



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Global Food Security Threatened by Potassium Neglect

Citation for published version:

Brownlie, W, Alexander, P, Maslin, M, Cañedo-Argüelle, M, Sutton, M & Spears, B 2024, 'Global Food Security Threatened by Potassium Neglect', *Nature Food*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-024-00929-8>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1038/s43016-024-00929-8](https://doi.org/10.1038/s43016-024-00929-8)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Nature Food

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



1 Global Food Security Threatened by Potassium Neglect

2 *Will J. Brownlie^{1*}, Peter Alexander², Mark Maslin³, Miguel Cañedo-Argüelles⁴, Mark A.*
3 *Sutton¹, Bryan M. Spears¹*

4

5 **Food security and healthy ecosystems are placed in jeopardy by poor potassium**
6 **management. Six actions may prevent declines in crop yield due to soil potassium**
7 **deficiency, safeguard farmers from potash price volatility, and address environmental**
8 **concerns associated with potash mining.**

9

10 Inadequate potassium management jeopardises food security and freshwater ecosystem
11 health. Potassium, alongside nitrogen and phosphorus, is a vital nutrient for plant growth¹ and
12 will be fundamental to achieving the rapid rises in crop yield necessary to sustain a growing
13 population. Sustainable nutrient management is pivotal to establishing sustainable food
14 systems and achieving the UN Sustainable Development Goals. While momentum to deliver
15 nitrogen² and phosphorus sustainability³ builds, potassium sustainability has been chronically
16 neglected. There are no national or international policies or regulations on sustainable
17 potassium use equivalent to those for nitrogen and phosphorus. Calls to mitigate rising
18 potassium soil deficiency by increasing potassium inputs in arable agriculture are
19 understandable^{4,5}. However, substantial knowledge gaps persist regarding the potential
20 environmental impacts of such interventions. We outline six proposed actions that aim to
21 prevent crop yield declines due to soil potassium deficiency, safeguard farmers from price
22 volatility in potash (i.e. mined potassium salts used to make fertiliser) and address
23 environmental and ecosystem concerns associated with potash mining and increased
24 potassium fertiliser use.

25 **The potassium threat**

26 An estimated 20% of global agricultural soils face severe potassium deficiency; most
27 critically in South-East Asia (44%), Latin America (39%), Sub-Saharan Africa (30%), and
28 East Asia (20%)⁶. Despite varying data reliability, the global trend over recent decades shows
29 more potassium is removed than applied in harvests^{1,6}. Large agricultural areas, including
30 75% of China's rice paddy soils and 66% of the Southern Australian wheat belt are
31 reportedly deficient in 'crop-available' soil potassium^{7,8}. Depleting crop-available potassium
32 threatens crop productivity and food security in multiple countries^{5,9}. Notably, in India,

33 despite the perception of potassium-rich soils, negative soil potassium balances are causing
34 crop-yield losses⁵. These issues, exacerbated by limited or absent potassium fertilisation,
35 emphasise the need for site-specific management. Similarly, declining crop fertility due to
36 potassium deficiency in historically high-potassium soils in the Southern Cone of Latin
37 America, North Africa, and Western USA has been reported⁵.

38 However, increasing the application of potassium fertilisers presents notable and often
39 overlooked challenges.

40 Firstly, geological reserves of potash are limited to a few countries. Potash encompasses
41 mined and manufactured salts containing water-soluble potassium (e.g. potassium chloride
42 and sulfate). Over 90% of mined potash is used in fertiliser; the remainder for industrial water
43 treatment, animal feed, cement, fire extinguishers and textiles¹⁰. Canada, Belarus, and Russia
44 collectively possess approximately 70% of the world's potash reserves. In terms of potash
45 production, Canada, Russia, Belarus, and China combined contribute approximately 80% of
46 the global output (Table 1). Consequently, food systems in most countries rely on potassium
47 fertiliser imports making them vulnerable to supply disruptions. Although peak potash is
48 projected by 2057¹⁰, current shortages for farmers are driven by production, economics, and
49 politics.

