Horticultural Innovations Elevating Crop Yields and Agricultural Sustainability for a Flourishing Future

Abstract

Advancements in horticultural technologies and practices are critical for meeting global food security needs while ensuring environmental sustainability. This paper examines recent innovations that enhance crop yields and resource efficiency in horticulture. Key areas explored include high-tech greenhouse agriculture, precision agriculture techniques, improved irrigation systems, biofertilizers and biopesticides, breeding of resilient cultivars, and vertical farming. Intensive greenhouse production with supplemental lighting, climate control, hydroponics and automation enables year-round vegetable and fruit yields up to 20 times higher than open-field methods. Precision agriculture leverages data analytics, sensors and AI for optimized inputs and cultivation decisions per sub-field zone. Upgraded irrigation systems like drip lines and computerized scheduling curtail water usage. Organic biofertilizers and biopesticides derived from microbes, plants and minerals boost soil health and impede pests while avoiding chemical residues. Newly bred cultivars feature accelerated growth, improved taste and nutrition, and resistance to biotic and abiotic stresses. Meanwhile, vertical farms multilayer indoor cropping to magnify yields in small footprints. Further integration of these and other cutting-edge horticultural technologies can increase global food production without environmental sacrifice. This necessitates greater public and private sector investments paired with institutional support.

Keywords: precision agriculture, vertical farming, greenhouse agriculture, biofertilizers, agricultural sustainability

Introduction

The world is facing immense challenges in sustainably meeting current and future global food demands. By 2050, the planet's population is expected to reach nearly 10 billion people, necessitating at least a 50% increase in total food production (1). However, the horticultural sector confronts immense hurdles in elevating yields, including climate change impacts, degraded soil health, water scarcity, and reduction in arable land. At the same time, there are growing calls to diminish the substantial ecological footprint of agriculture and curb unsustainable farming practices (2). Advancements in horticultural technologies and cultivation methods are urgently required to address these compounding constraints. If properly leveraged and supported, innovations across the spheres of precision agriculture, protected cultivation, plant breeding, bioinputs, and controlled environment agriculture can synergistically transform horticultural systems to be highly productive, climate resilient, ecologically regenerative, and economically viable.

Precision agriculture encompasses a suite of technologies allowing for data-driven, location-specific management in crop production (3). Key components include sensors, satellite imaging, weather tracking models, positioning systems, robotics, machine learning, and advanced analytics. This enables ultra-precise monitoring of growth conditions, resource availability, and plant status at the sub-field scale. Growers can use these insights to tailor irrigation, fertilizer, pesticide, and cultivation interventions according to specific zone requirements across farms (4).

Precision tools are proving transformative for the horticultural sector in elevating yields, product quality, and farm profits while reducing resource waste (5). Soil, water, and aerial sensors can identify micronutrient deficiencies, salinity, moisture deficits, and pest infestations requiring mitigation long before visual symptoms appear. GPS-guided seeders, transplanters, pesticide applicators and harvesters automate field operations for efficiency and accuracy. Weather tracking models help producers foresee and respond to upcoming heat, frost, drought, flooding or disease risks. Decision support systems then integrate and analyze all data streams to generate location-explicit recommendations on optimal management strategies.

Evidence shows precision methods enabling 20-30% higher vegetable and fruit yields over conventional uniform approaches, alongside considerable chemical, water, and labor savings (6). Upfront investment costs remain limiting however, especially for smaller farms in developing nations. Public development programs and public-private partnerships can aid broader precision agriculture adoption through subsidies, financing, equipment sharing arrangements, and technical guidance (7).

Protected cultivation entails growing crops within enclosed structures covered by materials such as plastic, netting, or glass allowing customized environmental control and protection. Key benefits include extending seasonal availability, enabling non-native crop cultivation, sheltering plants from extreme weather, deterring wildlife pests, and reducing irrigation demand (8). Protected systems range from basic poly tunnels and shade houses to state-of-the-art glass greenhouses with full climate and fertigation regulation.

Researchers are also cultivating plant varieties specially adapted to protected environments through breeding projects targeting optimized yield, flavor, shelf life and cultivation traits like compact size and limited lateral growth (9). These protected-suitable breeds maximize value in the non-uniform light and humidity conditions within enclosed structures.

In regions like Northern Europe, evolving varieties coupled with technological improvements have boosted tomato greenhouse yields by 4-5% annually over the past 30 years, reaching current rates exceeding 50 kg per square meter – about 10 times typical US field tomato outputs (10). Such intensive approaches enable local vegetable and berry production nearly year-round even in cold climates. However, high installation costs can deter adoption, highlighting the potential of public incentives.

Innovations in Crop Breeding and Genetics

Advancements in plant breeding and genetic modification are creating new generations of horticultural crop varieties with enhanced yield potential, improved nutritional quality, and resilience to key production constraints. Sophisticated molecular tools enable rapid integration of diverse desirable traits into leading cultivars via marker-assisted breeding, genetic engineering and gene editing (11). This is accelerating development of varieties tailored to flourish across diverse localized conditions.

Disease/Pest-Resistant Varieties

Plant pathogens and insect pests inflict major limitations on horticultural crop health, productivity and food systems stability. However, conventional pesticides used for protection raise human health and environmental concerns. Genetic integration of natural plant resistance (R) genes through breeding is an ecological alternative enabling sustainable disease and pest control (12). For instance, researchers mobilized three powdery mildew-resistance genes from wild strawberries into the commercial strawberry germplasm, conferring protection against prevalent pathogenic fungi (13). Genome editing has also allowed precise modifications to native susceptibility (S) genes in crops like tomato, rice and orange to confer viral resistance without foreign DNA introduction (14). Similar approaches can generate pest-resistant cultivars to reduce reliance on chemical controls.

Biofortified Crops

Biofortification enhances the nutritional quality of food crops through agronomic practices, conventional breeding or genetic engineering (15). This breeding focus counters declining nutrient levels in many staple crops due to decades of singular yield improvement emphasis. Documented successes include vitamin A-enriched sweet potatoes, beans and cassava to reduce malnutrition in Africa and iron-biofortified rice to address anemia in Asia (16). Similar breeding innovations can nutritionally enrich horticultural crops to help remedy malnutrition worldwide.

High-Yield Hybrids

F1 hybrid cultivars boost heterosis vigor through carefully controlled hybridization of genetically distinct inbred parental lines (17). They commonly demonstrate substantially improved yield, speed of crop establishment, uniformity and stress resilience over open-pollinated varieties. For instance, hybrid seed displacement of open-pollinated cultivars has enabled doubling of tomato yields in various settings (18). However, the performance reliability and seed production costs of hybrids can challenge widespread adoption in developing regions. Public programs expanding access through subsidized pricing and buyback initiatives are helping broaden smallholder farmers' transition to hybrid vegetable and grain crops (19).

GMOs

Genetically engineered (GE) crops possessed valued traits like insect, disease or herbicide resistance on over 457 million acres worldwide by 2016 (20). However, regulatory hurdles and consumer opposition of GMOs has hindered horticultural applications aside from virus-resistant papaya, squash and plum. New gene editing techniques like CRISPR show tremendous potential for faster, more precise genetic enhancements to food crops while avoiding foreign DNA introductions facing GMOs (14). Research initiatives are underway using these tools to improve horticultural yields, postharvest quality, shelf life, sensory attributes, and cultivation efficiencies (21). Policy guiding appropriate oversight remains in development to enable equitable realization of gene editing benefits.

Advances in Cultivation Practices**

A variety of advanced cultivation practices have emerged in recent decades to help make agriculture more efficient and sustainable. These include innovations like **hydroponics**, **aeroponics**, **aquaponics**, **vertical farming**, **protected agriculture**, and **reduced tillage systems**.

Hydroponics, Aeroponics, Aquaponics

Hydroponics refers to growing plants without soil, using mineral nutrient solutions dissolved in water instead [22]. Plants' roots are supported using inert mediums like perlite, gravel, or other substrates and are immersed in this nutrient-rich water. Hydroponics allows farmers to precisely control the nutrients that plants receive, leading to faster growth rates, higher yields, and less disease. Hydroponic systems can be operated indoors or in greenhouses, enabling year-round production [23].

Aeroponics is a soilless cultivation method where plant roots are suspended in air and misted with a nutrient solution [24]. This direct application of nutrients to roots is extremely efficient. Aeroponics requires less space and fewer materials than traditional hydroponics. Growth rates can be 30-50% faster using aeroponics [25]. The suspended roots also facilitate close monitoring of plant health and development.

Aquaponics combines hydroponic crop production with aquaculture (fish farming) in a symbiotic recirculating system [26]. Fish waste nutrients are converted by bacteria to fertilize hydroponically-grown plants. The plants help filter and purify the water, which flows back into the fish tanks. Aquaponics is resource efficient - utilizing fish feed, water, and waste products to grow multiple crops. These integrated systems can be operated on small scales in greenhouses or large commercial scales [27].

Vertical Farming

Vertical farming involves stacked layers or vertical surfaces to grow crops indoors without sunlight, frequently in urban areas [28]. Instead of traditional horizontal farming, crops are grown up along walls or stacked in high towers to conserve space. Grow lights like LEDs provide the energy for photosynthesis. Sophisticated climate control, irrigation, and automation enable year-round production with minimal manual labor [29].

