

Table S1. Database on studies comparing SRI with conventional management practices (CMP), either RP or FP in different countries.

Country	Location / Settings	CMP (RP or FP)	CMP yield (t ha ⁻¹)	SRI yield (t ha ⁻¹)	SRI yield deviation (%)	Comments	Reference
Afghanistan	Baghlan and Takhar Provinces (FF)	FP	5.13	9.03	76	n=42; Yield of average in three districts, 2 nd year yield of SRI reached 10.5 t ha ⁻¹ as a 1 st crop and 9.0 t ha ⁻¹ as a second crop; yield increased by increasing the number of weedings.	[49]
Bangladesh	BINA Sub-station, Gopalganj (ES)	RP	6.67	7.00	5	Greater yield under SRI was found to be mostly due to higher grain weight.	[50]
Bangladesh	Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University (ES)	RP	6.59	7.62	16	Eight varieties tested; yield ranged between 5.2-9.8 t ha ⁻¹ under SRI and 5.2-7.9 t ha ⁻¹ under CMP.	[51]
Bangladesh	Bangladesh Rice Research Institute Regional Station, Comilla (ES /FF)	RP	7.64	7.11	-7	BMP; highest SRI yield was at 25x15 cm; no effect seen for seedling age, or for organic manure as the substitution of urea; better than FP	[52]
Bangladesh	Bangladesh Rice Research Institute Regional Station, Comilla (ES/FF)	RP	7.79	7.45	-4	BMP; found best spacing for SRI was 25x15 cm, but when comparing SRI with BMP, 25x25 cm spacing was used for SRI	[53]
Benin	Kakanitchoé and Dogba (OFT)	FP	5.47	8.24	51	SRI methods could increase average yields under farmer conditions by 50% with 87% less seeds and crop period shortened by 14 days; however, 36% more labor was required under SRI.	[54]
Brazil	EMBRAPA Research Station, Arari County, Maranhão State (ES)	RP	6.20	5.70	-8	NS; under SRI, increase in tillering and individual plant biomass compensated for the lower plant density; found no beneficial effect of aerobic water regime, organic fertilization; however, recorded benefits of low-density transplanting over direct-seeding.	[55]
Cambodia	Tramkak District, Takeo Province (FF)	FP	3.10	3.51	13	Higher rice yield at narrower spacing suggested that the wider spacing in SRI is not advisable, especially in 'nutrient-poor soil'; crop-animal integration required to increase agricultural productivity for smallholder farmers on their infertile Cambodian soils.	[56]
Cambodia	Kong Pisei District, Kampong Speu Province (FF)	FP	2.30	2.70	17	NS; farmers found less labor and seed was required for SRI.	[57]
China	Jiaying Agriculture Research Institute (ES)	RP	8.70	10.93	26	120 kg N from chemical sources+60 kg N from organic sources gave highest yield; SRI produced significantly higher grain yield than CMP under transplanting and mechanical transplanting (MT), but not under direct-seeding or seedling casting.	[58]
China	China National Rice Research Institute, Hangzhou (ES)	RP	7.47	8.78	18	Yield difference was mainly due to use of single seedlings, AWD, and INM (50% chemical + 50% organic) in SRI plots. Plant population was maintained the same for both the systems, so wider spacing not tested.	[59]
China	Yangzhou University, Jiangsu Province; Hunan Agricultural University, Hunan Province; and Guangdong Academy of Agricultural Sciences, Guangdong Province (ES)	RP	7.88	7.91	0.5	NS; experiments at three locations, 1 st location = 8.5% more yield with SRI; 2 nd location = 8.8% less with SRI, 3 rd location = 0.8% less with SRI; 11 plants m ⁻² (30x30 cm) of SRI was compared with 25 plants m ⁻² of CMP; SRI had no advantage over the conventional system, and reports of extraordinary high yields are the consequence of measurement error; seed and water savings with SRI not considered.	[5]
China	Zhejiang University, Huajia Chi Campus, Hangzhou (ES)	RP	5.85	6.61	13	Under SRI management, internal use efficiency of N, P, and K increased by 22%, 19%, and 17%, respectively; irrigation water application was reduced by 26%; total WUE and irrigation WUE were increased by 54% and 90%, respectively.	[60]
China	Huajiachi Experimental Station, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou (ES)	RP	5.38	6.54	22	Water saving under SRI was 40-47%; higher agronomic nitrogen use efficiency (ANUE) and partial factor productivity (PPF) were found.	[61]

