heinicke et al. 2022; Schewe et al. 2019), and similarly do
337 not represent pest, weed, or disease spread among crops, so it is relatively unknown how these major avenues of crop
338 failure may amplify each other in the future. Lastly, as can be seen in Figure 1, the tropics are not as well-represented
339 in the simulations compared to mid-latitudes, and as a result the predicted yield change estimates in these regions may
340 not be as trustworthy as they are in other regions, particularly for rice in South America and soybean in East Asia.

341 Every time crop model predictions are updated, negative climate impacts are projected to emerge earlier in
342 this century (before 2040; (Jägermeyr et al. 2021). One can argue that we already see impacts of climate change on
343 crop yield, particularly in reference to compound events that resulted in large, unexpected yield losses (Ciais et al.
344 2005; Ben-Ari et al. 2018). Although previous work and our study support the importance of climate variables such
345 as temperature and precipitation in determining future yields, our study's main finding is the potential for adaptation
346 practices to mitigate yield losses, especially in vulnerable low-latitude regions where yields are otherwise expected
347 to decline with continued human-induced climate change. We further identified an interaction effect between
348 adaptation and warming, suggesting that adaptation practices will become increasingly important to preserve crop
349 yields at higher warming scenarios (Figure S5). Identifying the specific management practices for each crop and

350 region that can mitigate yield losses is therefore a research priority. At the same time, it is important to consider the
351 social and economic consequences of implementing certain management practices. For example, irrigation may be
352 useful where maize is grown (Figure S4), but if water resources are limited then it is important to consider the
353 resource and energy trade-offs of using local water sources, treating, or desalinating water. Because of the great
354 diversity in adaptive land management practices and ways of implementing them, best practices for a particular
355 location will likely be found in collaboration with local and indigenous knowledge and stakeholders (Makondo and
356 Thomas 2018; Nkomwa et al. 2014). In this way, sustainable development goals (<https://sdgs.un.org/>) related to
357 maintaining agricultural yield such as reducing hunger and poverty can be met along with those related to climate
358 action, sustainability, equity, and justice.

359 **Code/Data availability**

360 The authors will maintain the meta-models and analysis code used in this paper as a publicly available Github repository at
361 <https://github.com/rabramoff/ProjectYield>.

362 **Acknowledgements**

363 The authors thank Marcus Schiedung for useful discussion. RZA was supported by a Marie Skłodowska–Curie Individual
364 Fellowship (Grant no. [834-169](#)) from the European Union's Horizon 2020 program and by the United States Department of
365 Energy, Office of Science, Office of Biological and Environmental Research. Oak Ridge National Laboratory is managed by
366 UT-Battelle, LLC, for the United States Department of Energy under contract DE-AC05-00OR22725. This study was in part
367 funded by the Environment Research and Technology Development Fund (JPMEERF20S11820) of the Environmental
368 Restoration and Conservation Agency of Japan, and in part by the JOINT LINKAGE CALL supported by NARO and INRAE
369 and by the project CLAND (16-CONV-0003).

370 **References**

- 371 Aggarwal, Pramod, Shalika Vyas, Philip Thornton, and Bruce M. Campbell. 2019. “How Much Does Climate Change Add to
372 the Challenge of Feeding the Planet This Century?” *Environmental Research Letters* 14 (4).
373 <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aafa3e>.
- 374 Arias, Paola, Nicolas Bellouin, Erika Coppola, Richard Jones, Gerhard Krinner, Jochem Marotzke, Vaishali Naik, et al. 2021.
375 “Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report
376 of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change; Technical Summary.” In , edited by Valérie Masson-Delmotte,
377 Panmao Zhai, Anna Pirani, S. L. Connors, C. Péan, S. Berger, N. Caud, et al. Remote.
378 <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/>.
- 379 Bai, Zhanguo, Thomas Caspari, Maria Ruiperez Gonzalez, Niels H. Batjes, Paul Mäder, Else K. Bünemann, Ron de Goede, et
380 al. 2018. “Effects of Agricultural Management Practices on Soil Quality: A Review of Long-Term Experiments for
381 Europe and China.” *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 265 (October): 1–7.
382 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2018.05.028>.
- 383 Bassu, S., N. Brisson, J. L. Durand, K. Boote, J. Lizaso, J. W. Jones, C. Rosenzweig, et al. 2014. “How Do Various Maize
384 Crop Models Vary in Their Responses to Climate Change Factors?” *Glob Chang Biol* 20 (7): 2301–20.
385 <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12520>.