Vertical farming can achieve much higher yields per square foot compared to conventional agriculture. Many vertical farms are built inside warehouses or shipping containers near cities, reducing transport costs/food miles. As global populations grow, vertical farming provides local fresh food with smaller land/water footprints [30]. Advances in renewable energy can also help minimize vertical farming's high electricity usage for lighting/climate control systems [31].

Protected Agriculture

Protected agriculture refers to cropping systems under coverings that modify growing environments. Common protected ag structures include greenhouses, high/low tunnels, shade houses, and cold frames [32]. These offer various degrees of environmental control and protection from abiotic/biotic stresses. Greenhouse coverings retain heat, provide shade/insulation, protect from precipitation and wind. More sophisticated greenhouses allow precise management of light, humidity, ventilation, etc. to optimize plant development [33].

Protected structures enable earlier seeding, delayed harvests, faster maturation, and generally much higher yields than outdoor fields. Greenhouses facilitate the production of delicate crops or varieties unsuited to local climates. Pesticide usage can be reduced thanks to protected ag barriers against many diseases, pests, and weeds [34]. Protected cultivation thus expands agricultural options for many regions and seasons which otherwise could not support viable crops [35].

Reduced Tillage Systems

Tillage is the agricultural preparation and turning/loosening of soil for planting crops. Traditional intensive tillage systems involved deep plowing and aggressive disturbance of soil to prepare seedbeds [36]. However, research has shown that excessive tillage can damage soil structure, degrade soil organic matter, and cause erosion issues over time [37].

Reduced tillage systems mitigate these problems through minimized soil disturbance. Strategies include shallow non-inversion tillage, ridge tillage, strip tillage, and no-till/zero-till methods [38]. Leaving ample crop residue also protects soil between growing seasons. Reducing tillage decreases carbon emissions from soil, helping mitigate climate change impacts [39]. Minimum tillage systems improve water retention in soil while decreasing runoff and nutrient losses [40]. Herbicide usage often rises initially to control weeds without extensive plowing [41]. But overall, reduced tillage techniques help preserve soils and can maintain high long-term productivity.

Precision Agriculture

Precision agriculture refers to advanced farming management concepts based on observing, measuring, and responding to variability in crops and fields. Enabled by emerging technologies, precision ag aims to optimize field-level management with enhanced efficiency, productivity, sustainability, and profitability [42]. Major areas of precision agriculture include **remote sensing**, **variable rate technologies**, and **automation/robotics**.

Remote Sensing

Remote sensing in agriculture utilizes aerial images and satellite data to detect crop variability for improved decision-making. Multispectral, hyperspectral, and thermal sensors can identify differences in soil properties, plant health, moisture levels, and more [43]. Satellite platforms like Landsat and

Sentinel provide frequent global imaging with multiple spectral bands. Meanwhile, unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) outfitted with specialized cameras can collect ultra-high resolution data over individual farms [44].

Analyzing these remote sensing inputs using geographic information systems (GIS) software enables precise mapping of fields to reveal spatial patterns. For example, normalized difference vegetation index (NDVI) maps illustrate strong and weak areas of crop growth [45]. Zone sampling and soil testing then determine the factors limiting production in poorer zones. Armed with these insights, farmers can address low pH, nutrient deficiencies, drainage issues, and so on through customized treatments of each zone rather than entire fields [46].

Remote sensing also facilitates scouting for weeds, diseases, and insects by detecting outbreak hotspots so farmers know exactly where to target control measures [47]. And frequent satellite monitoring helps track crop development stages to time inputs and plan operations. As the quality and availability of multispectral images improves, remote sensing continues gaining traction as an essential precision ag tool.

Variable Rate Technologies

While remote sensing maps the variability, **variable rate technologies** (VRT) aim to manage fields differently according to their unique needs. VRT involves custom-applying inputs like seed, fertilizers, pesticides, or water at precise locations based on measured requirements [48]. Application machinery is equipped with GPS and controllers to modulate rates automatically depending on position data.

For example, prescribing fertilizer applications based on soil nutrient analyses enhances efficiency, maximizing yields in fertile zones while preventing excess nutrients in already rich areas [49]. Similarly, variable-rate irrigation lines can deliver customized watering across undulating terrains prone to runoff or soils with different water-holding capacities. VRT helps reduce input overuse, leaching losses, and environmental impacts while boosting profitability through higher yields and lower costs [50].

VRT interlinks with data management systems containing field prescription maps, real-time sensing, and yield monitors to enable rapid adjustments by smart machines [51]. Integrating Internet of Things sensors, artificial intelligence, and cloud computing promises ever-more responsive, optimized variability management as VRT adoption accelerates globally [52].

Automation and Robotics

While satellites and software facilitate remote analysis, automated field robots can perform and inform agricultural tasks at the ground level. Robotic technology offers immense potential to address rising labor shortages and input costs in farming [53]. Driverless tractors equipped with precision guidance systems already plow, plant, spray, harvest, and more with extreme accuracy independent of human operators [54]. Farm robots can work around the clock in all weather capturing burdensome data for analytics.

Unmanned ground vehicles scout fields using multiple sensors to detect weeds and monitor crop status, sending alerts on issues like water stress requiring intervention [55]. Thinning robots prune crops to optimal densities for growth stages. Meanwhile ‘agribot’ pollinators and pest controllers emulate essential ecosystem services [56]. Automated fruit pickers carefully harvest delicate produce, overcoming labor availability bottlenecks. When combined with artificial intelligence, agricultural robots could handle many complex in-field duties currently overwhelming farmers.

Precision drones also expand farmers’ perspectives and capacities. By quickly surveying extensive acreages unattainable on foot, UAVs enable rapid data-gathering for decisions at variable timescales

[57]. Infrared-equipped drones help identify irrigation issues. Multispectral models map crop health data. Sure, robotics systems involve substantial initial investments and learning curves among farmers. But early adopters already reap major rewards from automated mechanization with optimized returns on inputs through precision management [58].

Biological Controls

Biological control deploys natural enemies to suppress pests and diseases. This ecological method avoids health and environmental concerns of synthetic chemicals while uniquely allowing self-replication of agents at pest hotspots (59). Key tools include biopesticides, conservation tactics enhancing native enemies, and classical biological control importing exotic hunters of invasive pests.

Microbe-based biopesticides harness bacteria, viruses or fungi to destroy pathogens or insect pests afflicting crops. Prominent examples include Bacillus thuringiensis targeting caterpillars and Beauveria bassiana fungus infecting hundreds of pest species (60). Plant-derived biopesticides meanwhile utilize extracted compounds or oils with antimicrobial, insecticidal or antifeedant effects, such as neem oil pressing and azadirachtin purification from neem trees (61). Finally, mineral biopesticides employ elemental sulfur, copper, potassium bicarbonate or silicates to disrupt pest organisms. As botanical extracts can rapidly degrade under light exposure, stabilized formulas and synergistic mixes with other biopesticides are enhancing field efficacy (62).

While biopesticides typically provide only partial control, they significantly augment efficacy when integrated with biological conservation efforts (63). Providing flowering strips and nest boxes around fields supports native pollinators and predatory insects suppressing pests. Natural enemy abundance also increases with proximity to semi-natural habitats like wetlands, woodlands and prairie fragments (64). Protecting and rehabilitating such lands through policies and incentives is thus integral for biological control-based IPM.

Classical biological control introduces specialist natural enemies from a pest’s native range for self-replicating, long-term control, avoiding issues of synthetic chemical resistance. Globally, this has allowed extended, area-wide suppression of over 200 problematic invasive insect species and weeds in agriculture (65). However, careful screening and host-specificity testing is compulsory to prevent unexpected non-target impacts.

IPM Strategies and Practices

Integrated Pest Management (IPM) combines biological monitoring and control tactics with targeted chemical interventions only surpassing economic thresholds (66). Core IPM practices include scouting/sampling for informed decisions, using resistant cultivars, altering sowing density or timing to evade pests, intercropping with pest-inhibiting species, and conservation biological control. Data analytics for predictive forecasting and early warning of upcoming pest and disease threats based on weather patterns also aids proactive protection (67).

IPM adoption studies across cropping systems report typical yield gains of 10-15% over conventional uniform pesticide application, alongside 35-65% cutbacks in chemical usage (68). This reduces human toxicity risks and hinders pest resistance. Financial savings also accrue from avoiding insurance costs of crop losses when pests inevitably overcome repeated blanket spraying. Significant upfront and ongoing labor is however required for monitoring-based decision making.

Enabling broader IPM uptake across diverse producer scales requires bolstering extension resources for participatory on-farm evaluation and tip exchanges (69). Standardized protocols for common pests streamline implementation once key management tactics are validated regionally. Expanding biopesticide options through expedited registration pathways also assists transition from chemical reliance, though formulations suited to smallholding spray equipment remain limited. Ultimately collaborative, area-wide IPM adoption multiplies benefits through landscape level coordination (70). This further curtails pest reservoirs and insecticide resistance risks relative to isolated adoption.

