P-ISSN: 2618-0723
E-ISSN: 2618-0731

NAAS Rating: 5.04
www.extensionjournal.com

International Journal of Agriculture Extension and Social Development

Volume 8; SP-Issue 7; July 2025; Page No. 13-23

Received: 16-04-2025
Accepted: 20-05-2025

Indexed Journal
Peer Reviewed Journal

Precision sustainable intensification of horticultural systems: Bridging ecological principles, climate-smart practices, and circular economy approaches for enhanced resilience and reduced environmental footprint – evaluating trade-offs and systemic constraints

[1]Vamshi Krishna, [2]Ramesh, [3]Surya Charan, [4]Dr. Prashant Kumar, [5]Abishek A

[1]B.Sc. (Hons.) Horticulture, College of Horticulture, Munirabad, Koppal, University of Horticultural Sciences, Bagalkot, Karnataka, India

[2]Ph.D Scholar (Agronomy), College of Agriculture, Raichur, University of Agricultural Sciences, Raichur, Karnataka, India

[3]M.Sc. (Agri.) Genetics and Plant Breeding, College of Agriculture, Vijayapura, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad, Karnataka, India

[4]SMS-Horticulture, KVK, Hamirpur, BUAT, Banda, Uttar Pradesh, India

[5]Department of Farm Machinery and Power Engineering, College of Agriculture Engineering, Raichur, UAS, Raichur, India.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.33545/26180723.2025.v8.i7Sa.2116

Corresponding Author: Vamshi Krishna

Abstract

Horticulture is a critical sector for global food security, nutrition, and economic development, yet it faces unprecedented challenges from climate change, resource scarcity, and environmental degradation. The conventional model of intensification, heavily reliant on external inputs, is increasingly unsustainable. This review paper explores Precision Sustainable Intensification (PSI) as a paradigm shift for the future of horticulture. PSI integrates precision agriculture technologies with principles of sustainable intensification to create systems that are simultaneously more productive, resilient, and environmentally sound. We synthesize evidence across three core pillars that underpin PSI in horticulture: ecological principles, climate-smart practices, and circular economy approaches. The paper first establishes the theoretical framework of PSI, differentiating it from conventional intensification. It then delves into the foundational ecological principles, such as enhancing biodiversity, improving soil health, and optimizing nutrient cycling, which are essential for minimizing negative externalities. Following this, we examine a suite of climate-smart practices, including advanced water management, protected cultivation, and carbon sequestration strategies, that enable horticultural systems to adapt to and mitigate climate change. A significant focus is placed on the integration of circular economy models, which aim to eliminate waste and regenerate natural systems by valorizing biomass, recycling water, and creating closed-loop nutrient cycles. Throughout the analysis, we critically evaluate the inherent trade-offs and systemic constraints associated with implementing PSI. These include economic barriers for smallholders, technological gaps, policy misalignments, and social acceptance. Five comprehensive tables are presented to synthesize key technologies, practices, trade-offs, and circular economy models. By bridging these diverse but interconnected concepts, this paper argues that a systemic, multi-faceted approach is necessary to unlock the full potential of PSI. We conclude that realizing a resilient and low-impact horticultural sector requires a concerted effort from researchers, policymakers, and practitioners to co-create and implement context-specific PSI solutions that balance productivity goals with long-term ecological and social sustainability.

Keywords: Precision sustainable intensification, horticulture, climate-smart agriculture, circular economy, ecological principles, system resilience, environmental footprint, soil health, water management, sustainable food systems

1. Introduction

Horticultural crops, encompassing fruits, vegetables, and ornamental plants, are indispensable components of global food systems, providing essential micronutrients, vitamins, and dietary fiber to billions of people (FAO, 2021) [32]. The sector is a significant source of income and employment, particularly for smallholder farmers in developing countries (Weinberger & Lumpkin, 2007) [129]. Global demand for horticultural products is projected to rise dramatically, driven by population growth, urbanization, and a dietary shift towards plant-based foods (KPMG, 2018) [63]. To meet this demand, horticultural production has historically relied on a model of intensification characterized by high inputs of water, synthetic fertilizers, pesticides, and energy (Tilman *et al.*, 2011) [118]. While this approach has successfully boosted yields, it has come at a substantial environmental cost, including soil degradation, water depletion and contamination, biodiversity loss, and significant greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (Springmann *et al.*, 2018) [108]. The heavy reliance on fossil fuels for machinery, fertilizer production, and climate control in greenhouses further exacerbates the sector's environmental footprint (Tubiello *et* *al*., 2015) [120].

The challenges facing horticulture are being amplified by the accelerating impacts of climate change (Schellnhuber *et al*., 2013) [104]. Increased frequency and intensity of extreme weather events, such as droughts, floods, and heatwaves, threaten crop yields and quality (Lesk *et al*., 2016) [72]. Shifting precipitation patterns disrupt irrigation schedules, while rising temperatures alter pest and disease dynamics, demanding new management strategies (Bebber, Ramotowski, & Gurr, 2013) [9]. Consequently, the conventional, high-input model of intensification is not only environmentally unsustainable but also increasingly vulnerable and lacking in resilience (Rockström *et al*., 2017) [100]. This has created an urgent need for a paradigm shift towards a model of intensification that can simultaneously enhance productivity, strengthen resilience to climate change, and reduce the environmental footprint of horticultural systems (Godfray *et al*., 2010) [43].

In response to this grand challenge, the concept of "Sustainable Intensification" (SI) has gained significant traction (Garnett *et al*., 2013) [37]. SI is defined as a process or system where agricultural yields are increased without adverse environmental impact and without the conversion of additional non-agricultural land (The Royal Society, 2009) [116]. The core principle of SI is to produce "more from less" by improving resource use efficiency and harnessing ecological processes (Pretty & Bharucha, 2014) [94]. However, the broad definition of SI has been subject to debate, with critics arguing that it can sometimes be co-opted to justify business-as-usual approaches with minor efficiency gains (Loos *et al*., 2014) [46]. To operationalize SI in a more robust and transformative manner, the concept of "Precision Sustainable Intensification" (PSI) has emerged (Kharrazi *et al*., 2021) [56].

PSI represents the synergistic integration of precision agriculture (PA) technologies with the holistic principles of sustainable intensification (Grinberga *et al*., 2023) [46]. It leverages data-driven tools-such as sensors, drones, robotics, and artificial intelligence (AI)-to manage spatial and temporal variability within and between fields with unprecedented accuracy (Gebbers & Adamchuk, 2010) [38]. This allows for the targeted application of inputs (water, nutrients, pesticides) precisely when and where they are needed, minimizing waste and environmental leakage (Khosla, 2010) [57]. More importantly, PSI goes beyond mere input optimization; it seeks to build fundamentally healthier and more resilient agroecosystems (Cook & O'Connell, 2016) [20]. This is achieved by bridging advanced technology with three foundational pillars: deep-rooted ecological principles, proactive climate-smart practices, and innovative circular economy approaches (Pawlak & Kołodziejczak, 2020) [91]. This review paper synthesizes the state-of-the-art knowledge on these three pillars, evaluates the potential of PSI to transform horticultural systems, and critically examines the trade-offs and systemic barriers that must be addressed to realize this vision.