50 Global consumption of fertiliser nutrients has consistently risen since the 1960s and is
51 currently at an all-time high (Figure 1a). Currently, twelve countries dominate the \$15 billion
52 international market for potassium fertiliser, representing a quarter of the total fertiliser
53 market value¹². Canada (38%), Belarus (22%), and Russia (20%) collectively supply 80% of
54 international potash exports¹³. In 2021, global potash consumption reached 45 million tonnes
55 (Mt)¹¹. Global annual potash production capacity has been projected to increase to 69 Mt by
56 2025, supported by new mines and expansion projects in Belarus, Canada and Russia, as well
57 as planned projects in Australia, Eritrea and the UK¹¹. Anticipated expansion is expected to
58 lead to elevated emissions of pollutants into the air, soil, and water, potentially impacting
59 ecosystems and local communities¹⁴. Potash mining activities have raised human rights
60 concerns, including the displacement of indigenous populations, potential labour rights
61 violations, and social disruptions in affected regions^{15,16,17}.

62 Secondly, potash prices are prone to volatility; prices spiked in 2009 and 2021 (Figure 1b). In
63 2009, potash prices spiked by ~240% reaching 682 \$ t⁻¹¹⁸. This was likely due to a
64 combination of factors, including rising fossil fuels costs, Indian fertiliser subsidies and rising
65 biofuel prices, that also impacted the price of other commodities including phosphorus¹⁹. In

66 2021, a ‘perfect storm’ of drivers including rising fertiliser demand, economic recovery from
67 COVID-19, Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, escalating fuel prices, and several ‘knee jerk’
68 government policies to protect domestic fertiliser supplies (e.g. China halting fertiliser
69 exports), led to a rapid escalation in the price of fertilisers and other commodities¹⁹. In the
70 same year, the global potash market faced more turbulence, with the EU, UK, US and Canada
71 imposing potash import sanctions on Belarus and Russia²⁰. By April 2022, potash price
72 spiked by ~500%, reaching 1202 \$Mt⁻¹¹⁸. Countries that could afford to stockpile, whilst
73 many farmers were forced to significantly reduce potassium fertiliser use²¹. At present,
74 potash prices are below 50% of the 2022 peak, attributed to higher-than-anticipated supplies
75 from Russia and Belarus entering global markets²¹.

76 The 2022 fertiliser price spike raised global concerns that farmers will not be able to access
77 sufficient fertiliser to produce food using existing farming systems^{23,24}. These price spikes,
78 also observed for nitrogen and phosphorus, highlighted the urgent need to future-proof food
79 systems to fertiliser price instability and reduce farmers' vulnerability to fertiliser price
80 spikes, exacerbated by heavy reliance on synthetic fertilisers^{19,22}.

81 Thirdly, potash mining is exerting substantial environmental impacts on the atmosphere,
82 surface water, groundwater, soil and vegetation²⁵. Over the past decade, potash production
83 has risen by 9%, driven particularly by increased demand in South-East Asia¹¹. Addressing
84 growing agricultural demand necessitates an escalation in both potash ore mining and
85 processing. Like other mining activities, the potash industry generates millions of tonnes of
86 tailings, with approximately three tonnes of tailings (comprising solid halite waste, clay–salt
87 slurry and saturated brines) produced for each tonne of extracted potash^{25,26}.

88 These mining wastes are commonly disposed of in tailing piles, forming artificial mountains
89 predominantly composed of sodium chloride (Figure 2). This storage approach, often in open
90 locations near mines, has significant environmental ramifications. Uncontrolled discharge of
91 hypersaline effluents from potash waste disposal sites leads to soil, groundwater and surface
92 water salinisation, causing substantial harm to fauna and flora^{25,27,28}. Direct ecological
93 impacts include a reduction in total biomass and species diversity in aquatic ecosystems with
94 a prevalence of halophilic species²⁹. Such ecological impacts have been observed in Spain²⁶,
95 Germany³⁰, Russia and Belarus²⁵ and Canada³¹, and range from local to catchment scale.
96 Despite potential management measures such as brine collectors, challenges persist as salts
97 can still dissolve through rain and humidity, and leaks may occur from collecting and
98 retention infrastructures^{27,32}.

