Soil Health and Food Security

6

Abstract

Food security is a flexible concept as reflected in the many attempts at definition in research and policy usage. One more crucially important, factor in modifying views of food security was the evidence that the technical successes of the Green Revolution did not automatically and rapidly lead to dramatic reductions in poverty and levels of malnutrition. The forecast of 2050 global crop demand and then quantitatively evaluate the global impacts on land clearing, nitrogen fertilizer use, and GHG release of alternative approaches by which this global crop demand might be achieved. The role of soil microbial community for improving plant growth and development for keeping the pace with the global food demand and sustainable agriculture is documented here. A general perception about genetic engineering and public intervene and sustainable agricultural intensifications and food production is discussed in the preceding sections.

Keywords

Food demand · Security · Genetic engineering · Plant growth agriculture

6.1 Concept of Food Security

In many attempts at definition in research and policy usage it has been reflected that food security is a flexible concept as there were about 200 definitions in published writings before a decade (Maxwell and Smith 1992). Whenever the concept is introduced in the title of a study or its objectives, it is necessary to look closely to establish the explicit or implied definition, (Maxwell 1995). In the mid-1970s, the concept of food security originated in the discussions of international food problems at a time of global food crisis as its preliminary focus of attention was mainly on food supply problems of assuring the availability and to some degree the price stability of basic foodstuffs at the national and international level. The crisis had

© Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. 2019

J. A. Parray et al., *Sustainable Agriculture: Biotechniques in Plant Biology*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-8840-8_6

been precipitated for global food economy at institutional and international set of concerns reflected the changing organization. A process of international negotiation followed, leading to the World Food Conference of 1974, and a new set of institutional arrangements covering information, resources for promoting food security and forums for dialogue on policy issues. The issues of famine, hunger and food crisis were also being extensively examined, following the events of the mid 1970s. The outcome was a redefinition of food security, which recognized that the behavior of potentially vulnerable and affected people was a critical aspect. One more crucially important, factor in modifying views of food security was the evidence that the technical successes of the Green Revolution did not automatically and rapidly lead to dramatic reductions in poverty and levels of malnutrition. These problems were recognized as the result of lack of effective demand.

The continuing evolution of food security as an operational concept in public policy has reflected the wider recognition of the complexities of the technical and policy issues involved. The most recent and careful redefinition of food security is that negotiated in the process of international consultation leading to the World Food Summit (WPS) in November 1996. The contrasting definitions of food security adopted in WFS 1974 and WFS 1996, along with those in official FAO and World Bank documents of the mid 1980s are set out below with each substantive change. A comparison of these definitions highlights the considerable reconstruction of official thinking on food security that has occurred over 25 years. These statements also provide signposts to the policy analyses, which have re-shaped our understanding of food security as a problem of international and national responsibility.

A procedure of global exchange pursued, prompting the World Food Conference of 1974, and another arrangement of institutional courses of action covering data, assets for advancing sustenance security and discussions for discourse on approach issues. In the mid 1970s, after the occasions, issues like starvation, hunger and sustenance emergency were additionally being widely analyzed. The result was a redefinition of nourishment security, which perceived that the conduct of conceivably helpless and influenced individuals was a basic perspective. One all the more critically essential, factor in changing perspectives of nourishment security was the proof that the specialized accomplishments of the Green Revolution did not consequently and quickly lead to sensational decreases in neediness and dimensions of lack of healthy sustenance. These issues were perceived as the consequence of absence of successful interest. The proceeding with development of food security as an operational idea in broad daylight approach has mirrored the more extensive acknowledgment of the complexities of the specialized and arrangement issues included. The latest and watchful redefinition of nourishment security is that consulted during the time spent universal conference prompting the World Food Summit (WPS) in November 1996. The differentiating meanings of nourishment security embraced in WFS 1974 and WFS 1996, alongside those in authority FAO and World Bank reports of the mid 1980s are set out underneath with every substantive change. A correlation of these definitions features the impressive remaking of authority thinking on nourishment security that has happened more than 25 years. These

announcements additionally give signposts to the arrangement examinations, which have re-molded our comprehension of nourishment security as an issue of global and national duty. The underlying focus, mirroring the worldwide worries of nourishment security, was on the volume and soundness of sustenance supplies. The idea was characterized in the 1974 World Food Summit as: "Accessibility consistently of sufficient world sustenance supplies of essential foodstuffs to continue an unfaltering development of nourishment utilization and to counterbalance variances underway and costs" (UN 1975). Further the FAO extended his idea to incorporate verifying access by powerless individuals to accessible supplies, inferring that consideration ought to be adjusted between the interest and supply side of the sustenance security condition. It is characterized as, "Guaranteeing that all individuals consistently have both physical and monetary access to the essential nourishment that they need" (FAO 1983).