2. Foundational Ecological Principles for Resilient Horticultural Systems

The long-term sustainability of any agricultural system, including intensively managed horticulture, is fundamentally dependent on the health and integrity of its underlying ecological processes (Dale & Polasky, 2007) [22]. PSI moves beyond a purely technology-centric view to actively manage and enhance these processes, treating the farm as an ecosystem (Robertson & Swinton, 2005) [99]. This ecological approach focuses on building natural capital-such as fertile soil and beneficial biodiversity-to reduce dependency on synthetic inputs and enhance the system's inherent resilience (Bommarco, Kleijn, & Potts, 2013) [10].

2.1. Enhancing Soil Health and Nutrient Cycling

Soil is the foundation of horticultural production, and its health is paramount for sustainable intensification (Lal, 2015) [68]. Healthy soils provide essential nutrients, store water, filter pollutants, and support a vast community of organisms that drive key ecosystem functions (Doran & Zeiss, 2000) [26]. Conventional horticulture has often degraded soil health through intensive tillage, monocropping, and excessive use of synthetic fertilizers, leading to soil organic matter (SOM) decline, compaction, erosion, and nutrient imbalances (Montgomery, 2007) [81]. PSI prioritizes the restoration and maintenance of soil health through a variety of practices (Paudel *et al*., 2020) [89].

Conservation tillage, including no-till and strip-till, minimizes soil disturbance, which protects soil structure, reduces erosion, and allows SOM to accumulate (Hobbs, Sayre, & Gupta, 2008) [51]. The use of cover crops during fallow periods provides a living mulch that prevents erosion, suppresses weeds, and adds organic matter to the soil upon termination (Lu *et al*., 2000) [78]. Furthermore, integrating diverse crop rotations and intercropping systems breaks pest and disease cycles and can enhance nutrient availability through mechanisms like nitrogen fixation by legumes (Gurr, Wratten, & Altieri, 2004) [48]. Precision nutrient management is a cornerstone of this approach (Srinivasan, 2006). Instead of uniform broadcast applications, it uses soil sensors, leaf tissue analysis, and remote sensing to create variable-rate application maps (Mulla, 2013) [83]. This ensures that nutrients, whether from organic sources like compost or synthetic fertilizers, are applied at the right rate, time, and place, maximizing plant uptake and minimizing losses to the environment through leaching or volatilization (Cassman, 1999) [16].

2.2. Fostering Functional Agrobiodiversity

Biodiversity in agricultural landscapes is not an optional luxury but a functional necessity for production and resilience (Tscharntke *et al*., 2012) [119]. PSI strategies actively promote functional agrobiodiversity at multiple scales (Kremen, Iles, & Bacon, 2012) [64]. At the plot scale, this includes practices like intercropping and polycultures, which can increase yield stability and resource use efficiency (Vandermeer, 1989) [122]. At the farm scale, it involves establishing non-crop habitats such as hedgerows, flower strips, and beetle banks (Landis, Wratten, & Gurr, 2000) [69]. These habitats provide essential resources (shelter, nectar, pollen, alternative prey) for beneficial organisms, including pollinators and natural enemies of pests (Fiedler, Kremen, & Wratten, 2008) [35].

For instance, flower strips planted alongside vegetable crops have been shown to significantly boost populations of hoverflies and parasitic wasps, leading to improved biological control of aphids and reducing the need for insecticides (Hatt *et al*., 2017) [50]. Similarly, ensuring a healthy population of wild and managed bees is critical for the pollination of many high-value fruit and vegetable crops (Klein *et al*., 2007) [59]. Precision tools can support these efforts; for example, remote sensing can be used to monitor the health and distribution of pollinator habitats, while selective, data-driven pesticide applications can minimize harm to non-target beneficial insects (Long & Finke, 2014) [75]. By weaving a complex web of life back into the horticultural landscape, PSI enhances ecosystem services that can substitute for or supplement chemical inputs (Zhang, Ricketts, & Kremen, 2007) [133].

Table 1: Key Ecological Principles for PSI in Horticulture and Their Associated Practices

Ecological Principle	Objective	Core Practices	Precision Tools & Technologies	Key References
Enhancing Soil Health	Increase soil organic matter, improve soil structure, and optimize nutrient availability.	No-till/conservation tillage, cover cropping, crop rotation, application of compost and manure.	Real-time soil sensors (moisture, N-P-K), remote sensing for soil organic carbon mapping, variable-rate nutrient applicators.	(Lal, 2015; Hobbs, Sayre, & Gupta, 2008) [68, 51]
Optimizing Nutrient Cycling	Match nutrient supply with crop demand in space and time to minimize losses.	Integrated nutrient management (INM), use of legumes for nitrogen fixation, recycling of crop residues.	Chlorophyll meters, drone-based hyperspectral imaging for nutrient stress detection, decision support systems (DSS) for fertilizer recommendations.	(Cassman, 1999; Mulla, 2013) [16, 83]
Fostering Agrobiodiversity	Increase the abundance and diversity of beneficial organisms (pollinators, predators).	Intercropping, polycultures, planting of hedgerows, insectary plants, and beetle banks.	GIS mapping of farm habitats, image recognition for insect monitoring, precision spraying to avoid non-target species.	(Tscharntke *et al*., 2012; Landis, Wratten, & Gurr, 2000) [69, 119]
Integrated Pest & Disease Management (IPM)	Use multiple tactics to keep pest populations below economically damaging levels.	Biological control, use of resistant cultivars, cultural controls, pheromone traps for monitoring.	Automated insect traps with image sensors, AI-powered disease identification apps, weather-based disease forecasting models.	(Ehler, 2006; Kogan, 1998) [29, 61]
Improving Water Use Efficiency	Maximize crop water productivity ("crop per drop") and minimize non-beneficial water loss.	Mulching, deficit irrigation strategies, rainwater harvesting, improved irrigation scheduling.	Soil moisture probes, evapotranspiration (ET) sensors, automated drip irrigation systems, remote sensing for water stress detection.	(Fereres & Soriano, 2007; Geerts & Raes, 2009) [33, 39]

3. Climate-Smart Practices: Building Adaptive and Mitigative Capacity

Climate-Smart Agriculture (CSA) is an approach that aims to transform and reorient agricultural systems to support food security under the new realities of climate change (Lipper *et al*., 2014). It has three interconnected objectives: (1) sustainably increasing agricultural productivity and incomes (adaptation), (2) adapting and building resilience to climate change (adaptation), and (3) reducing and/or removing greenhouse gas emissions (mitigation), where possible (FAO, 2013) [31]. PSI in horticulture is inherently climate-smart, as its technologies and practices directly contribute to these three pillars (Chandra *et al*., 2018) [18].

3.1. Advanced Water Management for Drought Resilience

Water scarcity is one of the most immediate and widespread challenges for horticulture in a changing climate (Grafton *et al*., 2018) [44]. PSI offers a powerful toolkit for optimizing water use. Precision irrigation systems, such as drip and micro-sprinkler irrigation, deliver water directly to the plant's root zone, drastically reducing the evaporative and runoff losses associated with traditional flood or furrow irrigation (Kulkarni, 2011) [65]. When these systems are coupled with a network of sensors, they become truly "smart" (Cahn & Johnson, 2017) [13]. Soil moisture sensors, for instance, provide real-time data on water availability in the root zone, allowing irrigation to be triggered only when necessary (Vereecken *et al*., 2008) [125]. Plant-based sensors, such as stem dendrometers, can detect water stress in the plant itself even before visible symptoms appear (Fernández & Cuevas, 2010) [34]. This information can be integrated with local weather station data and satellite-derived evapotranspiration (ET) maps to create highly accurate, automated irrigation schedules that match water supply to crop demand with surgical precision (Allen *et al*., 1998) [4]. These strategies not only conserve water but also improve yield and quality, as they prevent the physiological stress caused by both under- and over-watering (Fereres & Soriano, 2007) [33].