99 In contrast to nitrogen and phosphorus, the effects of anthropogenic potassium enrichment in
100 freshwaters are poorly understood. Issues like harmful algal blooms typically arise from
101 excess nitrogen or phosphorus rather than excess potassium³³. However, potassium soil
102 deficiency can reduce crop nutrient use efficiency for both nitrogen and phosphorus,
103 potentially increasing the risk of nitrogen and phosphorus pollution. Where crop yields are
104 limited by insufficient potassium, applications of nitrogen and phosphorus must be
105 accordingly reduced. This is essential to prevent an unnecessary build-up of these nutrients in
106 the soil, which may not be utilized by the crop. In addition, available studies suggest that
107 potassium is among the most toxic ion for freshwater biodiversity^{34,35}, however the
108 physiological mechanisms that regulate potassium toxicity are still unclear³⁶. Overall, the
109 effects of increased potassium loading, and, more broadly, increased salinity, on freshwaters
110 requires further attention³⁷.

111 **A call for international action**

112 We propose the following six actions to prevent potential severe declines in crop yield due to
113 soil potassium deficiency, safeguard farmers from the potash price volatility and address
114 environmental concerns associated with (the poorly regulated expansion of) potash mining:

115 1. Review current potassium stocks and flows.

116
117 Initiate global scale assessment of current potassium soil stocks to identify the most at-risk
118 countries and regions. This assessment should acknowledge the different fractions of
119 bioavailable and non-bioavailable potassium in soils and roots⁸. A quantified life cycle
120 analysis of potassium flows throughout the anthropogenic potassium cycle/food system (as
121 depicted in Yakovleva et al., 2021) is also needed. Such analyses are essential to pinpoint
122 opportunities for reducing losses, enhancing potassium recycling³⁹ and identifying more
123 sustainable practices.

124 2. Establish capabilities for monitoring and predicting potassium price fluctuations.

125 It is imperative to develop national-scale potassium supply and demand monitoring and
126 forecasting capabilities to safeguard farmers and mitigate food security risks arising from
127 potash price volatility. A thorough review of current potash reserves and resources,
128 production and consumption will be essential to understanding and managing the risks
129 associated with trade channels between potash-producing and consuming nations.

130 Governments must acknowledge potash supply risks, emphasising the necessity for accurate
131 data on reserves, resources, and supply and demand¹⁰. International schemes for classifying

132 and reporting raw material resources can enhance potassium data accuracy. UN regional
133 bodies, like the ‘Aarhus Convention’ on environmental information access, may facilitate
134 improved public access to global potassium reserve and fertiliser production data. The focus
135 should extend to examining connections within local and global mineral supply chains,
136 promoting responsible consumption and production while acknowledging the environmental
137 and social implications of mining and processing minerals for agriculture.

138 3. Help farmers maintain sufficient soil potassium levels

139 Defining ‘sufficient’ potassium to avoid crop yield losses involves local assessment. Studies
140 conducted in the UK demonstrated spring barley yield in response to nitrogen application was
141 ~40% lower in soils with low compared to high potassium levels⁴⁰. However, further research
142 is required to better assess the yield implications of potassium limitation across diverse crops
143 and soils. Such assessment should consider soil potassium stocks, soil characteristics, crop
144 types and leaching potential, and may be significantly affected by the incorporation of
145 measures to reduce potassium losses⁴. National-scale assessments are essential to address
146 knowledge gaps and to develop targeted fertiliser recommendations for optimal crop yield
147 and environmental sustainability.

148 Challenges to ensuring sufficient potassium soil levels will vary between regions and shape
149 national approaches. Some countries may prioritise affordable potassium fertiliser access,
150 necessitating credit, subsidies and improved infrastructure. Others may look to optimise the
151 recycling of potassium-rich materials like manure and food waste. This will require public
152 education, agricultural extension services, and in some cases enhanced infrastructure.
153 Governments have an additional chance to consider utilising ‘International Commodity
154 Agreements’ for safeguarding food security in developing economies with high market
155 exposure⁴¹. This approach could follow a ‘fair and equitable benefit-sharing’ model, akin to
156 examples seen in various natural resource sectors⁴². Multilateral and bilateral agreements
157 could be employed to ensure a stable potassium supply for nations lacking domestic
158 resources, with reciprocal arrangements securing agricultural exports from these vulnerable
159 countries. Equitable trade of potash and potassium fertilisers is crucial, demanding
160 international cooperation, exemplified by the World Trade Organization (WTO)
161 mediations⁴³.