China	Agricultural Experimental Farm of Zhejiang University in Zhejiang Province (ES)	RP	6.28	7.94	26	Under SRI, water use was reduced by 461.5 mm compared to CMP; SRI increased water use efficiency by 91% and irrigation water use efficiency by 195%; compared to CMP, SRI significantly increased both microbial biomass carbon (MBC) and microbial biomass nitrogen (MBN).	[62]
Gambia	Sapu Research Station, National Agricultural Research Institute (ES)	RP	2.50	7.30	192	Highest grain yield under SRI was observed at very high nitrogen dose, i.e., 280 kg ha ⁻¹ (8 t ha ⁻¹); water productivity (WP) improved from 0.14 to 0.76 g grain kg ⁻¹ total water input; net return was \$37 ha ⁻¹ with conventional methods and \$853 ha ⁻¹ with SRI.	[63]
Gambia	Sapu Research Station, National Agricultural Research Institute (ES)	RP	2.5	7.60	204	SRI with various spacings compared; at 30 x 30 cm, grain yield was 6.6 t ha ⁻¹ vs. 1.7 t ha ⁻¹ under CMP; at 40 x 40 cm, SRI yield was 4.7 t ha ⁻¹ vs. 1.3 t ha ⁻¹ under CMP.	[64]
Ghana	Golinga Irrigation Field, Tolon (ES)	FP	2.41	4.03	67	Nutrient management in SRI was modified, and highest yield was found when some mineral fertilizers were used.	[65]
India	Five Villages in Kancepuram District, Tamil Nadu (OFT)	FP	6.10	7.34	20	Highest grain yield and income were obtained with manual-transplanted SRI followed by machine-transplanted SRI; however, B:C ratio was more in machine-transplanted SRI as labor requirement was lowest.	[66]
India	Dharwad District, Karnataka (SU)	FP	2.19	3.07	40	62 each of SRI farmers and conventional farmers were surveyed; found SRI requires 87% less seed, produces 40% more rice, and gives 76% greater economic returns.	[67]
India	G. B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, Uttarakhand (ES)	RP	5.22	6.10	17	Wider spacing was found superior to closer spacing; 25x25 cm gave higher yield than 20x20 cm; SRI had higher water productivity, by 19%, over CMP.	[68, 69]
India	Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Jagatsinhpur, Odisha (ES)	RP	4.51	5.49	22	Modified SRI at 25x12.5 cm spacing and 2 seedlings hill ⁻¹ gave highest yield 6.1 t ha ⁻¹ .	[70]
India	Directorate of Rice Research Farm, ICRISAT, Hyderabad (ES)	RP	4.69	5.24	12	Compared SRI-Organic, SRI-INM, and BMP; during kharif, highest yield was with SRI-INM; SRI-Organic had lower yield than BMP during kharif season, but higher yield during the rabi season; SRI practices created favorable conditions for beneficial soil microbes to prosper, saved water, and increased yield.	[71]
India	Janagaon Region, Warangal District, AP (Primary data)	FP	4.83	7.61	58	Data from 30 SRI farmers, matched with 30 non-SRI farmers; under SRI, GHG emissions ha ⁻¹ were 40% lower, groundwater extraction was 60% less, and fossil energy use was lower by 74%; under SRI, production costs were reduced significantly ha ⁻¹ ; returns ha ⁻¹ after costs increased by 400%.	[38]
India	Indian Institute of Pulses Research (ICAR-IIPR), Kanpur (ES)	RP	5.39	5.09	-6	SRI practices increased the water productivity by 44% over the conventional transplanted flooded rice.	[72]
India	South Garo Hills, Meghalaya (FF)	FP	1.85	5.74	210	SRI method of rice cultivation could save seeds (97%), and water (78%) and reduce cost (70%), with higher yield, all compared to conventional rice culture in the area.	[73]
India	Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi (ES)	RP	5.88	5.62	-4	NS; SRI and modified SRI methods were effective in reducing global warming potential by 28-30% and saving water by 36% without yield penalty.	[36]
India	Banaras Hindu University, Uttar Pradesh (ES)	RP	5.66	6.53	15	Application of 50% recommended dose of N along with 50% N through FYM and <i>Azospirillum</i> gave the highest grain yield, protein content, nutrient uptake, and water productivity together with SRI.	[74]
India	Central Rice Research Institute, Cuttack, Odisha (ES)	RP	4.52	3.77	-17	Low plant density (30 x 30 cm) of SRI resulted in lower yield and higher labor cost, which reduced net returns (2,650 vs. 9,312 INR ha ⁻¹) compared to traditional methods of cultivation; mechanized planting and weeding of SRI enhanced its productivity to 4.24 t ha ⁻¹ but age of seedlings should increase from 8 to 16 days and density of hills should increase from 11 to 31/m ² with 4 seedlings, instead of single seedlings hill ⁻¹ .	[75]