FAO (1983) has amplified idea of food security to incorporate the accompanying parts:

(a) The severe goal of world food security must to be to guarantee that all individuals consistently have both physical and financial access to needed sustenance.
(b) Food Security ought to have three essential points, guaranteeing creation of satisfactory nourishment supplies, boosting solidness in the stream of provisions, and guaranteeing access to accessible supplies with respect to the individuals who need them.
(c) Action will be required on a wide front including all factors that have a bearing on the limit of the two nations and individuals to deliver or buy foods, while grains will keep on being the primary focal point of consideration, activity should cover all fundamental nourishment stuff essential for wellbeing, farming and rustic advancement, food production, food holds, the working of national and worldwide cereal showcase.

The outside trade needs of bringing in nations, exchange progression and fare profit, the buying intensity of most unfortunate strata of the populace, money related assets and specialized help and the stream of sustenance help and courses of action to address crisis issues. This more extensive idea of food security is like that embraced by the World Bank 3 years after the fact in its position paper Poverty and Hunger: Issues and Options for Food Security in developing countries. It presented the generally acknowledged qualification between chronic food frailties, related with issues of auxiliary neediness and low earnings, and transient food insecurity, which included times of increased weight brought about by catastrophic events, monetary breakdown. This idea of food security is additionally expounded regarding: "Access surprisingly consistently to enough nourishment for a functioning, sound life". The most broadly utilized meaning of food security is that of the World Bank: 'Access by all individuals consistently to enough nourishment for a functioning, sound life'. The expression "access" here is comprehensive of both the supply side (accessibility) and the interest side (privilege).

By the mid-1990s food security was perceived as a noteworthy concern, traversing a range from the person to the worldwide dimension. Nonetheless, get to now include adequate sustenance, demonstrating proceeding with worry with protein-vitality unhealthiness. In any case, the definition was expanded to join nourishment wellbeing and furthermore wholesome parity, reflecting worries about food synthesis and minor supplement necessities for a functioning and sound life. Food inclinations, socially or socially decided, presently turned into a thought. The possibly high level of setting particularity suggests that the idea had both lost its straightforwardness and was not itself an objective; however an intermediating set of activities that add to a functioning and sound life.

The UNDP Human Development Report propelled the work of human security, including different part points, of which food security was only a solitary. This thought is immovably related to the human rights perspective on enhancement that has, in this way, affected talks about food security. The more broad examination concerning the activity of open action into battling longing for and hardship, found the same spot for sustenance security as a dealing with framework for action. Or maybe, it focused on an increasingly broad form of institutionalized funds, which has various undeniable portions including, clearly, prosperity and sustenance, (Dreze and Sen 1989). The World Food Summit (1996) grasped a still progressively grow definition: "Food security, at the individual, nuclear family, national, nearby and overall measurements is cultivated when all people, reliably, have physical and money related access to satisfactory, ensured and nutritious sustenance to meet their dietary needs and sustenance tendencies for a working and sound life" (FAO 1996). This definition is again refined in The State of Food Insecurity Report 2001: "Food security is a situation that exists when all people, reliably, have physical, social and monetary access to satisfactory, ensured and nutritious sustenance that meets their dietary needs and nourishment tendencies for a working and strong life" (FAO 2002). This new accentuation on usage, the premium side and the issues of access by frail people to sustenance, is most solidly identified with the key examination by Amartya Sen and focused on the capabilities of individuals and nuclear families (Sen 1981).

These inexorably expansive explanations of shared objectives has acknowledged by the global network, as its commonsense reaction has been to concentrate on straightforward and thin goals around which to compose worldwide and national open activity. The pronounced essential goal in universal improvement arrangement talk is progressively the decrease and disposal of neediness. The 1996 WFS exemplified this heading of approach by making the essential target of universal activity on sustenance security, dividing of the quantity of ravenous or undernourished individuals by 2015. Basically, nourishment security can be portrayed as a wonder identifying with people. It is the nourishing status of the individual family unit part that is a definitive center, and the danger of that sufficient status not being accomplished or getting to be undermined. The later hazard portrays the weakness of people in this unique situation. As the definitions explored above infer, powerlessness may happen both as a ceaseless and brief marvel. Helpful working definitions are depicted underneath.

Food security exists when all individuals, consistently, have physical, social and financial access to adequate, sheltered and nutritious sustenance which meets their dietary needs and sustenance inclinations for a functioning and sound life. Family sustenance security is the utilization of this idea to the family level, with people inside families as the focal point of concern. Guaranteeing Food Security involves meeting two conditions. One condition is guaranteeing that there are sufficient nourishment supplies accessible, through residential creation or imports. The other is guaranteeing that family units whose individuals experience the ill effects of under nourishment can get sustenance, either in light of the fact that they produce it themselves or on the grounds that they have the salary to procure it (Reutlinger 1985).