162 4. Evaluate the environmental effects of potash mining and increased potassium 163 application to identify sustainable practices.

164 There is a pressing need for a synthesis of evidence concerning environmental damage
165 attributable to potash mining. The impact of potash mining on river ecosystems, although a
166 global contributor to river salinisation, is not well understood²⁷. A combination of laboratory,
167 mesocosm and field studies is advised to establish safe potassium concentrations for aquatic
168 life and understand the implications of potash pollution for ecosystem integrity. Additionally,
169 specific biotic indices should be developed for detecting salt pollution³⁴ and anticipating
170 ecological disasters²⁷. A priority lies in responsible and transparent recording of the
171 environmental consequences of potash mining, supported by stringent regulations to
172 minimise pollution⁴⁴. Evaluating and implementing mining process innovations to better
173 manage polluting wastewater, such as electro-separation⁴⁵, will be crucial for transitioning to
174 a more environmentally conscious mining sector.

175 Polyhalite, a potassium mineral, has been suggested as a substitute for potash as a source of
176 potassium in fertilisers. Polyhalite has a lower chloride content and therefore salinisation risk
177 associated with its production. While it has a lower potassium concentration than potash, it
178 contains additional crop micronutrients (e.g. sulfur, magnesium, calcium). A new polyhalite
179 mine in England, backed by a multi-billion investment, is sparking debate over its potential to
180 disrupt the global potash market⁴⁶.

181 There is also an urgent need to promptly enhance our understanding of the potential
182 environmental repercussions resulting from the increased application of potassium fertilisers
183 to soils and the associated risk of potassium leaching. Addressing global soil potassium
184 deficiency necessitates careful consideration, especially when evidence points to potential
185 toxicity to freshwater organisms due to elevated potassium levels³⁴. Addressing potassium
186 deficiency has the potential to decrease the environmental impact of nitrogen and phosphorus
187 losses through enhanced crop yields and nutrient use efficiency. An integrated approach to
188 the sustainable management of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium in agriculture and
189 wastewater, focussed on limiting pollution of freshwater and coastal ecosystems, is long
190 overdue.

191 5. Develop a global strategy to transition to a circular potassium economy.

192 Establishing a circular potassium economy will require coordinated efforts of multiple
193 stakeholders across the supply chain, including agriculture, wastewater, food industries and
194 society³⁸. Key measures involve potassium-efficient farm practices, such as precision/low
195 emission fertiliser application and erosion control to mitigate potassium losses. Investigating
196 potential amendments and bio-fertilisers to release non-bioavailable potassium in soils is also

197 crucial. The growth of potassium recovery industries should play a key role but requires
198 further research and will likely need policy backing and financial support to accelerate
199 innovation and improve competitiveness. Exploring unconventional potassium sources from
200 waste ash (e.g. cocoa waste, plantain waste, market waste, and water hyacinth) shows
201 promise but remains underutilised³⁹. A societal shift towards diets with lower potassium
202 footprints, aligning with healthier and less meat-intensive choices, supports this overall
203 transition. The overarching goal is to reduce reliance on mined potassium sources³⁸, thereby
204 mitigating vulnerability to price fluctuations and environmental pollution associated with
205 potash production.

206 6. Accelerate intergovernmental cooperation as a catalyst for change.