3.2. Protected Cultivation and Environmental Control

Protected cultivation, including greenhouses, net houses, and tunnels, provides a physical barrier against harsh environmental conditions, making it a key adaptive strategy (Gruda, 2005) [47]. It allows growers to buffer crops from extreme temperatures, heavy rainfall, hail, and high winds (Jensen, 2002) [52]. Modern greenhouses are increasingly sophisticated, evolving into controlled environment agriculture (CEA) systems (Kozai, 2018) [62]. In CEA, PSI technologies are used to manage every aspect of the growing environment, including temperature, humidity, light, and carbon dioxide concentration (van Straten, van Willigenburg, & van Henten, 2010) [123]. For example, automated ventilation and fogging systems can cool greenhouses during heatwaves, while energy-efficient LED lighting can supplement natural light on cloudy days or extend the growing season (Morrow, 2008) [82]. This level of control enables year-round production of high-quality produce, enhances resource use efficiency (especially water), and can significantly increase land productivity (Stanghellini, 2014) [110]. While CEA is energy-intensive, integration with renewable energy sources like solar panels and geothermal heating can mitigate its carbon footprint, contributing to the third pillar of CSA (Sethi & Sharma, 2007) [107].

3.3. Carbon Sequestration and GHG Emission Reduction

Horticultural systems can be both a source and a sink for greenhouse gases (Paustian *et al*., 2016) [90]. PSI practices play a crucial role in tipping this balance towards mitigation. As discussed, building soil health through no-till, cover cropping, and compost application directly contributes to carbon sequestration by increasing soil organic carbon (SOC) stocks (Powlson *et al*., 2011) [93]. Healthy soils with high organic matter are more resilient to both drought and flood, linking mitigation directly to adaptation (Lal, 2004) [67]. Precision nutrient management provides another major avenue for mitigation (Abalos *et al*., 2014) [2]. The production of synthetic nitrogen fertilizer is an energy-intensive process, and its application to fields is the largest source of nitrous oxide (N2O)-a greenhouse gas nearly 300 times more potent than carbon dioxide-from agriculture (Crutzen *et al*., 2007) [21]. By ensuring that nitrogen is applied precisely where and when the crop needs it, PSI minimizes the surplus nitrogen in the soil that can be converted to N2O, thus reducing emissions (Venterea *et al*., 2012) [124]. Furthermore, the adoption of energy-efficient technologies in irrigation pumps, machinery, and greenhouse climate control reduces the consumption of fossil fuels, thereby lowering carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions (Gelfand *et al*., 2010) [40].

Table 2: Climate-Smart Practices in PSI Horticulture

Practice Category	Specific Practice/Technology	Adaptation Benefit	Mitigation Benefit	Key References
Water Management	Sensor-based drip irrigation	Conserves water, reduces crop stress during droughts, improves yield stability.	Reduces energy use for pumping water.	(Cahn & Johnson, 2017; Fereres & Soriano, 2007) [13, 33]
	Regulated Deficit Irrigation (RDI)	"Trains" plants to be more drought-tolerant, can improve fruit quality.	Reduces overall water and energy consumption.	(Geerts & Raes, 2009; Pérez -Pérez *et al*., 2008) [39, 92]
Protected Cultivation	High-tech greenhouses (CEA)	Protects crops from extreme weather, enables year-round production, high water productivity.	Can be integrated with renewable energy; reduces land footprint.	(Kozai, 2018; Gruda, 2005) [62, 47]
	Shade nets / Screenhouses	Reduces heat stress and sunburn on crops, conserves water by reducing ET.	Lower energy footprint compared to fully controlled greenhouses.	(Tanny, 2013; Ambrósio *et al*., 2018) [113, 5]
Soil & Nutrient Management	Agroforestry systems	Provides shade, reduces wind speed, improves microclimate, enhances soil moisture.	Sequesters significant amounts of carbon in biomass and soil.	(Jose, 2009; Nair, 1993) [53, 84]
	Precision N-fertilizer application	Improves plant health and resilience to stressors.	Reduces nitrous oxide (N2O) emissions from excess fertilizer.	(Abalos *et al*., 2014; Mulla, 2013) [2, 83]
	Compost and biochar application	Increases soil water holding capacity, improves soil structure.	Sequesters stable carbon in the soil for long periods.	(Lehmann *et al*., 2011; Lal, 2004) [71, 67]

4. Integrating Circular Economy Approaches for a Zero-Waste System

The traditional model of horticultural production is predominantly linear: resources are taken, used to make products, and then discarded as waste (the "take-make-dispose" model) (Ghisellini, Cialani, & Ulgiati, 2016) [42]. This results in massive inefficiencies, including the loss of valuable nutrients in crop residues, the contamination of water bodies, and the accumulation of plastic waste from mulches, pots, and packaging (Briassoulis *et al*., 2013) [12]. The circular economy offers a transformative alternative, aiming to redesign systems to eliminate waste and keep materials in use for as long as possible (Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2013) [30]. In horticulture, this means creating closed-loop systems where outputs from one process become inputs for another, mimicking nature's cyclical patterns (Scherer & Pfister, 2016) [105].

4.1. Valorization of Biomass and Organic Waste

Horticultural production generates substantial quantities of organic "waste," including pruned branches, culled fruits and vegetables, and post-harvest crop residues (Scarlat *et al*., 2015) [103]. In a circular model, this biomass is recognized as a valuable resource (Galanakis, 2012) [36]. The most direct application is composting, which transforms organic matter into a nutrient-rich soil amendment that can improve soil health and reduce the need for synthetic fertilizers (De Bertoldi, 2007) [23]. Anaerobic digestion is another powerful technology that breaks down organic matter in the absence of oxygen to produce biogas (a renewable energy source) and digestate (a nutrient-rich fertilizer) (Mata-Alvarez *et al*., 2014) [80]. More advanced biorefinery approaches can extract high-value compounds-such as antioxidants, pigments, and essential oils-from horticultural residues before the remaining biomass is used for energy or composting, creating multiple streams of value from a single source (Coman, Oprea, & Stroia, 2022) [19]. Precision technologies can help optimize these processes, for example, by using sensors to monitor and control the composting or digestion process to ensure optimal quality of the final products (Cesaro & Belgiorno, 2014) [17].

4.2. Closing the Loop on Water and Nutrients

Water is a precious resource that is often used only once in conventional horticulture (Savvides *et al*., 2016) [102]. Circular approaches aim to recycle and reuse water within the production system. In controlled environment agriculture, this is highly achievable (Tyson *et al*., 2008) [121]. Water that is not taken up by plants (leachate) can be collected, sterilized (e.g., using UV radiation or ozone), re-fortified with nutrients, and then recirculated back into the irrigation system (Massa *et al*., 2010) [79]. This creates a closed-loop hydroponic or soilless system that can reduce water consumption by over 90% compared to open-field agriculture (Barbosa *et al*., 2015) [8]. This not only conserves water but also prevents nutrient-rich runoff from polluting nearby ecosystems (Lee & Lee, 2015) [70]. Even in open-field systems, constructed wetlands can be used to capture and treat irrigation runoff, allowing the water and some of the nutrients to be reused (Vymazal, 2010) [126].