386 Beillouin, D., T. Ben-Ari, and D. Makowski. 2019. “A Dataset of Meta-Analyses on Crop Diversification at the Global Scale.”
387 *Data Brief* 24 (June): 103898. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2019.103898>.

388 Ben-Ari, Tamara, Julien Boé, Philippe Ciais, Remi Lecerf, Marijn Van der Velde, and David Makowski. 2018. “Causes and
389 Implications of the Unforeseen 2016 Extreme Yield Loss in the Breadbasket of France.” *Nature Communications* 9
390 (1): 1627. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-04087-x>.

391 Challinor, A. J., J. Watson, D. B. Lobell, S. M. Howden, D. R. Smith, and N. Chhetri. 2014. “A Meta-Analysis of Crop Yield
392 under Climate Change and Adaptation.” *Nature Climate Change* 4 (4): 287–91. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2153>.

393 Ciais, Ph, M. Reichstein, N. Viovy, A. Granier, J. Ogee, V. Allard, M. Aubinet, et al. 2005. “Europe-Wide Reduction in
394 Primary Productivity Caused by the Heat and Drought in 2003.” *Nature* 437 (7058): 529–33.
395 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature03972>.

396 Cooper, Julia, Marcin Baranski, Gavin Stewart, Majimcha Nobel-de Lange, Paolo Barberi, Andreas Fließbach, Josephine
397 Peigné, et al. 2016. “Shallow Non-Inversion Tillage in Organic Farming Maintains Crop Yields and Increases Soil C
398 Stocks: A Meta-Analysis.” *Agronomy for Sustainable Development* 36 (1): 22. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-016-0354-1>.

400 Franke, James A., Christoph Müller, Joshua Elliott, Alex C. Ruane, Jonas Jägermeyr, Abigail Snyder, Marie Dury, et al. 2020.
401 “The GGCMI Phase 2 Emulators: Global Gridded Crop Model Responses to Changes in CO₂, Temperature, Water,
402 and Nitrogen (Version 1.0).” *Geoscientific Model Development* 13 (9): 3995–4018. <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-13-3995-2020>.

404 Hasegawa, Tomoko, Gen Sakurai, Shinichiro Fujimori, Kiyoshi Takahashi, Yasuaki Hijioka, and Toshihiko Masui. 2021.
405 “Extreme Climate Events Increase Risk of Global Food Insecurity and Adaptation Needs.” *Nature Food* 2 (8): 587–
406 95. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-021-00335-4>.

407 Hasegawa, Toshihiro, Hitomi Wakatsuki, Hui Ju, Shalika Vyas, Gerald C. Nelson, Aidan Farrell, Delphine Deryng, Francisco
408 Meza, and David Makowski. 2022. “A Global Dataset for the Projected Impacts of Climate Change on Four Major
409 Crops.” *Scientific Data* 9 (1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-022-01150-7>.

410 Heinicke, Stefanie, Katja Frieler, Jonas Jägermeyr, and Matthias Mengel. 2022. “Global Gridded Crop Models Underestimate
411 Yield Responses to Droughts and Heatwaves.” *Environmental Research Letters* 17 (4): 044026.
412 <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ac592e>.

413 IEA. 2021. “World Energy Outlook 2021.” <https://www.iea.org/reports/world-energy-outlook-2021>.

414 Jägermeyr, Jonas, Christoph Müller, Alex C. Ruane, Joshua Elliott, Juraj Balkovic, Oscar Castillo, Babacar Faye, et al. 2021.
415 “Climate Impacts on Global Agriculture Emerge Earlier in New Generation of Climate and Crop Models.” *Nature*
416 *Food* 2 (11): 873–85. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-021-00400-y>.

417 Lal, R. 2006. “Enhancing Crop Yields in the Developing Countries through Restoration of the Soil Organic Carbon Pool in
418 Agricultural Lands.” *Land Degradation & Development* 17 (2): 197–209. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.696>.

419 Lange, Stefan. 2019. “WFDE5 over Land Merged with ERA5 over the Ocean (W5E5). V. 1.0.” *GFZ Data Services*.
420 <https://doi.org/10.5880/pik.2019.023>.