207 Potassium management is largely disregarded in the food and environmental policy agendas
208 of most countries. These gaps stem from a lack of awareness and coordination, particularly
209 evident in current national policies that inadequately address the environmental harm
210 resulting from potash mining wastewater salinisation²⁷. In January 2024, the United Nations
211 Environment Programme (UNEP) Working Group on Nitrogen, in conjunction with the
212 Global Partnership on Nutrient Management (GPNM), hosted by UNEP, delivered a
213 phosphorus sustainability update to the national focal points of the UN working group. Ahead
214 of United Nations Environment Assembly 6, the UNEP Executive Director's Report
215 highlighted that phosphorus has been a “..blind spot in international cooperation around
216 nutrients” and raises the opportunity for member states to advance on this issue
217 (UNEP/EA.6/2). We highlight a similar issue and opportunity for potassium. Similar UN
218 momentum on potassium, aligned with actions on phosphorus and nitrogen, will increase
219 awareness on the need for action on integrated nutrient management globally. This is
220 essential if the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework Targets 2 and 7 are to be
221 met by 2030.

222 We call for international action on potassium, advocating for the creation or expansion of an
223 intergovernmental coordination mechanism, similar to that being developed for nitrogen⁴⁷.
224 Prompted by the European Parliament's acknowledgement of food security risks tied to
225 Belarusian potash reliance amid geopolitical events⁴⁸, this mechanism should aid
226 governments, conventions, and stakeholders in fostering integrated action on potassium
227 sustainability. An international framework to consolidate knowledge on potassium cycles, set
228 globally agreed targets, and quantify the economic benefits of action, would appear essential
229 in support of this. A future UNEA resolution on potassium provides a key opportunity for
230 intergovernmental action, showcasing a strong commitment to fostering positive change.

231 **Data Availability**

232 All data supporting the findings of this comment are publicly available and listed in the
233 references section.

234 **Author information**

235 **Affiliations**

236 ¹ UK Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, Edinburgh, UK.

237 ² School of GeoSciences, The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK.

238 ³ Department of Geography, University College London, London, UK.

239 ⁴ FEHM-Lab, Institute of Environmental Assessment and Water Research (IDAEA), CSIC, Barcelona, Spain

240 **Contributions**

241 W.J.B. co-conceived the idea of the manuscript, led the writing of the paper, and collated and
242 conducted data analysis. P.A., M.M., M.C.A., M.A.S., and B.M.S. contributed to writing the
243 paper.

244 **Corresponding author**

245 Will Brownlie | E-mail: wilown@ceh.ac.uk

246

247 **Competing interests**

248 The authors declare no competing interests.

Figure 1. The monthly price, January 2007 to June 2022, of nutrients used in fertiliser production (US\$ tonne⁻¹)¹⁸; potassium chloride, triple super phosphate and urea. The price of potassium chloride peaked in 2008 and increased sharply again in 2021. Key national responses impacting the trade of potassium include; **Jan-2008 to Jun-2009:** Demand led price spike – likely due to multiple interacting factors including rising fossil fuels costs, Indian fertiliser subsidies and rising biofuel prices; **Jan-2013:** Fragmentation of the Belarusian Potash Company (representing Uralkali and Belaruskali) caused international potash prices to fall; **Jan-2020:** COVID-19 outbreak impacts prices of multiple commodities including potash and potassium fertiliser; **March-2022:** Russia halts fertiliser exports (after invading Ukraine in Feb-22); **May to Sept-2022:** EU, UK, US and Canada imposing potash import sanctions on Belarus.

Figure 2. Global consumption of nutrients used in fertiliser production between 1961 and 2021⁴⁹; potassium (Mt of K in K₂O); nitrogen (Mt of N), phosphate (Mt of P in P₂O₅).

Table 1. Potash production in 2020 and 2021 and estimated potash reserves in 2021 for Belarus, Canada, China and Russia as percentages of World totals¹¹.

Country	Potash production (% of World total)		Potash reserves in 2021 (% of World total)
	2020	2021	
Belarus	16%	8%	23%
Canada	31%	40%	33%
China	13%	15%	5%
Russia	20%	13%	12%