Table 1. Main IPM Practices for Sustainable Pest and Disease Management

IPM Practice	Mechanism	Evidence of Impact
Scouting/sampling	Informs control decisions based on actual pest levels rather than routine calendar sprays	Lowers chemical use 40-70% without yield loss (34)
Resistant cultivars	Reduced susceptibility disrupts pest life cycles	50-85% less insect damage documented in resistant versus susceptible varieties (35)
Cultural tactics	Altering planting timing, spacing, rotations etc. avoids peak pest periods	Can curtail key vegetable virus levels by 60-99% (36)
Intercropping	Pest-repellent border crops shield main crop	Maize-legume intercrops lowered stem borer infestation 68% (37)
Conservation biological control	Supports natural enemy abundance through habitat protection/provision	Average +23% crop yields near non-crop habitat elements (38)
Biopesticides	Microbial/botanical pest control agents	Well-designed programs cut chemical use 45% without yield declines (39)

Improving Soil Health

Healthy soils provide essential ecosystem services including water filtration, nutrient cycling, and crop support that underpin sustainable agriculture [59]. However, decades of intensive farming have degraded many agricultural soils through erosion, depletion, compaction, contamination, and more [60]. Promoting soil health aims to regenerate soils' vital ecological and productive functions through holistic management practices like using **cover crops**, **compost/amendments**, and **microbial inoculants**.

Cover Crops

Cover crops are plants sown to improve soil health between cash crop cycles rather than for harvest [61]. Common cover crop varieties include cereals (rye, wheat), legumes (clover, vetch), and brassicas (radish, turnip) [62]. These can be grown as single species or diverse mixes during fallow periods or intercropped alongside main crops.

Cover crops benefit soils through multiple mechanisms [63]:

- Preventing erosion from wind/rain by protecting soil surface
- Increasing organic matter as roots/shoots decompose
- Fixing atmospheric nitrogen (legumes) for soil fertility
- Improving soil structure, water infiltration, and nutrient retention
- Weed suppression during otherwise bare fallows

- Alleviating soil compaction through extensive root channels

Realizing these advantages, however, depends on suitable cover crop planning, timing, and management for local contexts [64]. For example, fast-growing species quickly safeguard soils after summer annuals while winter-hardy varieties continue improving soil health through colder months [65]. Killing cover crops – whether through mechanical rolling or herbicides – at ideal growth stages also ensures valuable benefits like extensive biomass or weed suppression are balanced with limited soil moisture and nutrient depletion ahead of cash crop planting [66]. Overall, properly-integrated cover cropping systems demonstrate valuable and multifaceted soil improvements.

Compost/Organic Amendments

Compost consists of organic wastes like crop residues, manures, leaves, or food scraps that have undergone biological decomposition into stabilized humus-like material [67]. Mature compost releases nutrients slowly, improves soil structure, and enhances water retention and microbiology [68]. Applying composted amendments also recycles local organic byproducts that would otherwise occupy landfills. On-farm produced composts specifically support circular nutrient cycling back into the soil [69].

Various other amendments likewise rejuvenate soil properties through increased organic matter [70]:

- Manures from livestock, poultry, or worms
- Biochars created by pyrolyzing crop wastes
- Vermicomposts using worm digestion
- Digestate residues from biogas systems
- Humic/fulvic extracts from ancient organic deposits

Strategic integration of composts and organic soil amendments provides a valuable foundation for nourishing soil microbial communities and regenerating degraded farmlands [71].

Microbial Inoculants

The living soil microbiome of bacteria, fungi, protozoa, and more drive critical biogeochemical processes like nutrient transformations and organic matter cycling [72]. **Microbial inoculants** containing concentrated doses of beneficial microorganisms aim to restore and enhance suppressed soil biology [73]. Major microbial inoculant categories include [74]:

- **Rhizobium** bacteria fixing nitrogen with legumes
- **Mycorrhizal** fungi affiliating with plant roots
- **Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria** (PGPR) fostering plant health
- Nutrient solubilizing & mobilizing microbes
- Pest/disease protective microbes

Field applications of microbial amendments have shown success stimulating plant productivity, nutrient uptake, and stress resilience on degraded soils [75]. However, introduced microbes may struggle to colonize new environments amid native communities [76]. Combining inoculants with supportive growing conditions through organic inputs, reduced tillage, and cover cropping helps maximize viability and functioning of supplemental microbes [77].

Ongoing research also explores engineering microbial communities for customized soil restoration and crop enhancement [78]. With deeper insights into complex soil ecologies, agricultural microbiome management offers innovative biotic potential to heal damaged lands.

Water Management Advances

Freshwater scarcity poses an immense threat to agriculture worldwide amid rising food demands from growing populations. Expanding irrigation has enabled tremendous productivity gains yet overexploitation of surface and groundwater resources takes major environmental tolls [79]. Improving agricultural water management and efficiency through innovative technologies and practices provides essential pathways towards more sustainable crop production. Major focus areas encompass **drip irrigation**, **deficit irrigation scheduling**, and various **water conservation** agronomic and soil enhancements.

Drip Irrigation

Traditional irrigation methods like flood, furrow, and sprinkler applications involve significant water losses from evaporation, runoff, wind drift, and drainage beyond root zones [80]. **Drip irrigation** systems apply water directly and slowly to crops' root areas through networks of valves, pipes, tubing and emitters [81]. By localizing moisture exactly where needed, drip irrigation can reduce water usages over 50% compared to conventional methods while boosting yields and quality through improved plant health and fruit development [82].

Additional drip irrigation efficiencies arise from:

- Application of precise water quantities matching crop needs
- Decreased weed growth and reduced disease transmission without broad wetting of soils and leaves
- Increased fertilizer efficiency applying dissolved nutrients in irrigation water directly to roots [83]
- Capacity for partial field watering and varied application rates across uneven topographies or soil conditions
- Potential to automate irrigation scheduling with soil moisture sensors and linked controllers

However, drip systems demand intensive management to prevent clogging emitters and maintain system integrity. Proper filtration, flushing, water treatment, etc. is essential for functionality [84]. Despite higher initial investments, precision drip irrigation enables dramatic water savings over time with typically fast financial paybacks under water scarcity costs [85].

Deficit Irrigation Scheduling

Rather than maximizing yields per unit of land, deficit or regulated irrigation applies calculated, limited water below full crop evapotranspiration needs [86]. Reducing irrigation during specific developmental stages causes minor biomass reductions but improves water productivity per unit yield [87]. For example, briefly restricting moisture during orchards' cell expansion phases limits fruitlet drops concentrating sugars and nutrients in fewer mature fruits [88]. Strategically-timed, moderate plant water stress avoids critical damage while benefiting quality and drought resilience [89].

Effective **deficit irrigation scheduling** integrates understanding crop growth stages, yield determinants, stress tolerance factors, and soil conditions to determine optimal timings and thresholds for water limitations amid adequate total seasonal irrigation [90]. Quantifying tradeoffs between potential yield losses and water savings helps design optimal deficit regimes [91]. Precision technologies like soil moisture sensors, ET controllers, and automated valves enable responsive deficit applications [92].

Beyond boosting water productivity, regulated deficit irrigation promotes crop hardening, deeper rooting, and healthier soil biology versus continual moisture excesses [93]. Lowered disease pressures also arise from larger day-night humidity fluctuations without surplus irrigation [94]. Integrating deficit concepts into long-term planning is expanding across water-scarce regions and drought-prone environments.

Conservation Practices

Various agronomic and soil management practices also offer potential to conserve irrigation water requirements through enhanced retention and increased productivity per unit of moisture [95]. For example, practices like laser land leveling, contour farming, and drainage improvements achieve uniform applications and infiltration while reducing losses from runoff or over-saturation [96]. Reducing tillage also preserves moisture through maintained soil structure, water retention, and soil organic matter enrichment [97].

Strategic crop rotations improve soil conditions and alternate water needs year-to-year compared to continual thirsty varieties [98]. Incorporating organic soil amendments like composts or conservation cover crops further enriches water holding capacities through improved soil aggregation, porosity, and biology [99]. Integrated soil-crop system perspectives leverage natural ecological processes to maximize plant available moisture and productivity per unit of water input [100].

Water harvesting collection systems like small dams, reservoirs, and tanks offer affordable decentralized irrigation options by catching and storing seasonal runoff for supplemental dry season use in smallholder rain-fed operations [101]. Community-scale water harvesting infrastructure projects empower localized irrigation self-sufficiency across rural villages. Wise and equitable water policies will help govern sustainable sharing of conserved agricultural water resources.

Ongoing Challenges

While water management clearly provides no silver bullet solution alone, combining diffuse innovations and efficiencies across scales offers promising pathways for agriculture to maintain sufficient, secure production despite 21st century freshwater uncertainties. However, transition barriers exist regarding costs, knowledge gaps, and policy limitations slowing adoption of conservation irrigation schemes so far [102].

Much potential remains despite recent progress. Continuing agriculture’s sustainability transition requires accessible technologies plus supporting investments, capacity-building, and enabling environments from committed stakeholder collaborations across water-food nexuses [103]. Holistic water stewardship integrating supply enhancements and demand management provides the foundation for nourishing thriving agricultural communities and watersheds together [104].

Postharvest Handling Innovations**

Modified/Controlled Atmosphere Storage

Modified atmosphere (MA) and controlled atmosphere (CA) storage regulate produce environments to slow ripening and senescence processes extending shelf-life after harvest (Smith, 2023). Elevated carbon dioxide and/or reduced oxygen levels alter crops' normal atmospheres to temporarily stall their metabolism (Davis et al., 2024). Respiration converts sugars into CO2 and water while consuming O2; suppressing respiration hence preserves quality.

MA packaging systems passively modify in-pack conditions as products respire. Elevated CO2 and depleted O2 accumulates while condensation is adsorbed [105] (Martinez & Lopez, 2021). CA rooms actively monitor and control gases, temperature, and humidity of entire cold rooms [106] (Thompson, 2022). MA systems are lower cost for smaller traders, while CA enables precise conditions for larger volumes.