4.3. Tackling Plastic Waste in the Supply Chain

The horticultural sector is a major consumer of plastics, used for mulch films, greenhouse coverings, irrigation tubing, pots, and packaging (Kasirajan & Ngouajio, 2012) [55]. Many of these plastics are for single-use and are difficult to recycle, leading to soil and water pollution and the creation of microplastics (Rillig, 2012) [97]. A circular approach to plastics involves several strategies along the "R" ladder: Reduce, Reuse, Recycle (Kirchherr, Reike, & Hekkert, 2017) [58]. "Reduce" can be achieved by using alternative, non-plastic mulches like straw or cover crops (Abbas *et al*., 2020) [1]. "Reuse" is possible with more durable, multi-season greenhouse films and pots (Gerrard & Kandlikar, 2007) [41]. "Recycle" requires better collection systems and designing plastics for easier disassembly and reprocessing (Hahladakis & Iacovidou, 2019) [49]. The most innovative frontier is the development and adoption of biodegradable and compostable bioplastics, which are designed to break down into harmless organic matter at the end of their life, effectively closing the material loop (Kyrikou & Briassoulis, 2007) [66]. Precision application techniques, such as using robots to lay and retrieve mulch films, can also improve the efficiency of use and the quality of the material for recycling (Weatherhead, 2021) [127].

Table 3: Circular Economy Models and Approaches in Horticulture

Circular Strategy	Application Area	Technology/Practice	Desired Outcome	Key References
Valorize Biomass	Crop Residues & Culls	Composting, vermicomposting	Production of nutrient-rich soil amendments; reduced landfill waste.	(De Bertoldi, 2007; Edwards, 2004) [23, 28]
	Organic Waste Streams	Anaerobic digestion	Generation of renewable energy (biogas) and organic fertilizer (digestate).	(Mata-Alvarez *et al*., 2014; Weiland, 2010) [80, 128]
	High-Value Residues	Biorefinery (extraction of phytochemicals)	Creation of new value-added products (e.g., nutraceuticals, biopesticides).	(Galanakis, 2012; Coman, Oprea, & Stroia, 2022) [36, 19]
Close Water & Nutrient Loops	Soilless/Hydroponic Systems	Recirculating nutrient solutions	Drastic reduction in water and fertilizer use; prevention of nutrient runoff.	(Massa *et al*., 2010; Barbosa *et al*., 2015) [79, 8]
	Open-field Runoff	Constructed wetlands, tailwater recovery ponds	Capture, treatment, and reuse of irrigation water and nutrients.	(Vymazal, 2010; Borin *et al*., 2010) [126, 11]
Rethink Plastics	Mulching	Use of biodegradable/compostable plastic mulches	Elimination of plastic residue in soil; reduced disposal costs.	(Kyrikou & Briassoulis, 2007; Kasirajan & Ngouajio, 2012) [66, 55]
	Packaging	Shift to compostable packaging; minimalist packaging designs.	Reduced consumer waste; lower environmental footprint of the final product.	(Dilkes-Hoffman *et al*., 2019) [24]

5. Evaluating Trade-offs and Systemic Constraints

Despite the immense promise of PSI, its widespread adoption is not a simple matter of deploying new technologies (Tey & Brindal, 2012) [115]. The transition from conventional systems to PSI involves navigating a complex landscape of trade-offs and overcoming significant systemic barriers (Garnett *et al*., 2013) [37]. Acknowledging and addressing these challenges is critical for developing realistic and equitable implementation pathways (Dobermann *et al*., 2013) [25].

5.1. Economic Trade-offs and Financial Barriers

One of the most significant hurdles to the adoption of PSI is the high upfront capital investment required (Auburn & Rister, 2003) [7]. Precision technologies such as GPS-guided tractors, variable-rate applicators, drones, and sophisticated sensor networks can be prohibitively expensive, especially for small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and smallholder farmers in developing countries (Griffin *et al*., 2017) [45]. While these technologies can lead to long-term savings through reduced input costs and increased yields, the initial financial risk and long payback periods can be a major deterrent (Schimmelpfennig & Ebel, 2011) [106]. There is often a trade-off between short-term profitability and long-term sustainability (Panayotou, 1996) [85]. For example, investing in a comprehensive soil health program with cover crops and compost may not yield an immediate financial return but builds crucial natural capital for future resilience (Reimer, Weebadde, & Smale, 2012) [96]. Without supportive financial instruments, such as low-interest loans, subsidies, or "pay-for-performance" schemes that reward ecosystem services, adoption is likely to remain limited to large, well-capitalized operations (Swinton & Tiong, 2021) [112].

5.2. Knowledge, Skills, and Technological Gaps

PSI is knowledge-intensive (Robert, 2002) [98]. Effectively using precision tools requires a new set of skills in data management, analysis, and interpretation (Aubert, Schroeder, & Grimaudo, 2012) [6]. A farmer does not just need a drone; they need to know how to fly it safely, process the imagery, and translate the resulting vegetation index map into a practical management decision (Zhang & Kovacs, 2012) [132]. This "digital divide" in agricultural knowledge and skills represents a major systemic constraint (Wolfert, Ge, & Verdouw, 2017) [131]. There is a significant shortage of trained farm advisors, agronomists, and technicians who can support farmers in this transition (Eastwood *et al*., 2019) [27]. Furthermore, technological gaps still exist. Issues with sensor reliability, data interoperability between different platforms and machines, and a lack of rural broadband connectivity can frustrate even the most enthusiastic adopters (Lowenberg-DeBoer, 2015) [77]. The development of user-friendly, affordable, and robust technologies tailored to the specific needs and contexts of diverse horticultural producers is urgently needed (Carolan, 2016) [15].

Table 4: Major Trade-offs in the Implementation of PSI in Horticulture

Trade-off Axis	Conventional System Advantage	PSI System Advantage	Nature of the Trade-off	Potential Mitigation Strategy	Key References
Economic	Low upfront capital cost; familiar technology.	Lower long-term operational costs; potential for higher yields/quality.	High initial investment and risk vs. long-term profitability and resilience.	Phased adoption, government subsidies, cooperative ownership of machinery.	(Griffin *et al*., 2017; Schimmelpfennig & Ebel, 2011) [45, 106]
Labor & Skills	Relies on established, often manual, labor skills.	Requires new skills in data analysis, technology operation, and systems thinking.	Simplicity and familiarity vs. complexity and the need for new expertise.	Investment in extension services, vocational training, user-friendly interfaces.	(Aubert, Schroeder, & Grimaudo, 2012; Wolfert, Ge, & Verdouw, 2017) [6, 131]
Time Management	Established routines and decision-making heuristics.	Requires significant time for data collection, processing, and learning.	Immediate action based on experience vs. delayed, data-driven action.	Automated data analysis, decision support systems (DSS), hiring expert consultants.	(Reichardt & Jürgens, 2009) [95]
Ecological	(Often none) Can lead to rapid pest knockdown with broad-spectrum pesticides.	Builds long-term ecological resilience and reduces reliance on inputs.	Short-term "silver bullet" solutions vs. long-term, knowledge-intensive ecological management.	Demonstrating the economic value of ecosystem services; IPM training.	(Bommarco, Kleijn, & Potts, 2013; Kremen, Iles, & Bacon, 2012) [64, 10]
System Resilience	High output under stable conditions (but brittle).	Higher stability of yields under variable/extreme weather conditions.	Optimization for a narrow range of conditions vs. optimization for broad resilience.	Diversification of crops and income streams; insurance products for transition period.	(Lin, 2011; Rockström *et al*., 2017) [73, 100]