References

1. Zörb, C., Senbayram, M. & Peiter, E. Potassium in agriculture – Status and perspectives. *J Plant Physiol* **171**, 656–669 (2014).
2. Sutton, M. A. *et al.* The nitrogen decade: mobilizing global action on nitrogen to 2030 and beyond. *One Earth* **4**, 10–14 (2021).
3. *Our Phosphorus Future*. (UK Centre for Ecology & Hydrology, 2022). doi:10.13140/RG.2.2.17834.08645.
4. Leverich Nigon, L. & Bruulsema, T. Assessing Soil Potassium: Basic Principles and New Developments. *Crops & Soils* **56**, 29–34 (2023).
5. *Improving Potassium Recommendations for Agricultural Crops*. (Springer International Publishing, 2021). doi:10.1007/978-3-030-59197-7.
6. Grzebisz, W., Szczepaniak, W., Potarzycki, J. & Ukowiak, R. Sustainable Management of Soil Potassium – A Crop Rotation Oriented Concept. in *Soil Fertility* (InTech, 2012). doi:10.5772/53185.
7. Mengel, K. & Kirkby, E. *Principles of plant nutrition*. (Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001).
8. Römheld, V. & Kirkby, E. A. Research on potassium in agriculture: needs and prospects. *Plant Soil* **335**, 155–180 (2010).
9. Sheldrick, W. F., Syers, J. K. & Lingard, J. A conceptual model for conducting nutrient audits at national, regional, and global scales. *Nutr Cycl Agroecosyst* **62**, 61–72 (2002).
10. Al Rawashdeh, R. World peak potash: An analytical study. *Resources Policy* **69**, 101834 (2020).
11. Jasinski, S. 2022 Minerals Yearbook - Potash. *U.S. Geological Survey* (2022).
12. Chatham House. ‘resourcetrade.earth’. <https://resourcetrade.earth/> (2021).
13. Government of Canada. Potash Facts. (2023). <https://natural-resources.canada.ca/our-natural-resources/minerals-mining/minerals-metals-facts/potash-facts/20521>

14. Martin, A. & Iles, A. The Ethics of Rare Earth Elements Over Time and Space. in *Ethics of Chemistry* 317–346 (World Scientific, 2021). doi:10.1142/9789811233548_0012.
15. Myette, E. & Riva, M. Surveying the complex social-ecological pathways between resource extraction and Indigenous Peoples' health in Canada: A scoping review with a realist perspective. *Extr. Ind. Soc.* **8**, 100901 (2021).
16. Fernandes, S., Fernandes, G. W. & Fearnside, P. M. Viewpoint: Sovereignty and reversing Brazil's history of Amazon destruction. *Land use policy* **133**, 106868 (2023).
17. Al Rawashdeh, R., Campbell, G. & Titi, A. The socio-economic impacts of mining on local communities: The case of Jordan. *Extr. Ind. Soc.* **3**, 494–507 (2016).
18. World Bank. World Bank Commodities Price Data (The Pink Sheet). (2023).
19. Brownlie, W. J. *et al.* Phosphorus price spikes: a wake-up call for phosphorus resilience. *Front Sustain Food Syst* (2022).
20. Baffes, J. & Koh, W. Soaring Fertilizer Prices Add to Inflationary Pressures and Food Security Concerns. Available. *World Bank Data Blog* (2021).
21. Hook, L. Ukraine war thrusts fertiliser minerals to centre of food security debate. *Financial Times* (2023).
22. Alexander, P. *et al.* High energy and fertilizer prices are more damaging than food export curtailment from Ukraine and Russia for food prices, health and the environment. *Nat Food* **4**, 84–95 (2022).
23. UN GCRG. Global Impact of war in Ukraine on food, energy and finance systems. **Brief no 1**, (2022).
24. World Bank Group. *Commodity Markets Outlook: The Impact of the War in Ukraine on Commodity Markets, April 2022*. (World Bank, 2022).
25. Ushakova, E. *et al.* Environmental Aspects of Potash Mining: A Case Study of the Verkhnekamskoe Potash Deposit. *Mining* **3**, 176–204 (2023).
26. Gorostiza, S. & Saurí, D. Naturalizing pollution: a critical social science view on the link between potash mining and salinization in the Llobregat river basin, northeast Spain. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **374**, 20180006 (2019).