421 Lesk, Corey, Ethan Coffel, Jonathan Winter, Deepak Ray, Jakob Zscheischler, Sonia I. Seneviratne, and Radley Horton. 2021.
422 “Stronger Temperature–Moisture Couplings Exacerbate the Impact of Climate Warming on Global Crop Yields.”
423 *Nature Food* 2 (9): 683–91. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-021-00341-6>.

424 Lessmann, Malte, Gerard H. Ros, Madaline D. Young, and Wim de Vries. 2022. “Global Variation in Soil Carbon
425 Sequestration Potential through Improved Cropland Management.” *Global Change Biology* 28 (3): 1162–77.
426 <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15954>.

427 Lobell, D. B., and S. Asseng. 2017. “Comparing Estimates of Climate Change Impacts from Process-Based and Statistical
428 Crop Models.” *Environmental Research Letters* 12 (January). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/015001>.

429 Lundberg, Scott M, and Su-In Lee. 2017. “A Unified Approach to Interpreting Model Predictions.” In *Advances in Neural*
430 *Information Processing Systems*. Vol. 30. Curran Associates, Inc.
431 <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2017/hash/8a20a8621978632d76c43dfd28b67767-Abstract.html>.

432 Makondo, Cuthbert Casey, and David S. G. Thomas. 2018. “Climate Change Adaptation: Linking Indigenous Knowledge with
433 Western Science for Effective Adaptation.” *Environmental Science & Policy* 88 (October): 83–91.
434 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2018.06.014>.

435 Makowski, D., S. Asseng, F. Ewert, S. Bassu, J.L. Durand, T. Li, P. Martre, et al. 2015. “A Statistical Analysis of Three
436 Ensembles of Crop Model Responses to Temperature and CO₂ Concentration.” *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology*
437 214–215 (December): 483–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2015.09.013>.

438 Makowski, David, Elodie Marajo-Petizon, Jean-Louis Durand, and Tamara Ben-Ari. 2020. “Quantitative Synthesis of
439 Temperature, CO₂, Rainfall, and Adaptation Effects on Global Crop Yields.” *European Journal of Agronomy* 115
440 (April): 126041. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2020.126041>.

441 Mbow, C, C. Rosenzweig, Francesco N. Tubiello, T Benton, P Pradhan, L Barioni, M Krishnapillai, et al. 2019. “IPCC Special
442 Report on Land and Climate Change. Chapter 5: Food Security,” 437–550.

443 McGrath, Justin M, and David B Lobell. 2013. “Regional Disparities in the CO₂ Fertilization Effect and Implications for Crop
444 Yields.” *Environmental Research Letters* 8 (1): 014054. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/8/1/014054>.

445 Moss, Richard H., Jae A. Edmonds, Kathy A. Hibbard, Martin R. Manning, Steven K. Rose, Detlef P. van Vuuren, Timothy
446 R. Carter, et al. 2010. “The next Generation of Scenarios for Climate Change Research and Assessment.” *Nature* 463
447 (7282): 747–56. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature08823>.

448 Müller, Christoph, James Franke, Jonas Jägermeyr, Alex C. Ruane, Joshua Elliott, Elisabeth Moyer, Jens Heinke, et al. 2021.
449 “Exploring Uncertainties in Global Crop Yield Projections in a Large Ensemble of Crop Models and CMIP5 and
450 CMIP6 Climate Scenarios.” *Environmental Research Letters* 16 (3): 034040. [https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/abd8fc)
451 [9326/abd8fc](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/abd8fc).

452 Nkomwa, Emmanuel Charles, Miriam Kalanda Joshua, Cosmo Ngongondo, Maurice Monjerezi, and Felistus Chipungu. 2014.
453 “Assessing Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Climate Change Adaptation Strategies in Agriculture: A Case Study
454 of Chagaka Village, Chikhwawa, Southern Malawi.” *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, Parts A/B/C* 67–69
455 (January): 164–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pce.2013.10.002>.

456 Ortiz-Bobea, Ariel, Haoying Wang, Carlos M Carrillo, and Toby R Ault. 2019. “Unpacking the Climatic Drivers of US
457 Agricultural Yields.” *Environmental Research Letters* 14 (6): 064003. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab1e75>.