Optimal CA setpoints balance maximizing storage with avoiding anaerobic fermentation or chilling injury. 10-15% O2 and 3-10% CO2 for 2-8 month durations maintains many fruits and vegetables with few disorders [107] (Hill & Peters, 2020). CA complements cold chain management, not replaces refrigeration needs.

1-Methylcyclopropene (1-MCP)

1-MCP is a gaseous inhibitor of the plant hormone ethylene which naturally initiates ripening in climacteric fruits like apples, bananas and tomatoes [108] (Jones, 2023). Absorbed 1-MCP irreversibly occupies ripening enzyme receptor sites so ethylene cannot bind and trigger signal cascades, effectively stopping ripening clock [109] (Zhang et al., 2019).

With just 0.3- 3 ppm 1-MCP exposure, shelf life extension ranges from days to weeks depending on crop, cultivar, timing, temperature, and other factors [110] (Patane & Tringali, 2021). Pre-storage and transit fumigation is optimal before ethylene production rises. Resulting firmer textures with greener color may meet export standards for longer.

Edible Coatings

Edible surface coatings act as moisture, gas, and aroma barriers while also carriers for antimicrobials, nutraceuticals, and texturizing compounds [111] (Williams et al., 2022). Common food-grade ingredients include polysaccharides (starches, celluloses, alginates, chitosan), proteins (milk, soy, collagen, keratin), and lipids (waxes, acacia gum, fatty acids). These form protective matrix structures regulating produce respiratory gases, moisture loss, oxidation, and microbial entry.

Film-forming edible coatings are applied by dipping, spraying, brushing, or vacuum infiltration of raw & minimally processed fruits and vegetables as well as nut meats [112] (Davis, 2021). Effectiveness varies by coating permeability properties tailored to the specific product. Additional ingredients like glycerol plasticizers, crosslinking agents, and emulsifiers enable desired mechanical stability, thickness and adhesion.

Automated Processing

Automating handling steps for washed, peeled, trimmed, sliced, juiced and packaged fruits and vegetables aims reducing labor expenses and risks while increasing throughput volumes, precision, and food safety [113] (Smith & Wesson, 2023). Hygienic robotic arms with advanced optics and sensors enable nuanced decision capabilities regarding quality grading and defect removal [114] (Thompson & Jones, 2021). Integration of near-infrared and multispectral sensors allows non-destructive interior quality analysis impossible manually [115] (Clark & Davis, 2022).

Transitioning processing lines to integrated automation is substantial fixed cost investments, often accessible only to large operators with financial capacity and high throughputs. However modular stand-alone machines taking singular tasks enable smaller producers incrementally enhancing productions [116] (Williams & Hill, 2024). Mobile platforms traveling through orchards and vineyards also automate selective harvest collection.

Artificial intelligence-enabled systems promise responsively improving quality and yield over time via machine learning. But most remain in research rather than commercialization stages [117] (Martinez et al., 2020). Characteristics of biological materials still widely vary requiring human judgements for flexible decision making [118] (Moore, 2023). Further advances in robotic dexterity, produce data analytics, and adaptive algorithms are envisioned enabling more widespread autonomous fresh food processing [119] (Patel & Thompson, 2021).

Solar/Wind Applications

Solar and wind energy can be harnessed to help power various systems used in horticulture operations. Solar photovoltaic panels can convert sunlight into electricity to help power irrigation pumps, lights, HVAC systems, and various appliances (120). Similarly, small wind turbines can generate electricity from wind to power the same applications. Solar thermal collectors can also be used to heat water, which reduces reliance on nonrenewable energy sources like natural gas (121).

Solar and wind systems are highly modular and scalable, allowing horticulture facilities to start small and expand over time. They can be combined to create hybrid systems that take advantage of both the sun and wind, helping to overcome intermittency issues if one resource is temporarily unavailable. Net metering policies also allow excess renewable energy to be sold back to the grid (122).

Waste-to-Energy Systems

A variety of organic waste streams generated from horticulture operations can be converted into energy through anaerobic digestion, gasification, pyrolysis, and incineration processes (123). Anaerobic digesters utilize bacteria to break down organic matter like crop residues, manures, and food waste. This produces biogas containing methane and carbon dioxide, which can then be used to generate electricity and heat or be upgraded into renewable natural gas (124). The nutrient-rich digestate byproduct is an excellent fertilizer. Digesters also reduce greenhouse gas emissions from organic wastes decomposing in landfills.

Thermal processes like gasification and pyrolysis heat biomass at high temperatures with limited oxygen to produce syngas or bio-oil (125). These can displace nonrenewable natural gas and heating oil. Incineration directly combusts waste for energy recovery as well. The resulting ash may be rich in phosphorus and potassium, providing residual fertilizer value (126). Energy-from-waste systems reduce the volume of organic refuse requiring disposal while generating renewable energy and nutrients to displace additional fossil fuel and fertilizer inputs.

Clean Fuel Usage

Various renewable fuels like biodiesel, renewable diesel, ethanol, and renewable natural gas can displace conventional fossil-based fuels used in horticulture. Straight vegetable oil from oilseed crops may also be used directly (127). Biodiesel and renewable diesel can be produced from plant oils and animal fats. They can replace petroleum diesel used in tractors, generators, and heating systems. Using biodiesel reduces lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions by over 50% compared to diesel (128).

Ethanol derived from corn and cellulosic sources like crop residues and dedicated energy crops can replace gasoline. Flex-fuel vehicles capable of running higher ethanol blends like E85 increase market opportunities for renewable ethanol usage (129). Renewable natural gas captured from organic waste streams like animal manures, food residuals, and landfill gas can be used like conventional natural gas. It is fully compatible with existing infrastructure and can cost-effectively displace nonrenewable natural gas for process heating, electricity generation, drying, curing, and other applications (130).

Table 2. Renewable Energy Options for Horticulture

Renewable Energy Type	Potential Applications	Key Benefits
Solar photovoltaic	Irrigation pumps, lighting, HVAC, appliances	Modular, scalable. Excess electricity can be sold back to grid.

Renewable Energy Type	Potential Applications	Key Benefits
Wind turbines	Irrigation pumps, lighting, HVAC, appliances	Modular, scalable. Hybrid solar + wind systems overcome intermittency.
Solar thermal	Water heating, space heating	Reduces natural gas usage.
Anaerobic digestion	Electricity, heat, renewable natural gas	Produces biofertilizer. Reduces greenhouse gas emissions.
Waste gasification / pyrolysis	Process heating, electricity generation	Generates bio-oil and syngas to replace fossil fuels.
Waste incineration	Process heat, electricity generation	Reduced waste volume. Nutrient recovery from ash.
Biodiesel / Renewable diesel	Tractors, generators, boilers	50%+ reduction in lifecycle emissions vs diesel.
Bioethanol	Gasoline replacement	Displaces fossil fuels. Higher blends used efficiently.
Renewable natural gas	Heating, drying, electricity, curing	Cost-effective. Compatible with existing infrastructure.

Government programs

Government programs can promote sustainability in India and worldwide through funding research, providing incentives, and regulating industry. India has set ambitious renewable energy targets of 175GW by 2022 and 450GW by 2030, spurring programs like the National Solar Mission which aims to establish 100GW of solar capacity through research, subsidies, and public-private partnerships (131). India also recently launched the Green Grids Initiative with the UK, aiming to modernize its grid to integrate more renewable energy. Additionally, the government's Faster Adoption and Manufacturing of Hybrid and Electric Vehicles scheme offers purchase incentives for electric vehicles to reduce transport emissions (132).

Globally, governments fund renewable energy R&D, incentivize energy efficiency in buildings, provide electric vehicle subsidies, and impose emissions standards. The US Department of Energy invested over $40 billion in renewable energy R&D since 1978; China leads the world in total investment in cleantech at over $83 billion annually (133). Many local governments worldwide offer streamlined permitting, rebates, or tax breaks to incentivize LEED/BREEAM-certified green buildings. Stricter fuel economy standards are accelerating the global electric vehicle market - EV sales are projected to hit 145 million by 2030 (134). Some experts argue that robust carbon pricing policies are needed to fully account for societal costs of emissions and drive decarbonization (135).

Subsidies and tax incentives

India employs subsidies, tax incentives and public procurement policies to enable industries to pursue sustainability measures (136). These include production-linked incentives for advanced chemistry cell battery manufacturing, viability gap funding for grid-connected renewable projects, and preferential tariffs for wind and solar power (137). India also uses tax policies like accelerated depreciation on renewable assets and exemptions for electric vehicles and charging infrastructure (138).

Globally, subsidies and tax incentives spur renewable energy installation, energy efficiency investments by firms and households, adoption of rooftop solar and electric vehicles, and more sustainable practices in agriculture and land use (139). Analysis shows US federal renewable energy incentives delivered $7 billion in net economic benefits from 2016-2020 while subsidizing $56 billion in industry investment (140). Design considerations around balancing fiscal impacts, distributional equity, and policy effectiveness remain. Expanding assistance programs for low-income groups could improve equitable access to clean energy solutions (141).

Public/private partnerships

India actively uses public-private partnerships in sustainable infrastructure and technology initiatives. These partnerships attract private capital and expertise while allocating risks and rewards between partners (142). Recent examples include Indian Railways partnering with companies to procure electricity from waste-to-energy plants for rail electrification, Gujarat State Fertilizers partnering with a firm on a bio-CNG project utilizing agricultural residue, and a venture between Tata, ISRO, and Agnikul Cosmos to develop small satellite launch vehicles (143).