All individuals consistently to the sustenance required for a sound life characterize nourishment security in its most essential structure as access. Food security contrasts from appetite in that sustenance security is an issue that a network in a nation state, city or neighborhood encounters (Conway 1997a, b). A more extensive meaning of food security consolidates what is regularly eluded in the personal satisfaction pointers. As needs, food security suggests employment security at the dimension of every family and all individuals inside, and includes guaranteeing both physical and monetary access to adjusted eating routine, safe drinking water, ecological sanitation, essential instruction and fundamental social insurance. It is envisioned that food security includes-

(a) Financial development, particularly access to assets.
(b) Instruction particularly training of ladies.
(c) Populace programs
(d) Common habitat.
(e) Participation and responsibility are the characteristic count reactants to starvation and ailing health (Gittinger et al. 1987).

6.2 Soil Microbial Community and Plant Growth

Schmidt et al. (2014) reported that there has been an upsurge in phytomicrobiome publications; this community of microbes is now seen as key to the growth and health of plants and there is still a great deal to be learned about the composition and nature of interactions among members of this community, and its interactions with the host plant. Microbes associate with the phyllosphere (epi- and endophytes, of leaves and stems), rhizosphere and reproductive structures such as flowers, fruits and seeds. In grape, *Pseudomonas* and *Bacillus* spp. colonize the epidermis and xylem of the ovary and ovules, while *Bacillus* spp. colonize berries and seed cell walls (Compant et al. 2010a, b). Nitrogen-fixing plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (Quecine et al. 2012) e.g., *Acetobacter diazotrophicus, Pantoea agglomerans*) associate with plant roots (Pisa et al. 2011), and stems of sugarcane (Velázquez et al. 2008), residing in the apoplast in a low-nitrogen, high-sucrose environment (Dong et al. 1994). Other nitrogen-fixing bacteria (*Azotobacter*, *Azospirillum, Azoarcus, Burkholderia, Bacillus Enterobacter*, *Klebsiella*, *Herbaspirillum* and

Gluconacetobacter) are found in grasses such as rice and maize (Santi et al. 2013). Phyllomicrobiome communities influence the plant development and ecosystem function, while the host controls aspects of phytomicrobiome composition and function. Within the plants the biosynthesis of many metabolites is known to alter by environmental factors; specific members of the rhizomicrobiome also alter plant development, composition and growth. Badri et al. (2013) reported that specific phyllomicrobiome components suppress the feeding of leaves by insect larvae. There is a random distribution and community composition of microbes in the phyllosphere, whereas plants create niches in the rhizosphere and endosphere to accommodate specific microbial communities (Lebeis 2015).

Amongst diverse root endophytes as some are PGPRs, which are comprised of rhizomicrobiome (Gaiero et al. 2013). Rhizomicrobiome is dynamic in time and space, the presence of other soil organisms, soil physical conditions, in response to environmental conditions plant species and genotype and interactions between a specific microbe and a specific plant type. The best characterized microbes in the rhizomicrobiome are the PGPR which include bacteria in the soil near plant roots, in spaces between root cells or inside specialized cells of root nodules, on the surface of plant root systems; they stimulate plant growth through a wide range of mechanisms (Mabood et al. 2014), such as: (1) nutrient solubilization (P) (Trabelsi and Mhamdi 2013), (2) N- fixation (Drogue et al. 2012), (3) production of metal chelating siderophores, (4) production of phytohormones, (5) production of volatile organic compounds, (6) production of 1-aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylate deaminase (ACC) (7) induction of systemic resistance [induced systemic resistance (ISR) and systemic required resistance (SAR) – Jung et al. 2008], and (8) Antibiosis (Spence et al. 2014). Lee et al. (2009) showed that "signal" compounds produced by bacteria in the phytomicrobiome stimulate plant growth particularly in the presence of abiotic stress (Prudent et al. 2015). In the broadest sense PGPR include legume-nodulating rhizobia. PGPR reside outside plant cells (extracellular – ePGPR) or, like rhizobia, live inside them (intracellular – iPGPR; Gray and Smith 2005). Application of PGPR to crops, except for rhizobia, has met with mixed results in the field, causing increased growth sometimes and not others (Nelson 2004). Elements of the phytomicrobiome also assist plants in dealing with abiotic stress. The *Arabidopsis* phytomicrobiome, for instance, can sense drought stress and help the plant maintain productivity (Zolla et al. 2013). Further, mycorrhizal associations enhance crop salinity tolerance (Ruiz-Lozano et al. 2012). At a time when we are looking to crop plants to provide biofuels and other bioproducts while still feeding the world's growing population, against a background of climate change, understanding and developing technologies that can increase overall plant productivity is imperative (Orrell and Bennett 2013).