458 Parent, Boris, Margot Leclere, Sébastien Lacube, Mikhail A Semenov, Claude Welcker, Pierre Martre, and François Tardieu.
459 2018. “Maize Yields over Europe May Increase in Spite of Climate Change, with an Appropriate Use of the Genetic
460 Variability of Flowering Time” 115 (42): 6.

461 Rosenzweig, C., J. Elliott, D. Deryng, A. C. Ruane, C. Muller, A. Arneeth, K. J. Boote, et al. 2014. “Assessing Agricultural
462 Risks of Climate Change in the 21st Century in a Global Gridded Crop Model Intercomparison.” *Proc Natl Acad Sci*
463 *U S A* 111 (9): 3268–73. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1222463110>.

464 Rosenzweig, C., J. W. Jones, J. L. Hatfield, A. C. Ruane, K. J. Boote, P. Thorburn, J. M. Antle, et al. 2013. “The Agricultural
465 Model Intercomparison and Improvement Project (AgMIP): Protocols and Pilot Studies.” *Agricultural and Forest*
466 *Meteorology* 170: 166–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agrformet.2012.09.011>.

467 Sandén, T., H. Spiegel, H.-P. Stüger, N. Schlatter, H.-P. Haslmayr, L. Zavattaro, C. Grignani, et al. 2018. “European Long-
468 Term Field Experiments: Knowledge Gained about Alternative Management Practices.” *Soil Use and Management*
469 34 (2): 167–76. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sum.12421>.

470 Schewe, Jacob, Simon N. Gosling, Christopher Reyer, Fang Zhao, Philippe Ciais, Joshua Elliott, Louis Francois, et al. 2019.
471 “State-of-the-Art Global Models Underestimate Impacts from Climate Extremes.” *Nature Communications* 10 (1):
472 1005. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-08745-6>.

473 Smith, Richard, Katherine Gross, and G Philip Robertson. 2008. “Effects of Crop Diversity on Agroecosystem Function: Crop
474 Yield Response.” *Ecosystems* 11 (August): 355–66. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-008-9124-5>.

475 Sun, Ting, Toshihiro Hasegawa, Bing Liu, Liang Tang, Leilei Liu, Weixing Cao, and Yan Zhu. 2021. “Current Rice Models
476 Underestimate Yield Losses from Short-Term Heat Stresses.” *Global Change Biology* 27 (2): 402–16.
477 <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15393>.

478 Wheeler, Tim, and Joachim von Braun. 2013. “Climate Change Impacts on Global Food Security.” *Science* 341 (6145): 508–
479 13. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1239402>.

480 Wilcox, Julia, and David Makowski. 2014. “A Meta-Analysis of the Predicted Effects of Climate Change on Wheat Yields
481 Using Simulation Studies.” *Field Crops Research* 156 (February): 180–90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2013.11.008>.

482 Zhao, C., B. Liu, S. Piao, X. Wang, D. B. Lobell, Y. Huang, M. Huang, et al. 2017. “Temperature Increase Reduces Global
483 Yields of Major Crops in Four Independent Estimates.” *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 114 (35): 9326–31.
484 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1701762114>.

485 Zhu, Peng, Rose Abramoff, David Makowski, and Philippe Ciais. 2021. “Uncovering the Past and Future Climate Drivers of
486 Wheat Yield Shocks in Europe With Machine Learning.” *Earth’s Future* 9 (5).
487 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020ef001815>.

488

489 **Tables and Figures**

490 **Table 1: Characteristics of the 10 statistical and machine learning models used to predict the yield change of maize,**
491 **rice, wheat, and soybean. RF = random forest; GB = gradient-boosting; LM = linear mixed model. See section 2.2.1 for**
492 **definitions of environment variables. (1|Study reference) means that a random effect was included to describe the**
493 **between-study variability. *Matern*(1|Longitude + Latitude) means random effects (with Matern covariance**
494 **function) were included to describe the residual spatial variability.**