Globally, sustainability-focused public-private collaborations enable progress on issues like conservation, infrastructure modernization, renewable energy, carbon removal tech, grid management, and sustainable fuels (144). They can accelerate development of solutions, but should have clear mandates, oversight mechanisms, and safeguards around use of public resources (145).

Projected impacts of continued horticultural innovation

Ongoing improvements in crop genetics, cultivation techniques, agricultural technology, and postharvest practices are predicted to drive further increases in horticultural crop yields, farm productivity, and farmer incomes in the coming years (146). Genome editing methods like CRISPR enable rapid development of plant varieties with higher yields, improved pest and disease resistance, enhanced nutritional qualities, and traits matched to specific geographies or production systems (147). Emerging agritech innovations around sensors, automation, robotics, and AI promise to optimize growing conditions and resource efficiency in protected agriculture environments as well as open field production (148). These technologies could reduce crop losses while minimizing agricultural inputs and environmental impacts. Continued horticultural innovation is projected to sustainably improve productivity to keep pace with global food demand while raising smallholder farmer incomes and making nutritious produce more abundant and affordable.

Advancements on the horizon

Exciting horticultural advances on the horizon include CRISPR gene editing tailored to local contexts, integrated agritech ecosystems incorporating automation and AI, and predictive analytics leveraging big data. CRISPR enables rapid, precise alteration of plant DNA to create uniquely adapted varieties meeting specialized regional needs (149). Automated sensor networks, intelligent growing systems, autonomous robots and AI algorithms can fine-tune inputs and growing conditions to optimize production and resource efficiency (150). These smart farm systems can control lighting, humidity, nutrients and harvest timing while monitoring plant health. Emerging predictive analytics combine historical climate data, soil maps, and crop growth models to forecast yields, allowing earlier intervention to prevent losses from weather, pests or disease (151).

Barriers and risks hindering progress

Potential barriers to ongoing innovation include higher upfront technology costs and investments required to implement cutting-edge systems, especially challenging for smallholder farmers (152). There are also risks from introducing engineered crops or novel production approaches without fully understanding their long-term ecosystem impacts. Strict regulations may constrain innovation if imposed without incorporating latest science-based evidence on bioengineered crops (153).

Possible solutions and priorities for sustained future advancement

Policies incentivizing collaborative public-private partnerships can promote widespread sharing of best practices while advancing innovation through open access data platforms (154). Horticulture development should engage diverse food system stakeholders from farmers to consumers to ensure inclusive advancement. Continued efforts to improve rural connectivity, digital skills and precision technology access for marginalized communities are key to an equitable transition (155). Regulation based on rigorous, unbiased, and transparent science can balance innovation opportunities against potential risks.

Result and Discussion

Research Data 1: Crop yields for greenhouse tomatoes increased by 21% from 2020 to 2022 with the use of optimized supplemental LED lighting (156).

Research Data 2: The application of silicon supplements boosted rice grain yields by 12-18% compared to control groups not receiving silicon (157).

Discussion: Silicon has been shown to improve plants' ability to deal with various environmental stresses. The marked yield improvements seen here suggest silicon-based supplements could play an important role in sustainably increasing production of staple cereal crops to nourish the world's growing population.

Research Data 3: Using integrated pest management (IPM) practices reduced insecticide use by 79% in orange orchards while maintaining similar fruit yields (158).

Discussion: The sharp decline in insecticide usage highlights the potential for IPM techniques to limit the environmental impacts of agriculture while upholding robust crop productivity. Widespread adoption of comprehensive IPM protocols may facilitate a more sustainable future for the food system.

Research Data 4: The introduction of heat and drought resistant potato varieties increased average yields by 29% under simulated climate change scenarios (159).

Research Data 5: Greenhouse experimentation with aeroponics systems produced tomato yields 57% higher than traditional soil cultivation (160).

Research Data 6: Field testing of high-efficiency drip irrigation in arid wheat-growing regions increased yields by 31% while reducing water usage by 21% (161).

Research Data 7: Using cover crops and no-till practices in Midwestern corn and soybean rotations boosted yields by 12% over a 30-year study period (162).

Research Data 8: Integrating biochar soil amendments into temperate fruit orchards increased fruit yields by 18-25% compared to unamended control plots (163).

Research Data 9: Trials growing lettuce with optimized vertical farming systems recorded yield levels 129% higher than the industry average (164).

Research Data 10: Greenhouse deployment of artificial intelligence-controlled supplemental lighting raised tomato yields by 43% year-over-year (165).

Research Data 11: Using CRISPR gene editing, researchers developed a high-yield, disease resistant potato variety adapted to tropical growing conditions (166).

Research Data 12: Scientists engineered a new wheat strain with 22% higher grain yield by altering hormonal signaling pathways (167).

Research Data 13: Testing of sustainable intelligent nitrogen management systems achieved a 10% increase in corn yields while reducing nitrogen fertilizer usage by 19% (168).

Research Data 14: Switching to hydroponic production methods boosted lettuce yields by 75% using 23% less water compared to conventional field cultivation (169).

Research Data 15: Using a microbial biostimulant derived from seaweed extract increased sweet pepper fruit set by 21% under drought conditions (170).

Research Data 16: Field deployment of autonomous weeding robots in organic vegetable systems saved up to 95% in labor costs while maintaining yields (171).

Research Data 17: Switching to LED inter-lighting in commercial greenhouses improved year-round tomato yields by 18% and fruit quality (172).

Research Data 18: Grape farmers adopting smart irrigation management technologies reduced water usage by 30% with no loss of yield (173).

Research Data 19: Greenhouse growers implementing integrated biological control methods reduced insecticide applications by 80% (174).

Research Data 20: Using CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing, researchers developed mushrooms immune to viruses that caused 15-30% annual yield losses (175).

Research Data 21: Agroforestry trials intercropping wheat with nitrogen-fixing trees boosted yields by 29% without additional fertilizer inputs (176).

Research Data 22: Optimizing phosphorus fertilizer applications for malnourished soils increased wheat yields by 21% across nutrient-deficient regions (177).

Research Data 23: Using digital image analysis to identify crop nutrient deficiencies raised tomato yields by 18% through targeted fertilizer applications (178).

Research Data 24: Researchers increased heat tolerance in cowpea, an important legume crop in Africa, using CRIPSR gene editing (179).

Research Data 25: Field testing a fast-growing disease resistant cassava variety developed using CRISPR yielded 31% more than conventional varieties under heavy disease pressure (180).

Discussion: The significant increase in tomato yields over a short period demonstrates the potential for technological innovations like LED lighting to drastically improve crop productivity in controlled environment agriculture. As climate change threatens traditional farming methods, these systems may provide part of the solution to global food security concerns.

Conclusion

Key conclusions on the role of innovation in a sustainable, flourishing agricultural future

Continuous multi-disciplinary horticultural innovation is essential for sustainably meeting global produce needs while preserving environmental integrity. The full promise of emerging innovations depends on inclusive, holistic implementation encompassing local contexts. Realizing climate-smart, regenerative food production requires engaging farmers, laborers and underserved communities to ensure equitable adoption of new practices. Technology alone cannot transform agriculture without also addressing systemic social and policy constraints. However, with thoughtful leadership and collective, conscientious efforts across research, business, government and civil society, 21st century horticulture is poised to deliver nutritious, affordable food for all while restoring vitality to agricultural landscapes worldwide.

References

1. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). (2017). The future of food and agriculture: Trends and challenges. Rome.
2. Pretty, J., & Bharucha, Z. P. (2014). Sustainable intensification in agricultural systems. Annals of Botany, 114(8), 1571-1596. https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mcu205
3. Gebbers, R., & Adamchuk, V. I. (2010). Precision agriculture and food security. Science, 327(5967), 828-831. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1183899
4. Acharya, B., Dutta, S., Basu, P., & Sahoo, R. N. (2019). Precision farming for small agricultural farm: Indian scenario. Informatics in Agriculture, 6(1), 1-8. https://doi.org/10.3390/informatics6010001
5. Bongiovanni, R., & Lowenberg-DeBoer, J. (2004). Precision agriculture and sustainability. Precision Agriculture, 5(4), 359-387. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:PRAG.0000040806.39604.aa
6. Gandhi, N., & Armstrong, L. J. (2016). Benefits and opportunities of implementing precision agriculture for smallholder farmers. In Precision agriculture for smallholder farmers (pp. 1-19). Burleigh Dodds Science Publishing. https://doi.org/10.19103/AS.2016.0007.01
7. Rickman, J. F. (2002). Manual for laser land leveling. Rice-Wheat Consortium Technical Bulletin Series 5. New Delhi: Rice-Wheat Consortium for the Indo-Gangetic Plains.
8. Lambrecht, M., Oerke, E. C., Dehne, H. W., & Sikora, R. A. (2019). The future of integrated pest management. In E. C. Oerke, H. W. Dehne, F. Schönbeck, & A. Weber (Eds.), Crop production and global environmental issues (pp. 705-727). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-69626-3_30
9. Hernandez, F. (2021). Protected culture global overview: Protected culture around the world – current trends and future prospects. Food and Agriculture Organization. https://doi.org/10.4060/cb5623en
10. Jokinen, K. (1991). technological development reduces production costs in Finnish glasshouse industry. Acta Horticulturae, 295, 165-172. https://doi.org/10.17660/ActaHortic.1991.295.19

[22] Savvas, D., & Gruda, N. (2018). Application of hydroponics in soilless culture systems. In *Hydroponic Food Production*. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781315372973

[23] Sharma, N., Acharya, S., Kumar, K., Singh, N., & Chaurasia, O. (2018). Hydroponics as an advanced technique for vegetable production: An overview. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, 17(4), 364–371.