Newer deployments of PGPR and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) consortia that promote crop productivity by mimicking, or partially reconstructing, the phytomicrobiome are being developed. Application of a PGPR consortium (*Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* IN937a, *Bacillus pumilus* T4, AMF *Glomus intraradices*) to greenhouse tomato resulted in full yield with 30% less fertilizer (Adesemoye et al. 2009). Co-inoculation of *B. japonicum* 532C, RCR3407 and *B. subtilis* MIB600

increased biomass for two soybean cultivars (Atieno et al. 2012). Co-inoculation of *B. japonicum* E109 and *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* LL2012 improved soybean nodulation efficiency. Phytohormone production by *B. amyloliquefaciens* LL2012 improved nodulation efficiency for *B. japonicum* E109 (Masciarelli et al. 2014). A consortium of *B. megaterium*, *Enterobacter* sp., *B. thuringiensis* and *Bacillus* sp., plus composted sugar beet residue, on *Lavandula dentata* L. helped restore soils by increasing phosphorus availability, soil N- fixation and foliar NPK content (Mengual et al. 2014).

6.2.1 Signaling in the Phytomicrobiome

The complex community formed by the plant and its phytomicrobiome is carefully cautiously coordinated; there is signal exchange among the various microbes involved, and also between the host plant and the microbe community as these signals regulate aspects of each other's activities and the community overall (Engelmoer et al. 2014). Microbial chemical signals can help plants initiate immune responses to harmful pathogens or allow the entry of beneficial endophytes (Hartmann et al. 2014). Microbe associated molecular patterns (MAMPs) play a key role in plant immune response and antibiotic secretion in microbes. Plant associated *Bacillus* strains have been shown to down-regulate MAMP-regulated immune response including antibiotic secretion in the presence of plant root exudates to better facilitate root infection (Lakshmanan et al. 2012). Bacteria can also interfere with signaling between plants and other microbial strains. LCOs are similar in structure to chitin and can be cleaved by bacterially produced chitinases, thus interfering with plant microbe symbioses (Jung et al. 2008). Other aspects plant–microbe symbiosis follows pathways similar to pathogen infection (Barea 2015).

Signaling compounds produced by plants include a variety of root exudates such as primary metabolites (carbohydrates, proteins, organic acids, etc.) and secondary metabolites (flavonoids, phenol, phytohormones, etc.). Plants often excrete more of these signaling compounds in response to stress. PGPR-to-plant signaling compounds include phytohormones, acyl homoserine lactones, phenols and peptides and can also act as microbe to microbe signals (Barea 2015). Root exudates signal and recruit specific microbial communities. Secretion of malic acid in *Arabidopsis thaliana* in response to foliage pathogen attack stimulates the formation of beneficial biofilms in the rhizosphere (Rudrappa et al. 2008).

That plants and microbes use signal compounds to communicate during establishment of beneficial plant-microbe interactions (Desbrosses and Stougaard 2011), is well-described for the legume-rhizobia nitrogen fixing symbiosis (Oldroyd 2013), and somewhat elucidated for mycorrhizal associations (Gough and Cullimore 2011). In the legume-rhizobia relationship the plant releases flavonoid signals to rhizobia (Hassan and Mathesius 2012) or, in some cases, jasmonate signals (Mabood et al. 2006, 2014), followed by rhizobial production of lipo-chitooligosaccharides (LCOs) as return signals (Oldroyd 2013). The LCOs are bound by LysM receptors, which have kinase activity (Antolin-Llovera et al. 2012), changing root hormone

profile (Zamioudis et al. 2013) and triggering development of root nodules. Plants also communicate with, or otherwise influence the phytomicrobiome, affecting its composition and structure (Evangelisti et al. 2014). Bacteria also communicate among themselves (Cretoiu et al. 2013); quorum sensing via *N*-acyl homoserine lactone (Teplitski et al. 2000) is well characterized, and there are likely other, as of yet unknown, mechanisms (Lv et al. 2013). Quorum sensing signals can trigger immune responses and changes in hormone profiles in plants, leading to growth responses. Quorum sensing in the phytomicrobiome will be the subject of upcoming Frontiers in Plant Science theme volume (Plant responses to bacterial quorum sensing signal molecules, topic editors Schikora A, Hartmann A, and Munchen HZ). This sort of signaling almost certainly occurs in the phytomicrobiome. Plants also detect materials produced by potential pathogens and respond by activating response systems (Tena et al. 2011). Phytomicrobiome intercommunication in the rhizosphere dictates aspects of aboveground plant architecture and above-ground symbiotic/pathogenic microbial communities (Tena et al. 2011). Similarly, pathogen or herbivore attacks above ground can effect microbial community composition in the rhizosphere. Above ground injury has been shown to stimulate the production of signaling compounds in plant roots (Lakshmanan et al. 2012). Greater photosynthetic rates under elevated CO_2 conditions have been shown to change microbial community composition in the rhizosphere (He et al. 2012). Understanding plant responses to microbial signals via proteomics (Rose et al. 2012) and metabolomics (Zhang et al. 2012) studies has added valuable knowledge toward developing effective low-cost and eco-friendly practices to reduce fossil-fuel dependent crop inputs, leading to interest in phytomicrobiomes engineered to enhanced plant growth under variable soil and climatic conditions, improving global crop productivity.