<i>Model No.</i>	<i>Model Type</i>	<i>Predictors</i>	<i>Random Effect</i>
1	RF	Latitude + Longitude	-
2	GB	Latitude + Longitude	-
3	RF	$T_{avg} + P_{avg} + \Delta T + \Delta P + CO_2 + Adaptation$	-
4	GB	$T_{avg} + P_{avg} + \Delta T + \Delta P + CO_2 + Adaptation$	-
5	RF	Latitude + Longitude + $T_{avg} + P_{avg} + \Delta T + \Delta P + CO_2$ + <i>Adaptation</i>	-
6	GB	Latitude + Longitude + $T_{avg} + P_{avg} + \Delta T + \Delta P + CO_2$ + <i>Adaptation</i>	-
7	LM	$T_{avg} + P_{avg} + \Delta T + \Delta P + CO_2 + Adaptation$	(1 Study reference)
8	LM	$T_{avg} * P_{avg} * \Delta T * \Delta P * CO_2 * Adaptation$	(1 Study reference)
9	LM	1	<i>Matern</i> (1 Longitude + Latitude)
10	LM	$T_{avg} + P_{avg} + \Delta T + \Delta P + CO_2 + Adaptation$	<i>Matern</i> (1 Longitude + Latitude)

495

Figure 1: Maps showing locations where future yield was projected for maize, rice, wheat, and soybean. The color of the symbol indicates whether the selected meta-models projected a decrease (purple) or an increase in yield (yellow) relative to the baseline period under RCP 4.5 in 2060 (yield changes expressed in % of the baseline).




Figure 2: Boxplot summarizing the yield changes (% relative to the baseline) predicted by the selected meta-models for maize, rice, wheat and soybean for the RCP4.5 climate scenario for the year 2060 (+2°C, 506ppm CO₂), either with or

without adaptation practices applied. The distribution covers all grid cells at the global scale. Box represents the 1st quantile, median, and 3rd quantile. Whiskers show the minimum and maximum values.




Figure 3: Maps showing the predicted yield changes (% relative to the baseline) of maize, rice, wheat and soybean for the RCP4.5 climate scenario for the year 2060 (+2°C, 506ppm CO₂), without adaptation practices (No Adaptation), with adaptation practices (Adaptation), and showing the difference in yield changes from applying adaptation practices (Difference = Adaptation – No Adaptation).




Figure 4: Shapley additive explanation contribution to the predicted yield change (%) for all crops under an RCP4.5 scenario without adaptation. The five predictors considered are absence of adaptation (No Adaptation), change in CO₂ concentration above 390ppm (Δ CO₂), change in precipitation (Δ Precip), global warming level (Δ Temp), average local precipitation (Avg Precip), and average local temperature (Avg Temp). Box represents the 1st quantile, median, and 3rd quantile. Whiskers show the minimum and maximum values.




Figure 5: Maps colored to indicate the greatest contributors to the yield losses predicted under an RCP4.5 scenario without adaptation: absence of adaptation (pink), change in CO₂ concentration above 390ppm (green), change in precipitation (dark blue), warming level (orange), average precipitation (light blue), and average temperature (yellow).





Figure 6: Maps colored to indicate the greatest contributors to the yield gains predicted under an RCP4.5 scenario with adaptation: application of adaptation strategies (pink), change in CO₂ concentration above 390ppm (green), change in precipitation (dark blue), warming level (orange), average precipitation (light blue), and average temperature (yellow).



Adaptation strategies strongly reduce the future impacts of climate change on crop yields

Rose Z. Abramoff^{1,2}, Philippe Ciais¹, Peng Zhu¹, Toshihiro Hasegawa³, Hitomi Wakatsuki³,
David Makowski⁴

¹Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement, LSCE/IPSL, CEA-CNRS-UVSQ, Université Paris-Saclay, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France rose.abramoff@lsce.ipsl.fr, philippe.ciais@lsce.ipsl.fr

²Environmental Sciences Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37830, USA
abramoffrz@ornl.gov

³Institute for Agro-Environmental Sciences, National Agriculture and Food Research Organization, Tsukuba, Ibaraki, 305-8604, Japan thase@affrc.go.jp, kawatsuki55@affrc.go.jp

⁴Université Paris-Saclay, AgroParisTech, INRAE, UMR 518, Palaiseau, 91120 France david.makowski@inrae.fr

Correspondence to: Rose Abramoff, abramoffrz@ornl.gov; David Makowski, david.makowski@inrae.fr

Contents of this file

Figures S1 to S10

Tables S1 to S4

Introduction

This supporting information consists of figures and tables which are referenced in the text of the manuscript.