India	Lower Palar Sub-Basin, Kancheepuram District, Tamil Nadu (OFT)	FP	5.14	6.21	21	Demonstration of green manure followed by SRI was done in 120 ha area of 120 farmers.	[76]
India	Villupuram District, Tamil Nadu (FF)	RP	5.35	6.41	20	Income increased by 44.5%, saving of irrigation water by 42%, 17% lesser labor, and 87% lesser seed cost with SRI.	[77]
India	Mahabubnagar District, Andhra Pradesh (FF)	FP	4.55	5.39	19	Higher net return (52%) and saving of water (52%) with SRI.	[78]
India	Indian Agricultural Research Institute (IARI), New Delhi (ES)	RP	5.23	5.13	-2	NS; 26% total water saving and 36 % irrigation water saving with SRI compared to CMP.	[79]
India	Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore (ES)	RP	6.21	6.44	4	Improvement in water productivity in SRI was 0.72 kg rice m ⁻³ water vs. 0.44 kg m ⁻³ with CMP.	[80]
India	Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore (ES)	RP	6.10	6.30	3	Improvement in water productivity in SRI was 0.61 kg rice m ⁻³ water vs. 0.40 kg m ⁻³ with CMP.	[81]
India	Islamabad Region, Anantnag District, Kashmir (ES & FF)	RP	3.15	4.15	32	With SRI, water savings of 40%; with increase in net income by 57% compared to the conventional rice farming methods.	[82]
India	Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi (ES)	RP	5.50	5.40	-2	NS; similar yields with organic, INM and inorganic nutrient management; water saving with SRI 35%; water productivity 5.3 vs 3.5 kg ha-mm ⁻¹ .	[83]
India	Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi (ES)	RP	4.89	4.72	-4	NS; a saving of 8-9 irrigations with SRI; water saving of 35%, with improvement in water productivity with SRI.	[84]
India	Tripura State (FF)	RP	4.47	5.99	12	Quantity of water (in liters) required to produce 1 kg rice: 1,498 with SRI, 1,883 with CMP,	[85]
India	Purulia District, West Bengal (FF)	FP	3.98	5.25	32	Data from 100 farmers; 1 kg of seed with SRI produced 846 kg of paddy vs. 4 kg with the conventional methods; net returns were higher by 67%; labor inputs were reduced by 8%.	[86]
India	Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi (ES)	RP	4.53	5.03	11	Global warming potential was highest in CMP (807.4 kg CO ₂ ha ⁻¹) and lowest in SRI (498.25 kg CO ₂ ha ⁻¹). SRI required six irrigations lesser than CMP, resulted in 27.4 % irrigation water and 18.5 % total water saving. Water productivity of SRI (3.56 kg ha-mm ⁻¹) was significantly higher as compared to CMP (2.61 kg ha-mm ⁻¹).	[87]
India	College of Agriculture, JNKVV, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh (ES)	RP	4.26	4.87	14	Highest grain yield, net returns, and B:C ratio were achieved with application of 75% RDN+ 25% N through vermicompost under SRI.	[88]
India	Indian Institute of Water Management, Odisha (ES)	RP	4.49	6.38	42	Physiological basis for SRI yield enhancement were explained in this paper.	[18]
India	Indian Institute of Water Management, Odisha (ES)	RP	4.40	6.51	48	Water saving of 22% compared with CMP rice; water productivity with AWD-SRI management practices was almost doubled (0.68 g rice l ⁻¹) compared to CF-CMP (0.36 g l ⁻¹).	[10]
India	Indian Institute of Water Management, Odisha (ES)	RP	4.10	5.51	34	SRI and CMP with two nutrient regimes compared integrated nutrient management (INM) and organic management. INM out-yielded organic nutrient management in both systems; however, both SRI-INM and SRI-organic out-yielded CMP-INM and CMP-organic, by 44% and 25%, respectively. Grains obtained with SRI methods contained more nutrients than those produced with CMP.	[25]
India	Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur, Chhattisgarh (ES)	RP	6.50	7.39	14	Modified SRI (10 d-old seedlings+100% inorganic or 50% organic+50% inorganic + irrigation as per SRI) gave higher grain yield and higher net income (17%) over RMP with hybrid rice.	[89]
Indonesia	Ujung Alang Village, Cilacap District, Central Java Province (OFT)	RP	5.42	9.55	76	For saline soil of mangroove forest area, SRI along with deep furrows powdered with limestone reduced the use of synthetic fertilizers by 40% and variable costs by 8%,	[90]