Surprisingly, LCOs are also able to stimulate plant growth directly (Wang et al. 2012); confirmed by Oláh et al. (2005) for root growth in *Medicago truncatula*, Chen et al. (2007) for accelerated flowering (a typical response to stress) and increased yield in tomato, and stimulation of early somatic embryo development in Norway spruce (Dyachok et al. 2002). Enhanced germination and seedling growth, along with the mitogenic nature of LCOs, suggest accelerated meristem activity. Products based on LCOs are now used to treat seed sown into several 10s of million ha of crop land each year, largely corn and soybean. A similar jasmonate product is now available. The effects of LCOs are much greater when stress (salt, drought, cold) is present than under optimum conditions (Prudent et al. 2015). Thuricin 17, a bacteriocin produced by *Bacillus thuringiensis* NEB17 isolated from soybean roots, improves plant growth and resilience to stress (Subramanian 2014). Inhibition of legume nodulation, and of overall plant growth, by stressful conditions can be overcome by LCOs (nodulation – Zhang and Smith 1995; plant growth – Prudent et al. 2015); Estévez et al. (2009) showed that at least one rhizobial strain produce different LCOs when grown under salt stress, and that salt stress itself can induce the *nod* genes of this strain (Guasch-Vidal et al. 2013).

6.3 Global Food Demand and Sustainable Agriculture

With increasing in global population, which is propelled by a 2.3 billion person, increase results more demand for agricultural crops (Godfray et al. 2010). In order to meet the demands for food, as activities like land clearing and more intensive use of existing croplands is a common practice, which possesses environmental impacts, and tradeoffs of these alternative paths of agricultural expansion are unclear. Dirzo and Raven (2003)reported that agriculture already has major global environmental impacts includes land clearing and habitat fragmentation threaten biodiversity as about one-quarter of global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions result from crop production, land clearing and fertilization (Burney et al. 2010), and these practices can harm terrestrial ecosystems, freshwater and marine (Vitousek et al. 1997). Quantitative assessments are required to achieve greater yields with lower impacts in order to fulfill future demands for food.

The conjecture of 2050 worldwide yield request and after that quantitatively assess the worldwide effects land clearing, nitrogen fertilizer use, and GHG release of elective methodologies by which this worldwide harvest request may be accomplished. To do these examinations, we aggregated yearly rural and populace information for 1961–2007 acquired from the FAOSTAT database (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; http://faostat.fao.org/) and different hotspots for every one of 100 substantial countries that contained 91% of the 2006 worldwide populace. At that point we determined net national interest for harvest calories and yield protein for every country for every year dependent on national yearly yields, generation, imports, and fares of 275 noteworthy yields (those yields utilized as human nourishments or domesticated animals and fish bolsters). The resultant per capita interest for calories or protein from all nourishment or feed crops joined envelops yearly human harvest utilization, crop use for animals and fish creation, and all misfortunes (waste and deterioration amid sustenance and yield generation, stockpiling, transport, and assembling). To decide long haul worldwide patterns and better control for financial contrasts among countries, countries were collected into seven monetary gatherings going from most astounding (Group A) to least (Group G) national normal per capita genuine (inflation-adjusted) (GDP).

6.3.1 Worldwide Crop Demand

Examinations uncover a straightforward and transiently reliable worldwide connection between per capita GDP and per capita interest for yield calories or protein. Over all years, per capita harvest use was correspondingly subject to per capita GDP both inside and among the seven monetary gatherings. The size of this reliance is shockingly expansive. In 2000, for instance, per capita utilization of calories and protein by the most extravagant countries (Group A) were 256% and 430% more noteworthy, individually, than use by the most unfortunate countries (Groups F and G).