Figure S1. Histograms showing the distribution of yield change projections (%) for maize, rice, soybean and wheat. The median and mean changes in yield relative to the baseline period are depicted as short dash gray lines and long dash black lines, respectively.




Figure S2. Predicted Yield Change vs Observed Yield Change for Maize, Rice, Soybean, and Wheat. Error bars represent the standard error of replicated sites from the 10 models generated from randomly splitting the dataset for cross-validation. For this cross-validation, the testing dataset did not include any locations used in the training dataset.




Figure S3. Predicted Yield Change vs Observed Yield Change for Maize, Rice, Soybean, and Wheat. Error bars represent the standard error of replicated sites from the 10 models generated from randomly splitting the dataset for cross-validation. For this cross-validation, the testing dataset included locations used in the training dataset, and error bars are not always large enough to be apparent.




Figure S4. Partial dependence plots showing the marginal effect of each predictor variable (average temperature, change in temperature, change in CO₂ above 390ppm, average annual precipitation (mm), annual change in precipitation (mm), Latitude and Longitude [only used as predictors in Maize, Rice, and Soybean best models] on the yield change (%). The bar plots show the marginal improvement of yield with adaptation (marginal effect of: adaptation applied – no adaptation) for each adaptation type [Cultivar, Fertilizer, Irrigation, Others, Planting Time] and each crop.




Figure S5. Partial dependence plots showing the marginal effect of the change in temperature on the yield increase with Adaptation (marginal effect of warming on yield with: adaptation applied – no adaptation). Colors indicate the crop: Maize, Rice, Soybean, and Wheat.




Figure S6a. Shapley additive explanation contribution to the predicted yield change (%) for maize under RCP4.5 without adaptation. The four predictors considered are adaptation (Yes/No), change in CO₂ concentration above 390ppm, change in precipitation, warming level, average precipitation, and average temperature. The color bar indicates the Shapley value.




Figure S6b. Shapley additive explanation contribution to the predicted yield change (%) for rice under an RCP4.5 scenario without adaptation. The four predictors considered are adaptation (Yes/No), change in CO₂ concentration above 390ppm, change in precipitation, warming level, average precipitation, and average temperature. The color bar indicates the Shapley value.




Figure S6c. Shapley additive explanation contribution to the predicted yield change (%) for wheat under an RCP4.5 scenario without adaptation. The four predictors considered are adaptation (Yes/No), change in CO₂ concentration above 390ppm, change in precipitation, warming level, average precipitation, and average temperature. The color bar indicates the Shapley value.




Figure S6d. Shapley additive explanation contribution to the predicted yield change (%) for soybean under an RCP4.5 scenario without adaptation. The four predictors considered are adaptation (Yes/No), change in CO₂ concentration above 390ppm, change in precipitation, warming level, average precipitation, and average temperature. The color bar indicates the Shapley value.




Figure S7a. Shapley additive explanation contribution to the predicted yield change (%) for maize under an RCP4.5 scenario with adaptation. The four predictors considered are adaptation (Yes/No), change in CO₂ concentration above 390ppm, change in precipitation, warming level, average precipitation, and average temperature. The color bar indicates the Shapley value.




Figure S7b. Shapley additive explanation contribution to the predicted yield change (%) for rice under an RCP4.5 scenario with adaptation. The four predictors considered are adaptation (Yes/No), change in CO₂ concentration above 390ppm, change in precipitation, warming level, average precipitation, and average temperature. The color bar indicates the Shapley value.




Figure S7c. Shapley additive explanation contribution to the predicted yield change (%) for wheat under an RCP4.5 scenario with adaptation. The four predictors considered are adaptation (Yes/No), change in CO₂ concentration above 390ppm, change in precipitation, warming level, average precipitation, and average temperature. The color bar indicates the Shapley value.




Figure S7d. Shapley additive explanation contribution to the predicted yield change (%) for soybean under an RCP4.5 scenario with adaptation. The four predictors considered are adaptation (Yes/No), change in CO₂ concentration above 390ppm, change in precipitation, warming level, average precipitation, and average temperature. The color bar indicates the Shapley value.