27. Cañedo-Argüelles, M. *et al.* Effects of potash mining on river ecosystems: An experimental study. *Environmental Pollution* **224**, 759–770 (2017).
28. Haj-Amor, Z. *et al.* Soil salinity and its associated effects on soil microorganisms, greenhouse gas emissions, crop yield, biodiversity and desertification: A review. *Science of The Total Environment* **843**, 156946 (2022).
29. Feld, C. K., Lorenz, A. W., Peise, M., Fink, M. & Schulz, C.-J. Direct and indirect effects of salinisation on riverine biota: a case study from river Wipper, Germany. *Hydrobiologia* **850**, 3043–3059 (2023).
30. Coring, E. & Bäthe, J. Effects of reduced salt concentrations on plant communities in the River Werra (Germany). *Limnologica* **41**, 134–142 (2011).
31. Baberschke, N., Irob, K., Preuer, T., Meinelt, T. & Kloas, W. Potash mining effluents and ion imbalances cause transient osmoregulatory stress, affect gill integrity and elevate chronically plasma sulfate levels in adult common roach, *Rutilus rutilus*. *Environmental Pollution* **249**, 181–190 (2019).
32. Gorostiza, S., March, H., Conde, M. & Sauri, D. Corrosive flows, faulty materialities: Building the brine collector in the Llobregat River Basin, Catalonia. *Environ Plan E Nat Space* 251484862211058 (2022).
33. Talling, J. F. Potassium - A Non-Limiting Nutrient in Fresh Waters? *Freshwater Reviews* **3**, 97–104 (2010).
34. Schulz, C. & Cañedo-Argüelles, M. Lost in translation: the German literature on freshwater salinization. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **374**, 20180007 (2019).
35. Mount, D. R. *et al.* The acute toxicity of major ion salts to *Ceriodaphnia dubia* : I. influence of background water chemistry. *Environ Toxicol Chem* **35**, 3039–3057 (2016).
36. Griffith, M. B. Toxicological perspective on the osmoregulation and ionoregulation physiology of major ions by freshwater animals: Teleost fish, crustacea, aquatic insects, and Mollusca. *Environ Toxicol Chem* **36**, 576–600 (2017).
37. Cunillera-Montcusí, D. *et al.* Freshwater salinisation: a research agenda for a saltier world. *Trends Ecol Evol* **37**, 440–453 (2022).

38. Yakovleva, N., Chiwona, A. G., Manning, D. A. C. & Heidrich, O. Circular economy and six approaches to improve potassium life cycle for global crop production. *Resources Policy* **74**, 102426 (2021).
39. Adeoye, G. O., Sridhar, M. K. C. & Ipinmoroti, R. R. Potassium recovery from farm wastes for crop growth. *Commun Soil Sci Plant Anal* **32**, 2347–2358 (2001).
40. Johnston, A.E. & Milford, G.F.J. Potassium and nitrogen interactions in crops. <https://www.pda.org.uk/technical-potash-notes/potassium-and-nitrogen-interactions-in-crops/#13>. Potash Development Association (2012).
41. Oehl, M. E. *Sustainable Commodity Use*. vol. 21 (Springer International Publishing, 2022).
42. Morgera, E. The Need for an International Legal Concept of Fair and Equitable Benefit Sharing. *European Journal of International Law* **27**, 353–383 (2016).
43. Karapinar, B. China’s export restriction policies: complying with ‘WTO plus’ or undermining multilateralism. *World Trade Review* **10**, 389–408 (2011).
44. Schuler, M. S. *et al.* Regulations are needed to protect freshwater ecosystems from salinization. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **374**, 20180019 (2019).
45. Jena, S. A Review on Potash Recovery from Different Rock and Mineral Sources. *Min Metall Explor* **38**, 47–68 (2021).
46. Dempsey, H. & Susannah, S. Anglo American’s high-stakes bet on a new way to feed the world. *Financial Times* **November 23rd**, (2023).
47. UNEP. Roadmap for Action on Sustainable Nitrogen Management 2020-2022. Implementation of UNEA-4 Resolutions: Follow-up to UNEP/EA.4/Res.14. **Inf. Doc.**, (2019).
48. European Parliament. European Parliament resolution of 24 March 2022 on the need for an urgent EU action plan to ensure food security inside and outside the EU in light of the Russian invasion of Ukraine (2022/2593(RSP)). (2022).
49. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAOSTAT. *Food and Agricultural Data* <https://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/RFN> (2023).