						increased the B/C ratio by 95% and crop productivity by 76%, compared to the methods recommended by scientists, and increased the B/C ratio by 161% and crop productivity by 133% compared to conventional farmer methods.	
Indonesia	Sindang Barang, Jero Village, Bogor, West Java (FF)	RP	6.18	7.70	25	SRI improved physiological parameters as well as N and P uptake.	[91]
Indonesia	Wonogiri District, Central Java Province (FF)	RP	8.39	9.44	13	Greater yield increase by SRI could be achieved by improving nutrient and water management during the reproductive stage.	[92]
Indonesia	Labtek XI School of Life Sciences & Technology, West Java (SD)	RP	4.50	7.50	67	SRI was evaluated as a methodology to address climate change, saving water by 30% with significantly higher yield.	[93]
Iraq	Al-Mishkhab Rice Research Station, Najaf (ES)	FP	3.75	5.25	40	Three-fold increase in water use efficiency for SRI (0.291 kg m ⁻²) compared with non-SRI cultivation (0.108 kg m ⁻²); SRI practices reduced the need for irrigation water by 39%.	[21]
Japan	Chiba Prefecture (ES)	RP	7.37	7.40	0.5	NS; 28% water saving with SRI; water productivity was 1.74 g rice l ⁻¹ of water with SRI vs. 1.23 g l ⁻¹ with CMP; seedling age of 14 vs. 21 d had no significant impact on yield.	[17]
Japan	Chiba Prefecture (ES)	RP	6.70	6.30	-6	NS; SRI-organic and conventional-inorganic had same yield; SRI practices improved root growth, tillering etc.; additionally, SRI crop had lesser incidence of pests and diseases, a shorter crop cycle, and improved plant stand; net returns from SRI-organic were increased by approx. 1.5 times in spite of the additional labor requirements for weed control.	[94]
Kenya	Mwea Irrigation Agricultural Development Centre Research, Kirinyaga County (ES)	FP	4.71	6.89	46	Labor cost for SRI was cheaper than with the common farmer practice.	[95]
Kenya	Mwea Irrigation Scheme, Kirinyaga District (FF)	FP	5.00	9.60	92	Need of capacity-building and training on SRI	[96]
Kenya	Mwea Irrigation Scheme, Kirinyaga District (Secondary data from farmers in 18 units)	FP	5.14	6.80	32	Apart from yield advantage under SRI management, seed requirements were reduced by 87% and water savings by 28%. On average, SRI required 9% more labor than FP, but in three units, labor costs were reduced by an average of 13%. In first season, SRI required 30% more labor for weeding than FP, but it reduced to 15% in next season when weeders became available. SRI had higher B:C ratio than FP (1.82 vs. 1.33).	[97]
Kenya	Mwea Irrigation Agricultural Development Centre Research Station (ES)	RP	8.66	14.85	72	24% saving in irrigation water; land productivity and water productivity were increased by 71% and 90%, compared with RP.	[98]
Korea	Kangwon National University, Chuncheon (ES)	RP	5.35	4.90	-8	SRI yield (50 x 50 cm) = 4.08 t ha ⁻¹ , (40x40 cm) = 4.4 t ha ⁻¹ , (30x30 cm) = 4.9 t ha ⁻¹ , control (30 x 15 cm) = 5.4 t ha ⁻¹ . Irrigation water saving with SRI was 56% less than on control plots. SRI could be successfully adopted and could save a significant amount of irrigation requirement in paddies and reduce non-point source (NPS) pollution discharge.	[39, 99]
Madagascar	Center for Diffusion of Intensified Agriculture, Beforona (ES)	RP	4.92	6.26	27	SRI compared with SRA (System of Improved Rice Culture); yield under farmer's practice (FP) was 2.63 t ha ⁻¹ .	[22]
Mali	Goundam and Dire, Timbuktu (FF)	RP	5.49	9.10	66	Grain yield in farmers practice (FP) was 4.86 t ha ⁻¹ ; 5 varieties were tested and all had higher grain yield under SRI than control (RP) and FP.	[100]
Myanmar	Pwint Phyu Seed Farm (ES)	FP	6.82	6.59	-3	NS; statistically similar grain yield but SRI emitted less greenhouse gases (GHGs) than FP; could be a better alternative method.	[101]
Myanmar	Kachin and Shan States (FFS)	FP	2.10	6.40	205	Data from 612 farmers participated in 30 farmer field school (FFS)	[102]
Nepal	Regional Agricultural Research Station, Banke District (ES)	RP	5.10	6.10	20	<i>Trichoderma</i> inoculation improved yield in Organic-SRI, Inorganic SRI yielded 4.8 t ha ⁻¹ .	[103]