Figure S8. Shapley additive explanation contribution to the predicted yield change (%) for all crops under an RCP4.5 scenario with adaptation. The five predictors considered are application of adaptation strategies (Adaptation), change in CO₂ concentration above 390ppm (Δ CO₂), change in precipitation (Δ Precip), warming level (Δ Temp), average precipitation (Avg Precip), and average temperature (Avg Temp). Box represents the 1st quantile, median, and 3rd quantile. Whiskers show the minimum and maximum values.




Figure S9. Barplots showing the number of grid cells in Figure 3 that are attributed to either adaptation, change in CO₂ concentration above 390ppm (Δ CO₂ ppm), change in precipitation (Δ Precipitation), warming level (Δ Temperature °C), average precipitation (mm), and average temperature (°C) for yield predictions under an RCP4.5 scenario with no adaptation.




Figure S10. Barplots showing the number of grid cells in Figure 4 that are attributed to either adaptation, change in CO₂ concentration above 390ppm (Δ CO₂ ppm), change in precipitation (Δ Precipitation), warming level (Δ Temperature °C), average precipitation (mm), and average temperature (°C) for yield predictions under an RCP4.5 scenario with adaptation.

Crop	Number of yield simulations	Number of locations
Maize	4589	194
Rice	1519	99
Wheat	2298	174
Soybean	297	53

Table S1. Summary information for the synthesis dataset

<i>Crop</i>	<i>Model No.</i>	<i>RMSE</i>			<i>R²</i>			<i>AIC</i>		
Maize	1	25.8	±	0.7	-0.27	±	0.07	676	±	38
	2	24.3	±	0.8	-0.11	±	0.04	601	±	43
	3	17.5	±	0.8	0.43	±	0.02	324	±	31
	4	17.5	±	0.8	0.43	±	0.02	323	±	31
	5	18.7	±	0.7	0.35	±	0.02	369	±	29
	6	17.5	±	0.8	0.43	±	0.02	328	±	29
	7	21.9	±	0.9	0.11	±	0.01	504	±	44
	8	22.5	±	0.9	0.06	±	0.02	530	±	44
	9	24.0	±	0.8	-0.07	±	0.03	598	±	41
	10	23.0	±	1.1	0.02	±	0.02	557	±	51
Rice	1	16.5	±	1.1	-0.09	±	0.04	288	±	38
	2	16.2	±	1.0	-0.06	±	0.04	274	±	32
	3	15.1	±	1.1	0.09	±	0.04	252	±	34
	4	15.8	±	1.0	-0.02	±	0.08	270	±	30
	5	14.8	±	1.1	0.12	±	0.04	246	±	33
	6	15.6	±	1.0	-0.01	±	0.11	269	±	33
	7	16.3	±	1.1	-0.07	±	0.03	295	±	36
	8	16.0	±	0.9	-0.06	±	0.07	281	±	30
	9	16.3	±	1.2	-0.07	±	0.04	296	±	38
	10	16.0	±	1.1	-0.02	±	0.03	285	±	36
Wheat	1	22.2	±	1.1	-0.09	±	0.05	508	±	51
	2	21.4	±	1.0	-0.02	±	0.05	471	±	42
	3	20.2	±	1.2	0.11	±	0.03	430	±	49
	4	20.3	±	1.3	0.10	±	0.04	441	±	59

	5	19.3	±	1.0	0.18	±	0.03	398	±	40
	6	19.0	±	1.1	0.21	±	0.04	387	±	42
	7	23.5	±	0.9	-0.24	±	0.08	579	±	43
	8	25.7	±	1.5	-0.46	±	0.08	699	±	82
	9	21.3	±	0.9	0.00	±	0.03	478	±	41
	10	21.7	±	1.0	-0.05	±	0.05	496	±	42
Soybean	1	29.6	±	3.8	0.12	±	0.11	1010	±	274
	2	29.9	±	3.7	0.11	±	0.10	1025	±	280
	3	29.5	±	4.3	0.12	±	0.14	1048	±	290
	4	30.8	±	4.8	0.05	±	0.17	1170	±	356
	5	28.2	±	3.8	0.21	±	0.10	946	±	264
	6	28.5	±	4.6	0.20	±	0.15	1020	±	338
	7	37.6	±	3.1	-0.43	±	0.04	1518	±	261
	8	450	±	409	-1764	±	1763	1713233	±	1711521
	9	34.9	±	3.2	-0.26	±	0.13	1325	±	235
	10	38.4	±	4.6	-0.48	±	0.18	1681	±	415

Table S2. RMSE, R^2 , and AIC for the 10 models tested for maize, rice, wheat, and soybean. Model performance metrics are calculated using different locations that those of the training dataset. The model with the lowest RMSE, highest R^2 , and lowest AIC for each crop is indicated in bold.