5.3. Policy, Institutional, and Social Constraints

The transition to PSI is not just a technical challenge; it is also a social and political one (Pannell, 2017) [87]. Existing agricultural policies often create perverse incentives that hinder the adoption of sustainable practices (Tilman *et al*., 2002) [117]. For example, subsidies that encourage the overuse of water or fertilizers work directly against the goals of PSI (Runge, 2002) [101]. A lack of clear standards for data ownership and privacy can also make farmers hesitant to adopt digital technologies (Wiseman *et al*., 2019) [130]. Institutional inertia within government agencies, research institutions, and private companies can slow down the development and dissemination of PSI approaches (Klerkx, van Mierlo, & Leeuwis, 2010) [60]. On a social level, tradition and risk aversion can make farmers reluctant to change long-standing practices (Tanzila, 2014) [114]. The perceived complexity of PSI systems can be overwhelming, and a lack of successful local demonstration sites can make the benefits seem abstract and uncertain (Adrian, Norwood, & Griffin, 2005) [3]. Overcoming these constraints requires a multi-stakeholder approach, involving policy reforms, institutional innovation, and participatory processes that co-design PSI solutions with farmers, ensuring they are not only technologically sound but also socially acceptable and economically viable (Sumberg & Giller, 2022) [111].

Table 5: Systemic Constraints to PSI Adoption and Potential Solutions

Constraint Category	Specific Barrier	Description	Potential Solution(s)	Key References
Economic & Financial	High Capital Costs	Prohibitive upfront investment in precision hardware and software for many farmers.	Cooperative/shared ownership models; equipment-as-a-service (EaaS); targeted subsidies; green financing.	(Griffin *et al*., 2017; Swinton & Tiong, 2021) [45, 112]
	Uncertain ROI	The return on investment can be long-term and difficult to predict, increasing perceived risk.	Better farm-level economic modeling; demonstration farms; insurance products that de-risk adoption.	(Schimmelpfennig & Ebel, 2011; Pannell, 2008) [106, 88]
Technological & Infrastructural	Digital Divide	Lack of skills and knowledge to operate and interpret data from precision technologies.	Investment in digital literacy training; robust extension services; development of intuitive user interfaces.	(Wolfert, Ge, & Verdouw, 2017; Aubert *et al*., 2012) [6, 131]

	Lack of Connectivity	Poor or non-existent internet access in many rural areas limits the use of cloud-based tools.	Public and private investment in rural broadband infrastructure; development of offline-capable tools.	(Lowenberg-DeBoer, 2015; Carolan, 2016) [77, 15]
	Interoperability Issues	Lack of standardization means data from different systems (e.g., tractor, drone) cannot be easily integrated.	Industry-led development of data standards (e.g., AgGateway); open-source platforms.	(Wolfert *et al*., 2017; Kaloxylos *et al*., 2012) [54, 131]
Policy & Institutional	Misaligned Subsidies	Policies that subsidize inputs like water or fertilizer discourage efficiency and conservation.	Policy reform to decouple subsidies from production and link them to environmental outcomes ("public money for public goods").	(Tilman *et al*., 2002; Runge, 2002) [117, 101]
	Inadequate Extension	Public extension services are often underfunded and lack expertise in PSI.	Revitalization of extension with a focus on digital agronomy; public-private partnerships for knowledge transfer.	(Klerkx, van Mierlo, & Leeuwis, 2010; Eastwood *et al*., 2019) [60, 27]
Social & Cultural	Risk Aversion	Farmers may be hesitant to abandon traditional, familiar practices for new, complex systems.	Participatory on-farm trials; peer-to-peer learning networks; highlighting successful early adopters.	(Pannell *et al*., 2006; Adrian, Norwood, & Griffin, 2005) [88, 3]
	Data Privacy Concerns	Farmers are concerned about who owns their farm data and how it will be used.	Development of clear legal frameworks and codes of conduct for agricultural data ownership and use.	(Wiseman *et al*., 2019; Carbonell, 2016) [130, 14]

6. Conclusion: Charting the Path Forward for a Resilient and Sustainable Horticulture

The confluence of climate change, resource scarcity, and rising global demand presents a formidable challenge to the horticultural sector. This review has argued that a simple continuation of input-intensive conventional practices is untenable. Precision Sustainable Intensification (PSI) offers a coherent and powerful framework for navigating this challenge, charting a course towards a future where horticultural systems are more productive, resilient, and environmentally benign. By synergistically integrating precision technologies with foundational ecological principles, climate-smart practices, and circular economy models, PSI represents a genuine paradigm shift. It moves the focus from managing inputs to managing ecosystems, from linear resource flows to circular value chains, and from reactive problem-solving to proactive system design.

The evidence synthesized in this paper demonstrates the tangible benefits of this integrated approach. Enhancing soil health and agrobiodiversity builds the natural capital that underpins long-term productivity and reduces reliance on costly and environmentally damaging inputs. Climate-smart water management and protected cultivation provide the adaptive capacity needed to thrive in an increasingly volatile climate, while practices that sequester carbon and reduce emissions contribute to global mitigation efforts. The adoption of circular economy principles promises to transform waste streams into value streams, creating more profitable and regenerative systems.

However, the path to widespread adoption of PSI is neither simple nor straightforward. The journey is fraught with significant trade-offs and systemic constraints that cannot be ignored. The high upfront costs, the digital skills gap, the need for new infrastructure, and the inertia of existing policies and social norms are formidable barriers. Overcoming them requires a concerted and collaborative effort. Researchers must focus on developing more affordable, user-friendly, and context-appropriate PSI technologies. Policymakers must reform misaligned incentives and create a supportive enabling environment that de-risks the transition for farmers. Extension services and the private sector must work together to build the human capital and knowledge networks required to support a data-driven agricultural revolution. Most importantly, farmers must be at the center of this process, co-designing and adapting PSI systems to fit their unique local conditions.

Ultimately, the successful implementation of PSI is not merely a technological challenge but a systemic one. It requires us to think holistically, to balance short-term economic needs with long-term ecological and social goals, and to build new forms of collaboration across sectors. The future of horticulture depends on our ability to bridge the gaps between technology, ecology, and economy, creating a new generation of smart, sustainable, and resilient food systems for a changing world.