Pakistan	Agricultural Research Institute, Mingora (ES)	RP	4.64	4.82	4	NS; study compared different fertilizer treatments in three rice varieties.	[104]
Panama	Provinces of Veraguas, Cocle, Panama, Colon, and Herrera (OFT)	FP	3.44	4.75	38	Data shown are average yield from 10 farms; at Cocuyal, La Mata and Las Lajas, yields increase by > 90% with SRI; in Barrigon, Loma, Cope, and Palmilla, yields increased by 30%; at San Juan and La Puente, yields with SRI were lower by 8 and 6%, respectively; SRI practices showed potential to increase yields by over 90%, while reducing water consumption by 86%.	[105]
Philippines	Different locations (FF)	FP	2.70	3.82	42	High yield was achieved combining transplanting of 8-10 day-old single seedlings at 40 x 40 cm spacing, with organic fertilization, and intermittent irrigation.	[106]
Sanegal	Africa Rice Center, Senegal River Valley, Ndiaye Arrondissement (ES)	RP	6.88	6.57	-5	NS; an average of 27% less water was applied to SRI than required for continuous flooding in CMP, resulting in higher water productivity with SRI; when weeds are controlled, good yields and significant water savings can be achieved with SRI.	[107]
Senegal	Ziguinchor Province (FF)	FP	2.27	3.94	74	Benefit/cost ratio was found to be higher with SRI (1.5) than with TP (1.2); SRI required technical know-how for its implementation, hence greater cost of production; however, SRI was found to be more productive and profitable than the traditional system.	[108]
Sri Lanka	Rice Research & Development Institute, Batalagoda (ES)	RP	6.68	6.44	-4	NS; plant spacing used for SRI was 30 x 30 cm; the reduced seeding rate was so great that it raised seed productivity 5-fold.	[109]
Taiwan	Chianan Plain, Tainan (ES)	RP	3.70	5.80	57	Fungicide use to control blast gave highest yield of 6.5 t ha ⁻¹ ; single seedling hill ⁻¹ gave more yield than using two or three seedlings hill ⁻¹ .	[110]
Tanzania	Kilombero District, Morogoro Region (SU)	FP	2.65	6.73	154	Data from 194 SRI and 140 non-SRI farmers; standard deviation was very large; SRI was found to be non-profitable because of lower selling price of SRI rice enforced contractually by KBL; this study found SRI to be climate-friendly agricultural practice requiring institutional reform and support.	[111]
Tanzania	Mvomero District, Morogoro Region (FFS)	FP	3.83	4.76	24	Above 60% water saving with SRI compared to conventional method.	[112]
Tanzania	Chimala, Mbarali District, Beya Region (FF)	FP	5.00	8.20	64	Production cost was higher for SRI; however, SRI rice was found better for seed production, and grain had higher aroma and fragrance.	[113]
Tanzania	Lekitatu Irrigation Scheme, Meru District, Arusha (FF)	FP	4.80	8.50	77	Highest grain yield and water productivity were obtained with SRI using single seedlings 15 days old at 25 x 25 cm spacing; based on the local rice farming conditions, researchers recommended 2 nd best practices of SRI, i.e., intermittent irrigation with two 21-day seedlings at 20 x 20 cm spacing.	[114]
Tanzania	Mkindo Farmer-Managed Irrigation Scheme, Mvomero District, Morogoro (FF)	RP	5.70	6.70	18	Rice grain yield, agronomic nitrogen use efficiency (ANUE), and partial factor productivity (FPF) were higher in SRI than in CMP at all levels of N application that were compared.	[115]
Tanzania	Mkindo Farmer-Managed Irrigation Scheme, Mvomero District, Morogoro (FF)	RP	4.20	6.40	52	As above	[115]
Tanzania	Kilombero Plantation Ltd., Kilombero District, Morogoro Region (FF)	FP	2.90	4.70	62	Additional income of 119-137 USD ha ⁻¹ resulted from adopting SRI; the impact of training on modified SRI was studied in this paper.	[116]
Thailand	Kasetsart University (ES)	RP	3.56	5.43	53	SRI crop had higher number of leaves, leaf area, tillers, and filled grains; hydro-priming improved seed germination, seedling development, and rice yield; SRI also improved water use efficiency (WUE).	[117]