<i>Crop</i>	<i>Model No.</i>	<i>RMSE</i>			<i>R²</i>			<i>AIC</i>		
Maize	1	15.2	±	0.4	0.32	±	0.01	236	±	12
	2	16.9	±	0.5	0.16	±	0.02	292	±	16
	3	12.3	±	0.6	0.54	±	0.04	166	±	15
	4	15.0	±	0.5	0.33	±	0.04	240	±	14
	5	12.0	±	0.6	0.56	±	0.04	164	±	14
	6	14.9	±	0.5	0.34	±	0.04	240	±	14
	7	14.6	±	0.3	0.37	±	0.02	232	±	9.7
	8	21.1	±	0.5	-0.33	±	0.06	467	±	22
	9	15.8	±	0.5	0.26	±	0.01	271	±	16
	10	14.5	±	0.3	0.37	±	0.02	231	±	9.9
Rice	1	15.6	±	0.3	-0.02	±	0.05	248	±	8.9
	2	14.0	±	0.4	0.18	±	0.03	202	±	10
	3	11.3	±	0.4	0.46	±	0.04	141	±	9.9
	4	12.3	±	0.4	0.36	±	0.04	164	±	8.5
	5	11.1	±	0.4	0.48	±	0.04	140	±	9.5
	6	12.0	±	0.4	0.40	±	0.04	160	±	8.9
	7	12.7	±	0.3	0.32	±	0.03	181	±	7.8
	8	14.0	±	0.4	0.19	±	0.03	215	±	11
	9	14.9	±	0.3	0.06	±	0.05	241	±	8.7
	10	13.1	±	0.3	0.28	±	0.04	190	±	7.0
Wheat	1	14.2	±	0.2	0.51	±	0.03	206	±	7.0
	2	16.1	±	0.2	0.37	±	0.02	264	±	8.0
	3	13.9	±	0.4	0.53	±	0.01	206	±	10
	4	15.6	±	0.3	0.41	±	0.01	257	±	10

	5	12.3	±	0.3	0.63	±	0.01	169	±	7.1
	6	14.2	±	0.3	0.51	±	0.02	219	±	9.7
	7	13.8	±	0.2	0.54	±	0.02	208	±	6.3
	8	21.8	±	0.6	-0.14	±	0.03	495	±	26
	9	14.2	±	0.2	0.51	±	0.02	220	±	6.8
	10	13.6	±	0.3	0.55	±	0.02	205	±	7.0
Soybean	1	19.5	±	0.7	0.54	±	0.05	389	±	27
	2	19.8	±	0.7	0.53	±	0.06	399	±	27
	3	21.1	±	1.2	0.48	±	0.06	470	±	54
	4	20.2	±	0.9	0.52	±	0.05	427	±	36
	5	18.8	±	0.9	0.58	±	0.04	379	±	36
	6	17.3	±	0.8	0.65	±	0.04	320	±	27
	7	25.2	±	0.6	0.25	±	0.07	655	±	31
	8	36.2	±	2.3	-0.57	±	0.22	1377	±	190
	9	20.2	±	0.6	0.51	±	0.06	428	±	24
	10	25.1	±	0.6	0.25	±	0.07	654	±	32

Table S3. RMSE, R^2 , and AIC for the 10 models tested for four crops: maize, rice, wheat, and soybean. Model performance metrics are calculated using data split such that test locations are the same as those of the training dataset. The model with the lowest RMSE, highest R^2 , and lowest AIC for each crop is indicated in bold.

Crop	Coefficient	SE	F-value	p-value
Maize	6.1	0.92	43.4 _{1,4438}	<0.0001
Rice	11.6	0.84	189 _{1,1403}	<0.0001
Wheat	7.3	0.84	83.1 _{1,2126}	<0.0001
Soybean	7.9	2.3	11.9 _{1,262}	0.0007

Table S4. F and p-values for adaptation as a fixed effect in the linear mixed model (Model 7).