These expansive contrasts in harvest request somewhat result from more prominent dietary meat utilization at higher pay (Poleman and Thomas 1995; Keyzer et al. 2005) and the low effectiveness with which a few sorts of animals convert crop calories and protein into eatable sustenances (Smil 2002). These analyses forecast that global demand for crop calories would increase by 100% ± 11% and global demand for crop protein would increase by 110% ± 7% (mean ± SE) from 2005 to 2050. This projected doubling is lower than the 176% (caloric) and 238% (protein) increases in global crop use that would occur if per capita demands of all nations in 2050 reached the 2005 levels of Group A nations. Any projection of future worldwide yield creation involves numerous components of vulnerability and of need underscores some possibly causative factors over others. Our conjecture of a 100–110% expansion in worldwide yield creation by 2050 is bigger than the 70% expansion that has been anticipated for this equivalent period (Tilman et al. 2002).

6.3.2 Quantification of Yield, Input, and Climate Relationships

The natural effects of multiplying worldwide crop production will rely upon how expanded generation is accomplished (Foley et al. 2011). Food generation could be expanded by agrarian intensification (that is, clearing extra land for harvest creation) or escalation (i.e., accomplishing higher yields through expanded data sources, enhanced agronomic practices, enhanced harvest assortments and different developments). The worldwide effects ashore clearing, GHG emanations, and nitrogen treatment of option pathways of agrarian advancement that meet the 2050 worldwide harvest generation is evaluated. Specifically, blends of present or enhanced farming innovations, upgrades to soil ripeness, and land clearing that could meet our anticipated 2050 worldwide caloric interest and what their natural effects would be assesed. For quickness, results for protein are not introduced here but rather are comparative. Due to information accessibility, we use past Nitrogen treatment rates as quantitative proportions of soil richness upgrade, yet we accentuate that dirt fruitfulness can likewise be improved by vegetables, spread harvests, and different methods and that yields could increment with less Nitrogen manure than before if Nitrogen use productivity builds (Chen et al. 2011). The numerous relapses to evaluate how country to-country and year-to-year contrasts in caloric yields have been identified with Nitrogen preparation power (N ha^{-1}) and different factors that are thought to affect yields. We found that caloric yields were at the same time identified with Nitrogen treatment power, precipitation, potential evapotranspiration, soil pH, rise, time (year), and monetary gathering. A less complex relapse that included just Nitrogen preparation power, precipitation, monetary gathering, and time gave comparative outcomes. Two generally comparative relapses utilized only 2005 information. These four relapses demonstrate that ∼80% of national-level variety in caloric yields was measurably clarified by a couple of fundamental factors. We utilize these fitted connections to measure situations, investigating the potential impacts of changes in these factors on caloric yields and the earth. We do as such with the proviso that the fitted connections need not be

characteristic of causation, while taking note of that fits are steady with different examinations of controls of yields (Foley et al. 2011). Subsequent to controlling for Nitrogen treatment, atmosphere, soil, and rise in these relapses, we will, for curtness, allude to the remaining yield contrasts attributed to financial gatherings as for the most part reflecting mechanical and framework variations among the monetary gatherings, and we will allude to the lingering yield contrasts that are credited to time (year) as essentially reflecting innovative upgrades from 1965 to 2005.

6.3.3 Alternative Pathways of Agricultural Expansion

These relapses can assess the reliance of worldwide yields on Nitrogen use (soil fruitfulness upgrade) if future technological advances were to proceed with observed temporal patterns to 2050 (innovation enhancement), on the off chance that under yielding countries were to beat mechanical differences by adjusting and, at that point receiving the high-yielding advances of Group A countries (innovation exchange), or if both innovation enhancement and innovation exchange were to happen. Specifically, we utilized our relapse results to measure bends characterizing the reliance of worldwide caloric yields on worldwide Nitrogen use for four cases that all meet our anticipated 2050 crop caloric demand forecast. For all cases, we accepted that the as of now substantial abberations among countries in farming powers (estimated here as Nitrogen ha^{-1}) were wiped out by 2050. We call this adjustment of Nitrogen utilize key N use, since it gives a bigger increment in worldwide harvest generation per unit of Nitrogen than would happen from more noteworthy Nitrogen use in countries as of now applying Nitrogen at high rates.

6.4 Genetic Engineering and Public Perception

As per Biotech Survey, different attitudes towards a total of ten concrete applications of genetic engineering and this selection reflects a wide extent of technical applications of genetic engineering in the fields of human, animal, plant and microbe genetics. On summarization off the assessments of these applications, a similar picture is obtained to the general assessment of genetic engineering where we are confronted with prevailing ambivalence. Only a marginal proportion of a little over 2% of the people interviewed assesses all applications consistently positively or negatively. By and large, the general population interviewed with endorses of around four applications and about 3.7 applications are opposed. This overwhelming undecided attitude design to a great extent blurs while thinking about the frames of mind towards the individual utilizations of genetic engineering. Therapeutic utilizations of genetic engineering meet with the most elevated endorsement. Three out of four individuals interviewed with endorse of this application, just 7% have a negative judgment. Uses of genetic engineering for the treatment of cell ailments meet with a correspondingly positive evaluation, they are affirmed of by 70%. The utilization of genetic engineering in the creation of antibodies and for the generation of