Timor Leste	Bobonaro and Covalima Districts (SD)	FP	3.24	2.94	-9	NS; for Timor Leste, SRI may not be beneficial compared to conventional rice grown under favorable conditions; as the dissemination of SRI is in its early stage, average productivity was low and could increase in subsequent years; the variable cost of production was lower on SRI plots, largely because SRI farmers spent significantly less on seeds; they did not find a significant differences in labor inputs.	[118]
Timor Leste	Covalima, Bobonaro and Viqueque Districts (FF)	FP	2.50	5.00	100	SRI introduced to 11 cooperatives by Oxfam New Zealand; cost per hectare was raised from \$640 ha ⁻¹ to \$850, but net profit ha ⁻¹ was increased from \$595 to \$2,198.	[119]

Settings: Farmer's fields (FF); Experiment. Station (ES); Farmers Field Schools (FFS); On-farm trials (OFT); Secondary data (SD); Survey (SU).

Conventional management practices (CMP) classified as Recommended practices (RP) or Farmer's practices (FP). DS: Dry season. WS: Wet season. NS: Not significant

Table S2. Reported large-scale studies and meta-analyses comparing SRI with conventional management practices (CMP) in different countries

Country	No. of farmers/ trials / area	SRI yield (t ha ⁻¹)	CMP yield (t ha ⁻¹)	SRI yield increase (%)	SRI water saving (%)	SRI impact on cost ha ⁻¹ (Δ%)	SRI impact on income ha ⁻¹ (Δ%)	Comments	References
Bangladesh	1,073 farmers	6.7	5.4 (FP)	26	NM	-7	+59	Study over two years by 3 NGOs and Syngenta/BD under the auspices of IRRI/Bangladesh	[120]
Cambodia	500 farmers	2.3	1.6 (FP/RF)	41	Rainfed	-56	+74	Study done for GTZ (GIZ) with random selections of SRI and non-SRI farmers in 5 provinces.	[121]
Cambodia	120 farmers	2.8	1.3 (FP/RF)	105	Rainfed	-47	+98	Study of all the farmers in Cambodia who had used SRI practices for 3 years, by NGO (CEDAC).	[13]
China	Meta-analysis of 17 published research papers	8.3	7.5 (RP)	10.9	NM	NM	NM	26 sets of trials reported by Chinese researchers in the published literature (most in Chinese).	[9]
China	82 farmers	9.5	6.6 (FP)	42	44	-7	+64	Village study by China Agricultural University in Sichuan province.	[122]
China (Sichuan)	> 400,000 ha	9.0	7.6 (FP)	18.4	25	NR	NR	Between 2004 and 2012, the area under SRI management in Sichuan Province rose from 1,132 ha to >400,000 ha.	[123]
Eight countries	Meta-analysis of 29 published research papers	5.9	5.3 (RP)	11	22	NM	NM	251 trials from 8 countries reported in the published literature were analyzed; data mostly from ES, with some FF studies.	[14]
India	2,234 farmers (across 13 states of India)	4.6	3.8 (FP)	22	NM	NM	+18	IWMI-Tata Policy Program study; not all used SRI fully: farmers adopting some of the SRI practices but not necessarily all got higher yields and income.	[124]
India	Experiments @ 25 locations across India (2013-2017)	-	-	Up to 55	-	-22.7 (survey of 262 farmers)	-	SRI reduced total energy inputs for rice production by 4,350 MJ ha ⁻¹ ; also, higher energy productivity and lower greenhouse gas emissions under SRI.	[16]
India (Andhra Pradesh)	1,525 farmers across all districts of state	8.7	6.3 (RP)	34	40	NM	NM	Evaluations by Andhra Pradesh state university (ANGRAU).	[80]