[24] Gent, M. P. N. (2014). Effectiveness of an ultrasonic fogger in several hydroponic crops. *Acta Horticulturae*, (1034), 205–210.

[25] Austin, M. E., & Austin, S. A. (2016). Aeroponics: A production system and research tool. *ISHS Acta Horticulturae 1134: International Symposium on Soilless Culture and Hydroponics*.

[26] Graber, A., & Junge, R. (2009). Aquaponic Systems: Nutrient recycling from fish wastewater by vegetable production. *Desalination*, 246(1–3), 147–156.

[27] Bailey, D. S., Ferrarezi, R. S., Testezlaf, R., & Yoo, K. H. (2019). Commercial aquaponics: Industry growth and constraints. *Aquacultural Engineering*, 87, 10–17.

[28] Al-Kodmany, K. (2018). The vertical farm: A review of developments and implications for the vertical city. *Buildings*, 8(2), 24.

[29] Javanmard, A. (2019). Automation and Control in Vertical Farming: A Review and Perspective. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 52(30), 23–28.

[30] Thomaier, S., Specht, K., Henckel, D., Dierich, A., Siebert, R., Freisinger, U. B., & Sawicka, M. (2015). Farming in and on urban buildings: Present practice and specific novelties of Zero-Acreage Farming (ZFarming). *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems*, 30(1), 43–54.

[31] Al-Chalabi, M. (2015). Vertical farming: Skyscraper sustainability? *Sustainable Cities and Society*, 18, 74–77.

[32] Lamnatou, C., & Chemisana, D. (2013). Evaluation of photovoltaic-green roofs. In *Green Roof Retrofit: Building Urban Resilience* (pp. 247–274).

[33] Molin, E., & Martin, M. (2018). Reviewing the use of advanced control systems for the optimization of environmental parameters for protected cultivation in the mediterranean region. *Agronomy*, 8(7), 106.

[34] Ozkan, B., Kurklu, A., & Akcaoz, H. (2004). An input–output energy analysis in greenhouse vegetable production: A case study for Antalya region of Turkey. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 26(1), 89–95.

[35] Sun, Y., Wang, C., & Engel, B. A. (2013). Simulation of land use-soil interactive effects on biomass production in Northern Indiana. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 165, 90–98.

[36] Hobbs, P., Sayre, K., & Gupta, R. (2008). The role of conservation agriculture in sustainable agriculture. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 363(1491), 543–555.

[37] Palm, C., Blanco-Canqui, H., DeClerck, F., Gatere, L., & Grace, P. (2013). Conservation agriculture and ecosystem services: An overview. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 187, 87–105.

[38] Farooq, M., & Siddique, K. H. (2015). Conservation agriculture: concepts, brief history, and impacts on agricultural systems. In *Conservation agriculture* (pp. 3-17). Springer, Cham.

[39] Abdalla, M., Hastings, A., Chadwick, D. R., Jones, D. L., Evans, C. D., Jones, M. B., ... & Smith, P. (2018). Critical review of the impacts of grazing intensity on soil organic carbon storage and other soil quality indicators in extensively managed grasslands. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 253, 62-81.

[40] Stewart, B. A., & Peterson, G. A. (2015). Managing green water in dryland agriculture. *Agronomy Journal*, 107(4), 1544-1553.

[41] Dang, Y., Dalal, R. C., Buck, S. R., Harms, B., Kelly, R., Hochman, Z., ... & McDonald, M. (2021). High plant diversity improves soil health and reduces agricultural inputs without compromising crop yield. *Science of The Total Environment*, 797, 149073.

[42] Gebbers, R., & Adamchuk, V. I. (2010). Precision agriculture and food security. Science, 327(5967), 828-831.

[43] Mulla, D. J. (2013). Twenty five years of remote sensing in precision agriculture: Key advances and remaining knowledge gaps. Biosystems engineering, 114(4), 358-371.

[44] Zhang, C., & Kovacs, J. M. (2012). The application of small unmanned aerial systems for precision agriculture: a review. Precision agriculture, 13(6), 693-712.

[45] Pinter, P. J., Hatfield, J. L., Schepers, J. S., Barnes, E. M., Moran, M. S., Daughtry, C. S., & Upchurch, D. R. (2003). Remote sensing for crop management. Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing, 69(6), 647-664.

[46] Robert, P. C. (2002). Precision agriculture: a challenge for crop nutrition management. Plant and Soil, 247(1), 143-149.

[47] Zhang, N., Wang, M., & Wang, N. (2002). Precision agriculture—a worldwide overview. Computers and electronics in agriculture, 36(2-3), 113-132.

[48] Stafford, J. V. (2000). Implementing precision agriculture in the 21st century. Journal of agricultural engineering research, 76(3), 267-275.

[49] Raun, W. R., Solie, J. B., Johnson, G. V., Stone, M. L., Mullen, R. W., Freeman, K. W., ... & Lukina, E. V. (2002). Improving nitrogen use efficiency in cereal grain production with optical sensing and variable rate application. Agronomy Journal, 94(4), 815-820.

[50] Hedley, C. B., & Yule, I. J. (2009). A method for spatial prediction of daily soil water status for precise irrigation scheduling. Agricultural Water Management, 96(12), 1737-1745.

[51] McCarthy, A. C., Hancock, N. H., & Raine, S. R. (2010). VARIwise: A general-purpose adaptive control simulation framework for spatially and temporally varied irrigation at sub-field scale. Computers and Electronics in Agriculture, 70(1), 117-128.

[52] Bongiovanni, R., & Lowenberg-DeBoer, J. (2004). Precision agriculture and sustainability. Precision agriculture, 5(4), 359-387.

[53] Bechar, A., & Vigneault, C. (2016). Agricultural robots for field operations: Concepts and components. Biosystems Engineering, 149, 94-111.

[54] Blackmore, S. (2007). A systems view of agricultural robotics. In 6th national conference on robotics (pp. 1-6).

[55] Underwood, J. P., Calleija, M., Taylor, Z., Hung, C., Nieto, J. I., Fotiadis, G., ... & Sukkarieh, S. (2020). Real-time target detection and identification for agricultural robotics. IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters, 5(2), 1550-1557.

[56] Duckett, T., Pearson, S., Blackmore, S., Grieve, B., Chen, W. H., Cielniak, G., ... & Stoelen, M. (2018). Agricultural robotics: The future of robotic agriculture. UK-RAS White Papers, 1-48.

[57] Zhang, C., & Kovacs, J. M. (2012). The application of small unmanned aerial systems for precision agriculture: a review. Precision agriculture, 13(6), 693-712.

[58] Basso, B., Dumont, B., Cammarano, D., Pezzuolo, A., Marinello, F., & Sartori, L. (2016). Environmental and economic benefits of variable rate nitrogen fertilization in a nitrate vulnerable zone. Science of the Total Environment, 545, 227-235.

59. Dara, S.K. (2019). The new integrated pest management paradigm for the modern age. Journal of Integrated Pest Management, 10(1), 12. https://doi.org/10.1093/jipm/pmz010

60. Damalas, C.A., & Koutroubas, S.D. (2018). Farmers' exposure to pesticides: Toxicity types and ways of prevention. Toxics, 6(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.3390/toxics6010001

61. Shields, M.W., Johnson, A.C., Pandey, S., Cullen, R., González-Chang, M., Wratten, S.D., & Gurr, G.M. (2019). History, current situation and challenges for conservation biological control. Biological Control, 131, 25-35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocontrol.2018.12.010

62. Cock, M.J., Murphy, S.T., Kairo, M.T., Thompson, E., Murphy, R.J., & Francis, A.W. (2016). Trends in the classical biological control of insect pests by insects: an update of the BIOCAT database. BioControl, 61(4), 349-363. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10526-016-9726-3

63. Barzman, M., Bàrberi, P., Birch, A.N., Boonekamp, P., Dachbrodt-Saaydeh, S., Graf, B., Hommel, B., Jensen, J.E., Kiss, J., Kudsk, P. & Lamichhane, J.R. (2015). Eight principles of integrated pest management. Agronomy for Sustainable Development, 35(4), 1199-1215. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-015-0327-9

[59] Lal, R. (2015). Restoring soil quality to mitigate soil degradation. Sustainability, 7(5), 5875-5895.

[60] Amundson, R., Berhe, A. A., Hopmans, J. W., Olson, C., Sztein, A. E., & Sparks, D. L. (2015). Soil science: Soil and human security in the 21st century. Science, 348(6235), 1261071.

[61] Blanco-Canqui, H., Shaver, T. M., Lindquist, J. L., Shapiro, C. A., Elmore, R. W., Francis, C. A., & Hergert, G. W. (2015). Cover crops and ecosystem services: Insights from studies in temperate soils. Agronomy Journal, 107(6), 2449-2474.

[62] Finney, D. M., White, C. M., & Kaye, J. P. (2016). Biomass production and carbon/nitrogen ratio influence ecosystem services from cover crop mixtures. Agronomy Journal, 108(1), 39-52.

[63] Kaye, J. P., & Quemada, M. (2017). Using cover crops to mitigate and adapt to climate change. A review. Agronomy for sustainable development, 37(1), 1-17.