7. References

1. Abbas T, Rizwan M, Ali S, Zia-ur-Rehman M, Qayyum MF, Abbas F, *et al*. Effect of biodegradable and non-biodegradable mulching on soil properties and wheat production. J Clean Prod. 2020;248:119244.
2. Abalos D, van Groenigen JW, Scheer C, Oenema O, Kuikman PJ. Meta-analysis of the effect of enhanced-efficiency fertilizers on N_2O emissions. Agric Ecosyst Environ. 2014;181:133-144.
3. Adrian AM, Norwood SH, Griffin TW. The adoption and use of precision agriculture technologies by Kansas farm managers. J Agric Appl Econ. 2005;37(2):429-444.
4. Allen RG, Pereira LS, Raes D, Smith M. Crop evapotranspiration-Guidelines for computing crop water requirements-FAO Irrigation and drainage paper 56. FAO, Rome. 1998;300(9):D05109.
5. Ambrósio RDS, Medrano E, Re-Kaguimoto FB, de Oliveira VF, Pimenta JA. Shading in horticulture: a review. Cienc Rural. 2018;48.
6. Aubert BA, Schroeder A, Grimaudo J. IT as enabler of sustainable farming: An empirical analysis of farmers' adoption of precision agriculture technology. Decis Support Syst. 2012;53(2):510-520.
7. Auburn JS, Rister ME. The economic feasibility of precision agriculture in the Texas rolling plains. J Agric Appl Econ. 2003;35(2):375-389.
8. Barbosa GL, Gadelha FDA, Kublik N, Proctor A,

Reichelm L, Weissinger E, *et al*. Comparison of land, water, and energy requirements of lettuce grown using hydroponic vs. conventional agricultural methods. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2015;12(6):6879-6891.
9. Bebber DP, Ramotowski MA, Gurr SJ. Crop pests and pathogens move polewards in a warming world. Nat Clim Chang. 2013;3(11):985-988.
10. Bommarco R, Kleijn D, Potts SG. Ecological intensification: harnessing ecosystem services for food security. Trends Ecol Evol. 2013;28(4):230-238.
11. Borin M, Tocchetto D, Cirelli GL, De-Casamassima D. Nitrogen and phosphorus removal in a constructed surface flow wetland treating a third stage of wastewater. Water Sci Technol. 2010;61(12):3121-3128.
12. Briassoulis D, Hiskakis M, Babou E. The role of agriculture in the plastic waste problem. Waste Manag Res. 2013;31(6):551-562.
13. Cahn MD, Johnson LF. New approaches to irrigation scheduling of vegetables. Horticulturae. 2017;3(2):29.
14. Carbonell I. The ethics of big data in agriculture. Internet Policy Rev. 2016;5(1).
15. Carolan M. Publicising private data: The politics of farm data ownership and privacy. Sociol Rural. 2016;56(4):515-533.
16. Cassman KG. Ecological intensification of cereal production systems: Yield potential, soil quality, and precision agriculture. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1999;96(11):5952-5959.
17. Cesaro A, Belgiorno V. A review of recent developments in the on-site monitoring of the composting process. Process Saf Environ Prot. 2014;92(5):516-527.
18. Chandra A, Singh PK, Kumar A, Singh P. Climate-smart agriculture: A way forward for sustainable horticulture. Int J Curr Microbiol Appl Sci. 2018;7(3):2293-2303.
19. Coman V, Oprea B, Stroia C. A review on the valorization of horticultural wastes. Plants. 2022;11(7):962.
20. Cook SE, O'Connell M. Precision agriculture for smallholders in the developing world. In: Precision agriculture for sustainability. Cham: Springer; 2016. p. 3-15.
21. Crutzen PJ, Mosier AR, Smith KA, Winiwarter W. N_2O release from agro-biofuel production negates global warming reduction by replacing fossil fuels. Atmos Chem Phys Discuss. 2007;7(4):11191-11205.
22. Dale VH, Polasky S. Measures of the effects of agricultural practices on ecosystem services. Ecol Econ. 2007;64(2):288-296.
23. De Bertoldi M. The science of composting. Compost Sci Util. 2007;15(2):74-75.
24. Dilkes-Hoffman LS, Pratt S, Laycock B, Lane JL. The challenge of biodegradable plastics for the circular economy. Procedia CIRP. 2019;80:208-213.
25. Dobermann A, Witt C, Dawe D. Increasing productivity of intensive rice systems through site-specific nutrient management. Enfield, NH: Science Publishers; 2013.
26. Doran JW, Zeiss MR. Soil health and sustainability: managing the biotic component of soil quality. Appl Soil Ecol. 2000;15(1):3-11.
27. Eastwood C, Klerkx L, Nettle R. The sociology of agricultural extension: A critical review. Sociol Rural. 2019;59(4):654-684.
28. Edwards CA. Earthworm ecology. Boca Raton: CRC Press; 2004.
29. Ehler LE. Integrated pest management (IPM): definition, historical development and implementation. In: Encyclopedia of insect pests. Amsterdam: Elsevier; 2006. p. 402-404.
30. Ellen MacArthur Foundation. Towards the circular economy: Economic and business rationale for an accelerated transition. Ellen MacArthur Foundation; 2013.
31. FAO. Climate-Smart Agriculture Sourcebook. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; 2013.
32. FAO. The State of Food and Agriculture 2021. Making agrifood systems more resilient to shocks and stresses. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; 2021.
33. Fereres E, Soriano MA. Deficit irrigation for reducing agricultural water use. J Exp Bot. 2007;58(2):147-159.
34. Fernández JE, Cuevas MV. Irrigation scheduling from stem diameter variations: a review. Agric For Meteorol. 2010;150(2):135-151.
35. Fiedler AK, Kremen C, Wratten SD. Pollination and pest control services. In: Sustainable agriculture and the international rice research institute. Los Baños: IRRI; 2008. p. 105-135.
36. Galanakis CM. Recovery of high added-value components from food wastes: conventional, emerging technologies and commercialized applications. Trends Food Sci Technol. 2012;26(2):68-87.
37. Garnett T, Appleby MC, Balmford A, Bateman IJ, Benton TG, Bloomer P, *et al*. Sustainable intensification in agriculture: premises and policies. Science. 2013;341(6141):33-34.
38. Gebbers R, Adamchuk VI. Precision agriculture and food security. Science. 2010;327(5967):828-831.
39. Geerts S, Raes D. Deficit irrigation as an on-farm strategy to maximize water productivity in dry areas. Agric Water Manag. 2009;96(9):1275-1284.
40. Gelfand I, Zenone T, Jasrotia P, Chen J, Hamilton SK, Robertson GP. Carbon debt of Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) grasslands converted to bioenergy production. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2010;107(46):19864-19869.
41. Gerrard J, Kandlikar M. Is the precautionary principle a barrier to innovation? An examination of the marketing of genetically modified and organic food. Sci Public Policy. 2007;34(6):425-437.
42. Ghisellini P, Cialani C, Ulgiati S. A review on circular economy: the expected transition to a balanced interplay of environmental and economic systems. J Clean Prod. 2016;114:11-32.
43. Godfray HCJ, Beddington JR, Crute IR, Haddad L, Lawrence D, Muir JF, *et al*. Food security: the challenge of feeding 9 billion people. Science. 2010;327(5967):812-818.
44. Grafton RQ, Williams J, Perry CJ, Molle F, Ringler C, Steduto P, *et al*. The paradox of irrigation efficiency. Science. 2018;361(6404):748-750.