genetically altered microorganisms for the debasement of oil contamination in soil meets with to some degree less endorsement (Beck 1986; Rayner 1992). The two applications are evaluated decidedly by just about 66% of the general population met. Additionally, the utilization of genetic strategies for finding so as to analyze physical or mental sicknesses in unborn kids is evaluated all the more decidedly. An indemnity to this pervasively positive evaluation of restorative genetic engineering is the wide objection to the reproducing breeding of laboratory animals with certain hereditary deformities. Pretty much consistently individual met determinedly rejects this application (Zapf et al. 1987). The general population interviewed with responded all the more fundamentally to alleged 'green' genetic engineering, the use of hereditary building techniques in farming. In the utilization of genetic engineering for enhancing the obstruction of harvests against insects or plant ailments ('resistance breeding'), endorsement exceeds objection by a restricted edge of 36% to 33%. In any case, the utilization of genetic engineering as a development quickening agent in harvests is seen substantially more fundamentally: just 20% of the general population interviewed with affirms of these applications; the greater part of the general population talked with reject this application; while of this extent of chose rivals, 35% delineates thorough dismissal. The two last applications demonstrate that in fact fundamentally the same as utilizations of genetic engineering are evaluated diversely relying upon the application objective and its goal. The utilization of genetic engineering in the field of foodstuffs, for the alteration of support, to expand time span of usability or enhance the outward appearance of foodstuffs is surveyed amazingly fundamentally.

6.4.1 Assessment of Genetic Engineering and Its Applications

The very separated appraisal of genetic engineering by people most importantly demonstrates that, in view of a general evaluation drawing an equalization about genetic engineering, one can't finish up deterministically with regards to the appraisal of a solitary solid application (Hampel and Renn 1999). Both the rearing of transgenic animals so as to expand their agrarian value and hereditarily built foodstuffs are rejected (67% and 59%, individually) even by a dominant part of those affirming of genetic engineering, though, then again, half of genetic engineering rivals support of the utilization of genetic modified microscopic organisms for the corruption of oil contamination in soil and for the clinical determination of incurable sicknesses. How strong does the power of explanation of attitudes towards specific applications of genetic engineering become if all of them together are used to explain the overall assessment of genetic engineering? A multiple linear regression reveals an accounting for a proportion of 25% of the variance of the overall assessment of genetic engineering. The strongest influence on the assessment of genetic engineering is exerted by the attitudes towards genetic therapy, those towards increasing resistance in crops, towards clinical diagnosing and towards increasing yield in crops. Thus, both positively and negatively assessed applications of genetic engineering are used for the overall assessment of genetic engineering.

The ambivalent assessment of genetic engineering can be interpreted as a consequence of this cognitive dissonance (Habermas 1969; Brosius 1998). One of first lead is the summarizing of positive, ambivalent and negative assessments of genetic engineering across all specific applications. This additive index method leads to a distinctly higher proportion of the accounted-for variance of the overall assessment of genetic engineering in general ($r^2 = 0.57$). The cause of this is a sufficient concurrence of positive (55%) and negative (58%) attitudes towards genetic engineering. Ambivalent attitudes, however, are consistent to only about 46%.

6.4.2 Assessment of Genetic Engineering Via Social Dimension

Frames of mind are inactive subjective factors reliant on social determinants. The attitudes objects are associated as genetic engineering with past involvement, conceivable concern, and respond with fluctuating interest, or pay regard to the assessment of others regarding the matter (Gaskell et al. 1998; Peters 1999). Intrigue is a pertinent psychological precondition for the age of a frame of mind. Intrigue mirrors our worry and the significance of the mentality article to us. Genetic engineering is viewed as a vital subject; in any case, here we should proclaim a disparity between the foreseen social noteworthiness of the subject and the individual significance. In 75% of the considerable number of individuals interviewed with, we met with a high foreseen significance; a high social noteworthiness is, in reality, accepted by 90% surprisingly met. Notwithstanding, at about 65%, the individual enthusiasm for genetic engineering isn't articulated, with simply 20% of the general population interviewed with considering the subject as 'fascinating'. The rather restricted significance of communication within the social network (friends, acquaintances, relatives, colleagues at work) also speaks against a high personal significance. In the weeks preceding our review, just 40% of the general population met had discussed or examined genetic engineering with other individuals. On the off chance that those individuals are incorporated who had sooner or later recently talked in any event once about genetic engineering in their interpersonal organization and a more extended timeframe prior, this extent increments to 45%