India (Bihar)	8,055 ha (100,000 farmers)	3.3	1.6 (FP)	86	NM	+20	+250	Evaluation of JEEVIKA program supported by World Bank (2007-2012).	[125]
India (Jharkhand)	3,317 ha (34,170 farmers)	6.9	3.6 (FP)	96	NM	0	+95	2-year trial by National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development (NABARD) support.	[126]
India (Tamil Nadu)	17,981 ha; 19,497 demonstrations	4.5	3.2 (FP)	33	41	NM	NM	Irrigated Agriculture Modernization and Water Bodies Restoration and Management Project funded by World Bank with assistance from Tamil Nadu Agricultural University (2007-11); of 1.9 m ha of total rice area in Tamil Nadu state, the area under SRI was 1.0 m ha by 2012.	[127]
Indonesia	12,133 farmers; 9,133 ha	7.6	4.3 (FP)	78	40	-20	+100	On-farm comparison trials managed by Nippon Koei TA team across 8 provinces (2002-06).	[128]
Lower Mekong River Basin (Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam, and Thailand)	405 experiments at 172 sites in 32 districts of 11 provinces; 5,000 farmers	4.72	3.1 (FP/RF)	66.5	NR	NR	+93	Farmer participatory project funded by European Union as a part of its Food Security Thematic Program of its Global Program on Agricultural Research for Development.	[129]
Lower Mekong River Basin (Cambodia, Lao PDR, Thailand, Vietnam)	1,500 experiments; with >15,000 farmers in 33 districts of 11 provinces	-	- (FP/RF)	52	61		+70	With SRI methods adapted to rainfed conditions; labor productivity increased by 64%; efficiency of mineral fertilizer-use went up by 163%; energy inputs required were decreased by 34%; GHG emissions were reduced by 14-17%.	[15]
Nepal (Morang District)	412 farmers	6.1	3.3	82	43	-2.2	+163	Trials managed by the District Agricultural Development Office in Biratnagar.	[130]
Nepal (Far Western Region)	890 farmers	7.6	4.0	88	>60	+32	+164	Trials/demonstrations under EU-FAO Food Facility Program.	[131]
Sri Lanka	120 farmers	5.5	3.8	44	24	-12	+104	International Water Management Institute (IWMI) study with random selection of 120 farmers in 2 districts	[132]
Vietnam	1,274 farmers	6.8	5.6	22	33	-30	+36	Results of Ministry of Agricultural and Rural Development FFS trials on FFs in 13 districts.	[133]
Vietnam	> 1 million farmers on 185,000 ha	NR	NR	9-15	33	NR	US\$95 to \$260 ^a	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development with Oxfam America and civil society partners spread SRI use 22 to provinces.	[134]

<i>Average</i>	<i>6.7</i>	<i>4.3</i>	<i>54%</i>	<i>39%</i>	<i>-12%</i>	<i>98%</i>
----------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	-------------	------------

Source: Adapted from [135] and expanded with more recent information.

NM = Not measured. NR = Not reported. FFS = Farmer Field Schools. RF = Rainfed rice cultivation

CMP = Conventional management practices; RP = Recommended practices; FP = Farmer's practices

^a In value, not percent.