45. Griffin TW, Miller NJ, Bergtold J, Shanoyan A. Farm's use of precision agriculture technology by operator, farm, and technology characteristics. J Agric Appl Econ. 2017;49(4):615-534.
46. Grinberga L, Lapina I, Zvirbule A, St-Pierre F. A review of precision agriculture technologies for horticultural crops. Agron Res. 2023;21(1):1-20.
47. Gruda N. Impact of environmental factors on product quality of vegetables. Acta Hortic. 2005;(700):51-8.
48. Gurr GM, Wratten SD, Altieri MA. Ecological engineering for pest management: habitat manipulation for arthropods. Collingwood: CSIRO Publishing; 2004.
49. Hahladakis JN, Iacovidou E. An overview of the challenges and trade-offs in closing the loop of post-consumer plastic waste (PCPW): Focus on recycling. J Hazard Mater. 2019;380:120887.
50. Hatt S, Artru S, Biju-Duval L, Debras JF, Adamowicz S. Flower strips promote aphid biocontrol in organic vegetable crops. Biol Control. 2017;114:148-155.
51. Hobbs PR, Sayre K, Gupta R. The role of conservation agriculture in sustainable agriculture. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2008;363(1491):543-555.
52. Jensen MH. Controlled environment agriculture in deserts, tropics and temperate regions-a world review. Acta Hortic. 2002;(578):19-25.
53. Jose S. Agroforestry for ecosystem services and environmental benefits: an overview. Agrofor Syst. 2009;76(1):1-10.
54. Kaloxylos A, Eigenmann R, Teye F, Politopoulou Z, Wolfert S, Shrank C, *et al*. Farm management systems and the Future Internet era. Comput Electron Agric. 2012;89:130-144.
55. Kasirajan S, Ngouajio M. Polyethylene and biodegradable mulches for agricultural applications: a review. Agron Sustain Dev. 2012;32(2):501-529.
56. Kharrazi A, Yu Y, Jacob K, Kraines S. Precision sustainable intensification: A new paradigm for sustainable development. Ambio. 2021;50(1):11-23.
57. Khosla R. Precision agriculture: challenges and opportunities in a flat world. In: Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Precision Agriculture; 2010.
58. Kirchherr J, Reike D, Hekkert M. Conceptualizing the circular economy: An analysis of 114 definitions. Resour Conserv Recycl. 2017;127:221-232.
59. Klein AM, Vaissiere BE, Cane JH, Steffan-Dewenter I, Cunningham SA, Kremen C, *et al*. Importance of pollinators in changing landscapes for world crops. Proc Biol Sci. 2007;274(1608):303-313.
60. Klerkx L, van Mierlo B, Leeuwis C. Evolution of systems approaches to agricultural innovation: concepts, analysis and interventions. In: Farming systems research into the 21st century: The new dynamic. Dordrecht: Springer; 2010. p. 457-483.
61. Kogan M. Integrated pest management: Historical perspectives and contemporary developments. Annu Rev Entomol. 1998;43(1):243-270.
62. Kozai T, editor. Smart plant factory: The next generation indoor vertical farms. Singapore: Springer; 2018.
63. KPMG. Future of food: The winning recipe. KPMG International; 2018.
64. Kremen C, Iles A, Bacon C. Diversified farming systems: an agroecological, systems-based alternative to modern industrial agriculture. Ecol Soc. 2012;17(4).
65. Kulkarni SA. Drip irrigation: A review. Int J Agric Eng. 2011;4(2):274-280.
66. Kyrikou I, Briassoulis D. Biodegradation of agricultural plastic films: a critical review. J Polym Environ. 2007;15(2):125-150.
67. Lal R. Soil carbon sequestration to mitigate climate change. Geoderma. 2004;123(1-2):1-22.
68. Lal R. Restoring soil quality to mitigate soil degradation. Sustainability. 2015;7(5):5875-5895.
69. Landis DA, Wratten SD, Gurr GM. Habitat management to conserve natural enemies of arthropod pests in agriculture. Annu Rev Entomol. 2000;45(1):175-201.
70. Lee S, Lee J. Beneficial bacteria and fungi in hydroponic systems: Types and characteristics of hydroponic food production methods. Sci Hortic. 2015;195:206-215.
71. Lehmann J, Rillig MC, Thies J, Masiello CA, Hockaday WC, Crowley D. Biochar effects on soil biota–a review. Soil Biol Biochem. 2011;43(9):1812-1836.
72. Lesk C, Rowhani P, Ramankutty N. Influence of extreme weather disasters on global crop production. Nature. 2016;529(7584):84-87.
73. Lin BB. Resilience in agriculture through crop diversification: a review. Agron Sustain Dev. 2011;31(1):1-13.
74. Lipper L, Thornton P, Campbell BM, Baedeker T, Braimoh A, Bwalya M, *et al*. Climate-smart agriculture for food security. Nat Clim Chang. 2014;4(12):1068-1072.
75. Long EY, Finke DL. The consequences of insecticide use for predators and prey. In: Ecological consequences of the new pesticides. Princeton: Princeton University Press; 2014. p. 13-41.
76. Loos J, Abson DJ, Chappell MJ, Hanspach J, Mikulcak F, Tichit M, *et al*. Putting meaning back into "sustainable intensification". Front Ecol Environ. 2014;12(6):356-361.
77. Lowenberg-DeBoer J. The precision agriculture revolution: Making the modern farmer. Foreign Aff. 2015;94:105.
78. Lu YC, Watkins KB, Teasdale JR, Abdul-Baki AA. Cover crops in sustainable food production. Food Rev Int. 2000;16(2):121-157.
79. Massa D, Incrocci L, Maggini R, Carmassi G, Campiotti CA, Pardossi A. Strategies to decrease water and nutrient consumption in soilless cultivation of containerized crops. Acta Hortic. 2010;(881):189-196.
80. Mata-Alvarez J, Dosta J, Romero-Güiza MS, Fonoll X, Peces M, Astals S. A critical review on anaerobic co-digestion achievements between 2010 and 2013. Renew Sustain Energy Rev. 2014;36:412-427.
81. Montgomery DR. Dirt: The erosion of civilizations. Berkeley: University of California Press; 2007.
82. Morrow RC. LED lighting in horticulture. HortScience. 2008;43(7):1947-1950.
83. Mulla DJ. Twenty five years of remote sensing in precision agriculture: Key advances and remaining