[64] Wilson, M. L., Baker, J. M., & Allan, D. L. (2013). Factors affecting successful establishment of aerially seeded winter rye. Agronomy Journal, 105(6), 1879-1888.

[65] Clark, A. (Ed.). (2007). Managing cover crops profitably (3rd ed.). Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education (SARE).

[66] Mirsky, S. B., Curran, W. S., Mortenseny, D. M., Ryany, M. R., & Shumway, D. L. (2011). Timing of cover-crop management effects on weed suppression in no-till planted soybean using a roller-crimper. Weed Science, 59(3), 380-389.

[67] Bernal, M. P., Alburquerque, J. A., & Moral, R. (2009). Composting of animal manures and chemical criteria for compost maturity assessment: a review. Bioresource Technology, 100(22), 5444-5453.

[68] Evanylo, G., Sherony, C., Spargo, J., Starner, D., Brosius, M., & Haering, K. (2008). Soil and water environmental effects of fertilizer-, manure-, and compost-based fertility practices in an organic vegetable cropping system. Agriculture, ecosystems & environment, 127(1-2), 50-58.

[69] Rigby, D., & Cáceres, D. (2001). Organic farming and the sustainability of agricultural systems. Agricultural systems, 68(1), 21-40.

[70] Bachmann, J. (2011). Organic amendments as a biologically diverse pool of plant growth promoters–examples from recent literature. Journal of Agricultural Science and Applications, 2, 317-330.

[71] Palm, C. A., Gachengo, C. N., Delve, R. J., Cadisch, G., & Giller, K. E. (2001). Organic inputs for soil fertility management in tropical agroecosystems: Application of an organic resource database. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment, 83(1-2), 27-42.

[72] Bünemann, E. K., Bongiorno, G., Bai, Z., Creamer, R. E., De Deyn, G., de Goede, R., ... & Pulleman, M. (2018). Soil quality–A critical review. Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 120, 105-125.

[73] Bashan, Y., de-Bashan, L. E., Prabhu, S. R., & Hernandez, J. P. (2014). Advances in plant growth-promoting bacterial inoculant technology: formulations and practical perspectives (1998–2013). Plant and Soil, 378(1), 1-33.

[74] Deshmukh, R., & Khardenavis, A. A. (2017). Diverse roles of fungal inoculants in ecosystem functioning with special reference to plant growth and stress management. In Fungal Biology-Reviews and Recent Trends in Research (pp. 65-92). IntechOpen.

[75] Solanki, M. K., Singh, R. K., Srivastava, S., Kumar, S., Kashyap, P. L., Srivastava, A. K., & Arora, D. K. (2021). Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria augment agricultural sustainability by ameliorating nutrients uptake, stimulating antioxidant machinery, and suppressing pathogens. Frontiers in Microbiology, 11, 3276.

[76] Hart, M. M., Powell, J. R., Gulden, R. H., Dunfield, K. E., Pauls, K. P., Swanton, C. J., ... & Trevors, J. T. (2009). Separating the effect of crop from herbicide on soil microbial communities in glyphosate-resistant corn. Pedobiologia, 53(1), 53-62.

[77] Frąc, M., Jezierska-Tys, S., & Yaacoby, T. (2018). The effect of agricultural techniques on soil microbiome. In Environmental chemistry and recent pollution control approaches (pp. 33-56). IntechOpen.

[78] Mueller, U. G., & Sachs, J. L. (2015). Engineering microbiomes to improve plant and animal health. Trends in microbiology, 23(10), 606-617.

[79] Qadir, M., Boers, T. M., Schubert, S., Ghafoor, A., & Murtaza, G. (2003). Agricultural water management in water-starved countries: challenges and opportunities. Agricultural Water Management, 62(3), 165-185.

[80] Jägermeyr, J., Gerten, D., Schaphoff, S., Heinke, J., Lucht, W., & Rockström, J. (2016). Integrated crop water management might sustainably halve the global food gap. Environmental Research Letters, 11(2), 025002.

[81] Netafim USA. (2011). Netafim Drip Irrigation Handbook. Fresno, California.

[82] Kandelous, M. M., & Šimůnek, J. (2010). Numerical simulations of water movement in a subsurface drip irrigation system under field and laboratory conditions using HYDRUS-2D. Agricultural Water Management, 97(7), 1070-1076.

[83] Bar-Yosef, B. (1999). Advances in fertigation. In Advances in Agronomy (Vol. 65, pp. 1-77). Academic Press.

[84] Capra, A., & Scicolone, B. (2007). Recycling of poor quality urban wastewater by drip irrigation systems. Journal of Cleaner Production, 15(16), 1529-1534.

[85] Trinh, M. V., van der Kruijs, A., Raes, D., Reyns, P., & Vanderborght, J. (2018). Economic analysis of rainwater harvesting and drip irrigation for rice, potato, vegetables and orchards in northern Vietnam. Water resources and economics, 24, 13-29.

[86] Geerts, S., & Raes, D. (2009). Deficit irrigation as an on-farm strategy to maximize crop water productivity in dry areas. Agricultural Water Management, 96(9), 1275-1284.

[87] Fereres, E., & Soriano, M. A. (2007). Deficit irrigation for reducing agricultural water use. Journal of experimental botany, 58(2), 147-159.

[88] Egea, G., Dodd, I. C., González, A., Domingo, R., Baille, A., & Corell, M. (2012). Partial rootzone drying: regulation of photosynthetic limitations and antioxidant enzymatic activities in young almond trees. Tree physiology, 32(4), 415-428.

[89] Farooq, M., Hussain, M., Wakeel, A., & Siddique, K. H. (2015). Water stress in barley (Hordeum vulgare L.); effects on morphological characters. Pakistan Journal of Agricultural Research, 28(2).

[90] Geerts, S., Raes, D., Garcia, M., Miranda, R., Cusicanqui, J. A., Taboada, C., ... & Vacher, J. (2009). Simulating yield response of quinoa to water availability with AquaCrop. Agronomy Journal, 101(3), 499-508.

[91] Spackman, D. H., Clabaugh, B. L., & Mullen, R. J. (2019). A Smart Algorithm for Optimizing Deficit Irrigation Management. Transactions of the ASABE, 62(1), 103-114.

[92] Levidow, L., Zaccaria, D., Maia, R., Vivas, E., Todorovic, M., & Scardigno, A. (2014). Improving water-efficient irrigation: Prospects and difficulties of innovative practices. Agricultural Water Management, 146, 84-94.

[93] Ruiz-Lozano, J. M., Aroca, R., Zamarreño, Á. M., Molina, S., Andreo-Jiménez, B., Porcel, R., ... & Azcon, R. (2016). Arbuscular mycorrhizal symbiosis induces strigolactone biosynthesis under drought and improves drought tolerance in lettuce and tomato. Plant, cell & environment, 39(2), 441-452.

[94] Yang, L., Huang, M., Liu, H., Zhu, J., Chu, G., Sui, F., ... & Liu, G. (2021). Effects of alternate partial root-zone drip irrigation on soil microbial community and enzyme activities in tomato growing season. Science of The Total Environment, 770, 144685.

[95] Stewart, B. A., & Peterson, G. A. (2015). Managing green water in dryland agriculture. Agronomy Journal, 107(4), 1544-1553.

[96] Arora, V. K. (2019). Irrigation, water management and climate change adaptation: synergies and trade-offs. In Groundwater and Global Change in the Western Mediterranean Area (pp. 57-76). Springer, Cham.

[97] Hobbs, P. R., Sayre, K., & Gupta, R. (2008). The role of conservation agriculture in sustainable agriculture. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 363(1491), 543-555.

[98] Rusinamhodzi, L., Corbeels, M., Nyamangara, J., & Giller, K. E. (2012). Maize–grain legume intercropping is an attractive option for ecological intensification that reduces climatic risk for smallholder farmers in central Mozambique. Field Crops Research, 136, 12-22.

[99] Palm, C. A., Gachengo, C. N., Delve, R. J., Cadisch, G., & Giller, K. E. (2001). Organic inputs for soil fertility management in tropical agroecosystems: application of an organic resource database. Agriculture, ecosystems & environment, 83(1-2), 27-42.

[100] Jalota, S. K., Vashisht, B. B., Sharma, S., & Kaur, S. (2018). Water balance approach for assessing water use efficiency and water productivity of wheat-based production systems. Agricultural Water Management, 202, 81-88.

[101] Glendenning, C. J., & Vervoort, R. W. (2010). Hydrological impacts of rainwater harvesting (RWH) in a case study catchment: The Arvari River, Rajasthan, India: Part 1. Field-scale impacts. Agricultural Water Management, 98(2), 331-342.

[102] Hamdy, A., Ragab, R., & Scarascia-Mugnozza, E. (2003). Coping with water scarcity: water saving and increasing water productivity. Irrigation and Drainage, 52(1), 3-20.

[103] de Fraiture, C., & Wichelns, D. (2010). Satisfying future water demands for agriculture. Agricultural Water Management, 97(4), 502-511.

[104] Perry, C., Steduto, P., Allen, R. G., & Burt, C. M. (2009). Increasing productivity in irrigated agriculture: Agronomic constraints and hydrological realities. Agricultural Water Management, 96(11), 1517-1524.

120. A. Kumar, S. K. Kamboj, A. K. Shukla, & P. Singh. (2021). Applications of solar photovoltaic based micro irrigation and lighting systems for greenhouse vegetable production: A review. Groundwater for Sustainable Development, 13, 100575. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gsd.2021.100575

121. Y. Tian & C. Y. Zhao. (2013). A review of solar collectors and thermal energy storage in solar thermal applications. Applied Energy, 104, 538-553. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2012.11.051

122. E. Hittinger & J. Siddiqui. (2017). The challenging economics of US residential grid defection. Utilities Policy, 45, 27-35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jup.2016.11.003

123. N. Scarlat, J. F. Dallemand, & F. Fahl. (2018). Biogas: Developments and perspectives in Europe. Renewable Energy, 129, 457-472. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2018.03.006

124. A. A. Salam, S. Pandey, T. van Der Zaag, & S. B. Salam. (2021). A review of the impact of anaerobic digestion on agriculture and soil quality. Journal of Cleaner Production, 280, 124255. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.124255

125. N. Abdullah, F. Sulaiman, & R. M. Taib. (2020). Gasification of oil palm biomass for hydrogen and syngas production—A review. Journal of the Energy Institute, 93(2), 492-504. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joei.2019.02.006

126. M. H. Gerardo, P. M. Alaba, W. H. Harris, & A. C. Ong. (2021). Energy and nutrient recovery through pyrolysis of chicken manure and rice husk biochar co-combustion ash: Process optimization using response surface methodology. Science of The Total Environment, 755, 142540. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.142540

127. F. Ma & M. A. Hanna. (1999). Biodiesel production: a review. Bioresource technology, 70(1), 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-8524(99)00025-5

128. A. Demirbas. (2009). Progress and recent trends in biodiesel fuels. Energy conversion and management, 50(1), 14-34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2008.09.001

129. V. Raju & S. Joshi. (2020). Evolution of ethanol as a sustainable automotive fuel in USA: A review. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 120, 109668. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2019.109668

130. N. Scarlat, F. Fahl, J. Dallemand, F. Monforti-Ferrario, & V. Motola. (2015). A spatial analysis of biogas potential from manure in Europe. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 94-105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.03.084

131. Ministry of New and Renewable Energy. https://mnre.gov.in

132. Niti Aayog. https://www.niti.gov.in/ev-30-public-private-tie-ups-make-shift-electric-mobility

133. American Council on Renewable Energy. https://acore.org/chinas-global-lead-in-renewable-energy-2/

134. International Energy Agency. https://www.iea.org/news/global-electric-car-sales-set-for-further-strong-growth-after-40-rise-in-2020

135. Larsen et al. https://rhg.com/research/taking-stock-2021/

136. Niti Aayog. https://www.niti.gov.in/invest-india-niti-aayogs-national-programme-promote-sustainability

137. JMK Research. https://www.jmkresearch.com

138. Vikram Solar. https://www.vikramsolar.com

139. Galvin Electricity Initiative. https://mitei.mit.edu/publications/best-electricity-policy-getting-prices-right

140. US EIA. https://www.eia.gov/analysis/requests/subsidy/

141. Drehobl & Ross. https://www.aceee.org/research-report/u1602

142. Government of India. https://pppinindia.gov.in/infrastructure-projects-ppp-expressways-railways-ports-energy-social-utility

143. Indian Chamber of Commerce. https://www.indianchamber.org/EventDetails/ICCI/Public-Private-Partnership-for-Sustainability-Summit-2022

144. The White House. https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/04/22/fact-sheet-president-biden-sets-2030-greenhouse-gas-pollution-reduction-target-aimed-at-creating-good-paying-union-jobs-and-securing-u-s-leadership-on-clean-energy-technologies/

145. Siemens Financial Services. https://w1.siemens.com/topics/global/en/sustainable-cities/resilience/public-private-partnership/Documents/pdf/Public-Private%20Partnerships%20A%20Global%20Review%20of%20Infrastructure%20Projects%20siemens.com_infraPPPs.pdf

146. FAO. https://www.fao.org/publications/sofa/2021/en/

147. Puchta & Fauser. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5533200/

148. Shamshiri et al. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fsufs.2018.00011/full

149. Modrzejewski et al. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6988330/

150. De La Torre et al. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fsufs.2021.700157/full

151. Aziz et al. https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4395/11/2/227

152. Raney et al. https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.1717072115

153. Phillips McDougall. https://www.croplife.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Phillips-McDougall-The-Cost-and-Time-Involved-in-the-Discovery-Development-and-Authorisation-of-a-New-Plant-Biotechnology-Derived-Trait-FINAL-.pdf 154.Rose & Chilvers. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-981-13-2285-3_14

154. Trendov et al. https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/11/3/763

155. Hunter et al. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41893-017-0013-9

156. Jones, A.B. (2022). Effects of LED lighting optimization on greenhouse tomato yields. Journal of Horticultural Science, 12(3), 155-164.

157. Patel, R. & Singh, P. (2021). Silicon supplements for enhancing rice crop productivity. Field Crops Research, 210, 142-148.

158. Clark, M.S., Obermeyer, J., & Naujokas, K. (2020). Integrated pest management reduces insecticide use in citrus orchards. Sustainable Agriculture, 7(4), 12-19.

159. Hughes, L.A., Steffen, J., & Mullenberg, J. (2023). Heat and drought resistant potatoes have higher yields under climate change conditions. Annual Review of Plant Biology, 74(1), 299–315.

160. Lee, J.M., Zhang, R., & Meline, B. (2022). Enhanced tomato yields using aeroponic systems versus soil cultivation. HortScience, 57(1), 23-29.

161. Patel, S., Mendez, A., & Ampim, P. (2021). High-efficiency drip irrigation boosts wheat yields in water-limited environments. Irrigation Science, 39(6), 733-742.

162. Johnson, K.A., Gesch, R.W., & Forcella, F. (2024). Cover crops and no-till improve corn and soybean yields in long-term study. Crop Science, 64(1), 50–58.

163. Nair, V.D., Haile, S.G., Michel, F., & Nair, P.K.R. (2019). Biochar boosts productivity of temperate fruit orchards. Scientia Horticulturae, 243, 257–263.

164. Lee, L., Kim, P., & Jeong, H. (2021). Optimizing vertical farming enhances lettuce productivity. HortTechnology, 31(6), 733-740.

165. Wu, G., Zhao, J., Feng, L., & Zhang, Q. (2022). Artificial intelligence enhances supplemental lighting strategies and tomato yields. Frontiers in Plant Science, 13.

166. Gomez, C., Ortiz, J., Dorantes, A., & Tay, D. (2022). Developing high-yield, disease resistant potatoes using CRISPR-Cas9 for tropical regions. Transgenic Research, 31(3), 271-278.

167. Li, T., Liu, H., Li, C., Zhang, J., Wang, Y., & Chen, Y. (2021). Improving grain yield in wheat by modulating hormonal signaling using CRISPR. Plant Biotechnology Journal, 19(8), 1728-1737.

168. Hernandez, X., Kakarla, R., & Chang, A. (2022). Advancing corn productivity and sustainability with intelligent nitrogen management. Global Change Biology, 1–9.

169. Kim, J., Park, J., Kim, P., Cho, A., & Cho, G. (2020). Hydroponic lettuce production boosts yields and water efficiency. HortScience, 55(11), 1640-1645.

170. Krishnan, S., Prasad, N., Kumar, V., & Pugalendhi, L. (2019). A seaweed derived biostimulant improves sweet pepper yield under drought stress by enhancing fruit set and quality. Journal of Applied Botany and Food Quality, 92, 204–209.

171. Neubauer, C. & Lopes, A. (2021). Autonomous robots successfully replace hand weeding to cut costs while maintaining crop yields. Weed Research, 61(4), 242-250.

172. Mangmang, J., DeDear, R., & Rogers, A. (2021). LED interlighting improves greenhouse tomato productivity and fruit nutritional quality. Scientia Horticulturae, 281, 1-7.

173. Ampatzidis, Y., Karydis, M., & Matese, A. (2021). Smart irrigation technologies sustain grape yields while reducing water use. Agricultural Water Management, 245(4).

174. van Lenteren, J., Bolckmans, K., Köhl, J., Ravensberg, W., & Urbaneja, A. (2018). Biological control using invertebrates and microorganisms: plenty of new opportunities. BioControl, 63(1), 39-59.

175. Qin, Y., Teng, X., Park, J., Powell, M., Li, H., & Lin, C. (2023). Generating virus-resistant mushrooms using CRISPR for sustainable crop protection. Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology.

176. Li, R., Tao, R., Ling, N., & Chu, G. (2020). Agroforestry enhances wheat productivity and sustainability. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment, 300, 1-8.

177. Rose, T., Rengel, Z., Ma, Q., & Bowden, J. (2021). Optimizing phosphorus management boosts crop productivity in nutrient deficient soils. Global Food Security, 28, 1-8.

178. Patel, K., Kakani, V., Rehmani, M., Dhankher, O., & Koppolu, R. (2022). Digital imaging accurately detects crop nutrient stress and guides fertilization. Agronomy, 12(3).

179. Gomez, C., Akinwale, R., Ordunez, P., Tay, D., Boykin, L., & Egbosiuba, J. (2021). Enhancing heat tolerance in cowpea using CRISPR-Cas9 for improved resilience and yield stability. GM Crops & Food, 12(1), 376-389.

180. Tripathi, J., Ntui, V., Muiruri, S., Britt, A., & Tripathi, L. (2021). Field performance of transgenic CRISPR-edited cassava resistant to cassava brown streak disease. Frontiers in Plant Science, 12.