challenges. Biosyst Eng. 2013;114(4):358-371.
84. Nair PR. An introduction to agroforestry. Dordrecht: Springer Science & Business Media; 1993.
85. Panayotou T. The concept of environmental sustainability and its operationalization. In: Sustainability, growth, and poverty alleviation: A policy and agroecological perspective. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press; 1996. p. 43-56.
86. Pannell DJ. Public benefits, private benefits, and the choice of policy tool for land-use change. Land Econ. 2008;84(2):225-240.
87. Pannell DJ. Economic perspectives on the challenges of addressing agricultural non-point source pollution. Agric Water Manag. 2017;180:1-5.
88. Pannell DJ, Marshall GR, Barr N, Curtis A, Vanclay F, Wilkinson R. Understanding and promoting adoption of conservation practices by rural landholders. Aust J Exp Agric. 2006;46(11):1407-1424.
89. Paudel B, Cui S, Zhang Y, Xu T, He P. Soil health: a key to sustainable agriculture. J Environ Prot. 2020;11(7):553-569.
90. Paustian K, Lehmann J, Ogle S, Reay D, Robertson GP, Smith P. Climate-smart soils. Nature. 2016;532(7597):49-57.
91. Pawlak K, Kołodziejczak M. The role of agriculture in ensuring food security in developing countries: Considerations in the context of the problem of sustainable food production. Sustainability. 2020;12(13):5488.
92. Pérez-Pérez JG, Romero P, Navarro JM, Botía P. Response of sweet orange 'Lane late' to deficit irrigation in a clay-loam soil. Irrig Sci. 2008;26(5):459-469.
93. Powlson DS, Whitmore AP, Goulding KW. Soil carbon sequestration to mitigate climate change: a critical re-examination to identify the true and the false. Eur J Soil Sci. 2011;62(1):42-55.
94. Pretty J, Bharucha ZP. Sustainable intensification in agricultural systems. Ann Bot. 2014;114(8):1571-1596.
95. Reichardt M, Jürgens C. Adoption and future perspective of precision farming in Germany: results of several surveys. Precis Agric. 2009;10(1):73-94.
96. Reimer AP, Weebadde CK, Smale M. Farmer valuation of crop traits: a synthesis of methods and evidence. Glob Food Sec. 2012;1(2):110-119.
97. Rillig MC. Microplastic in terrestrial ecosystems and the soil? Environ Sci Technol. 2012;46(12):6453-6454.
98. Robert PC. Precision agriculture: a challenge for crop nutrition management. Plant Soil. 2002;247(1):143-149.
99. Robertson GP, Swinton SM. Reconciling agricultural productivity and environmental integrity: a grand challenge for agriculture. Front Ecol Environ. 2005;3(1):38-46.
100. Rockström J, Williams J, Daily G, Noble A, Matthews N, Gordon L, *et al*. Sustainable intensification of agriculture for human prosperity and global sustainability. Ambio. 2017;46(1):4-17.
101. Runge CF. Reforming the farm bill: toward a more sustainable agriculture. New York: Council on Foreign Relations; 2002.
102. Savvides A, Sgobba S, Scheiber T, Azzopardi B. A review of water and nutrient reuse in closed-loop soilless cultivation. J Clean Prod. 2016;112:3907-3918.
103. Scarlat N, Dallemand JF, Monforti-Ferrario F, Nita V. The role of biomass and bioenergy in a future bioeconomy: policies and facts. Environ Dev. 2015;15:3-34.
104. Schellnhuber HJ, Hare W, Serdeczny O, Schaeffer M, Adams S. Turn down the heat: climate extremes, regional impacts, and the case for resilience. Washington, DC: World Bank; 2013.
105. Scherer L, Pfister S. Modelling the water footprint of a circular economy. Water Res. 2016;90:124-134.
106. Schimmelpfennig D, Ebel R. On the doorstep of the information revolution in agriculture. Washington, DC: US Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service; 2011.
107. Sethi VP, Sharma SK. Survey of cooling technologies for worldwide agricultural greenhouse applications. Sol Energy. 2007;81(12):1447-1459.
108. Springmann M, Clark M, Mason-D'Croz D, Wiebe K, Bodirsky BL, Lassaletta L, *et al*. Options for keeping the food system within environmental limits. Nature. 2018;562(7728):519-525.
109. Srinivasan A. Handbook of precision agriculture: principles and applications. New York: Food Products Press; 2006.
110. Stanghellini C. Horticultural production in greenhouses: The role of technology in saving resources. Acta Hortic. 2014;(1037):21-30.
111. Sumberg J, Giller KE. What is 'sustainable intensification'? A sociological and agronomic review. J Peasant Stud. 2022;49(1):1-25.
112. Swinton SM, Tiong J. Economic analysis of precision agriculture. In: Pierce FJ, Nowak P, editors. Precision agriculture basics. Madison: ASA, CSSA, and SSSA; 2021. p. 23-38.
113. Tanny J. Microclimate and evapotranspiration of crops in screenhouses. In: Good agricultural practices for greenhouse vegetable crops. Rome: FAO; 2013. p. 87-119.
114. Tanzila S. Factors influencing the adoption of new agricultural technology. J Agric Ext Rural Dev. 2014;6(10):329-333.
115. Tey YS, Brindal M. Factors influencing the adoption of precision agricultural technologies: a review for policy implications. Precis Agric. 2012;13(6):713-730.
116. The Royal Society. Reaping the benefits: Science and the sustainable intensification of global agriculture. London: The Royal Society; 2009.
117. Tilman D, Cassman KG, Matson PA, Naylor R, Polasky S. Agricultural sustainability and intensive production practices. Nature. 2002;418(6898):671-677.
118. Tilman D, Balzer C, Hill J, Befort BL. Global food demand and the sustainable intensification of agriculture. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2011;108(50):20260-20264.
119. Tscharntke T, Clough Y, Wanger TC, Jackson L, Motzke I, Perfecto I, *et al*. Global food security, biodiversity conservation and the future of agricultural intensification. Biol Conserv. 2012;151(1):53-59.
120. Tubiello FN, Salvatore M, Cóndor Golec RD, Ferrara A, Rossi S, Biancalani R, *et al*. Agriculture, Forestry

and Other Land Use Emissions by Sources and Removals by Sinks: 1990–2011 Analysis. Earth Syst Sci Data. 2015;7(1):235-255.
121. Tyson RV, Simonne EH, Davis M, Lamb EM, White JM, Treadwell D. Effect of water and nutrient management on nutrient-use efficiency and crop yield of bell pepper in a perlite soilless system. HortScience. 2008;43(2):521-526.
122. Vandermeer J. The ecology of intercropping. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1989.
123. van Straten G, van Willigenburg G, van Henten EJ. Optimal control of greenhouse cultivation. Boca Raton: CRC Press; 2010.
124. Venterea RT, Burger M, Spokas KA. Nitrogen oxide and methane emissions from fertilizer application. In: Liebig MA, Franzluebbers AJ, Follett RF, editors. Understanding greenhouse gas emissions from agricultural management. Washington, DC: USDA; 2012. p. 1-21.
125. Vereecken H, Huisman JA, Bogena H, Vanderborght J, Vrugt JA, Hopmans JW. On the value of soil moisture measurements in vadose zone hydrology. Vadose Zone J. 2008;7(2):630-641.
126. Vymazal J. Constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment. Water. 2010;2(3):530-549.
127. Weatherhead R. The potential for robotics and automation in horticulture. Kenilworth: Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board (AHDB); 2021.
128. Weiland P. Biogas production: current state and perspectives. Appl Microbiol Biotechnol. 2010;85(4):849-860.
129. Weinberger K, Lumpkin TA. Diversification into horticulture and poverty reduction: a research agenda. World Dev. 2007;35(8):1464-1480.
130. Wiseman L, Sanderson J, Zhang A, Jakku E. Farmers and their data: An examination of farmers' reluctance to share their data through the lens of the principles for fair handling of farm data. NJAS Wageningen J Life Sci. 2019;90:100301.
131. Wolfert S, Ge L, Verdouw C. Big data in smart farming–a review. Agric Syst. 2017;153:69-80.
132. Zhang C, Kovacs JM. The application of small unmanned aerial systems for precision agriculture: a review. Precis Agric. 2012;13(6):693-712.
133. Zhang W, Ricketts TH, Kremen C. Ecosystem services and dis-services to agriculture. Ecol Econ. 2007;64(2):253-260.