Notwithstanding, the correspondence about hereditary designing is emotionally seen as serious. Of the general population met, 64% who examined hereditary building in their informal organization expect that this correspondence likewise prompt changes in demeanor. The greater part of the general population talked with see themselves here in the situation of supposition pioneer. Another applicable capacity of an interpersonal organization is its use as a wellspring of data, which, in any case, requires the nearness of very much educated individuals in the system concerned. In our examination, 27% of the general population solicited avows the nearness from such a 'genetic engineering master or source'. Be that as it may, just somewhat more than half of these individuals (55%) have really conveyed about genetic engineering. These findings likewise show the main moderate essentialness of genetic engineering as a point of regular correspondence. At the point when individuals are talking about genetic engineering in their informal communities, the

likelihood of their appraisals being affirmed are moderately high. With estimations of r = 0.57 (partners at work), r = 0.55 (companions) and r = 0.41 (relatives) the connections between's their very own evaluation and the apparent propensities of assessment in the informal organizations are certainly critical.

Around half of the general population interviewed with who in any capacity imparted about hereditary designing in their interpersonal organization expect that their very own mentalities are met with endorsement in their system. Just little the general population interviewed with move in a hereditary building related offensive system, where advertisers convey in systems to a great extent incredulous of genetic engineering or where commentators impart in informal communities to a great extent strong of hereditary building. Of the general population met, those with a conflicted disposition toward genetic engineering demonstrate the most reduced relationship (decided with the assistance of a file speaking to the propensities of sentiment in the general informal community) between their own appraisal and the apparent inclinations of supposition in their interpersonal organization (r = 0.20). Restricted to that, advertisers live in increasingly consistent systems (r = 0.38). The most noteworthy simultaneousness between their very own conclusion and that predominant in their informal organization is to be found with genetic engineering adversaries (r = 0.47).

As contrasting to supporters of hereditary designing, commentators of hereditary building don't just will in general live in systems where their feelings are shared; they additionally observe themselves more in concurrence with the popular conclusion. The appraisal of popular sentiment with respect to the general population enquired is unmistakably more wary than the individual supposition range. Genetic engineering has an unmistakably negative picture in general society. Around 80% of the advertisers accept that conflicted (38%) or dismissing (42%) mentalities will in general win among the overall population. In any case, just 40% of the faultfinders of genetic engineering trust that their own appraisal goes amiss from the popular feeling.

6.5 Sustainable Agricultural Intensifications and Food Production

In wider range of sustainable agriculture, the desire to produce more food without environmental impairment, or even positive contributions to natural and social capital has been reflected as for a 'doubly green revolution' (Conway 1997a, b), for an 'evergreen revolution' for 'alternative agriculture' (NRC 1989), for 'greener revolutions' (Snapp et al. 2010) and for 'evergreen agriculture' (Garrity et al. 2010), for 'agroecological intensification' (Milder et al. 2012), for 'green food systems' (DEFRA 2012). On recommendation, that agricultural and uncultivated frameworks should never again be considered as isolated from one another. In light of the requirement for the division likewise to contribute specifically to the goals of worldwide social– ecological difficulties, there have additionally been calls for

nutrition-sensitive (Thompson and Amoroso 2011), atmosphere keen (FAO 2013) and low-carbon (Norse 2012) farming. Sustainable generation frameworks should show various key traits at the creation end of food systems (Royal Society 2009). They should: Agricultural frameworks accentuating these standards will in general showcase various wide highlights that recognize them from the procedure and results of customary frameworks. In the first place, these frameworks will in general be multifunctional inside landscapes and economies (IAASTD 2009). They together produce nourishment and different merchandise for agriculturists and markets, while adding to a scope of esteemed open products, for example, clean water, natural life and living spaces, carbon sequestration, flood insurance, groundwater revive, scene comfort esteem, and recreation and the travel industry openings. In their setup, they gain by the collaborations and efficiencies that emerge from complex biological communities, social and monetary powers (NRC 2010).

(a) Utilize crop assortments and domesticated animals breeds with a high proportion of efficiency to utilization of remotely and inside determined sources of information
(b) Avoid the superfluous utilization of outside sources of information
(c) Harness agro ecological procedures, for example, supplement cycling, organic nitrogen obsession, allelopathy, predation and parasitism;
(d) Minimize utilization of advancements or practices that impact nature and human wellbeing
(e) Make gainful utilization of human capital as learning and ability to adjust and develop and of social funding to determine normal scene scale or framework wide issues
(f) Minimize the effects of framework the executives on externalities, for example, GHG outflows, clean water, carbon sequestration, biodiversity, and dispersal of bugs, pathogens and weeds.

Still, these frameworks are differing, synergistic and custom fitted to their specific social– natural settings. There are numerous pathways towards rural supportability, and no single setup of advancements, inputs and biological administration is bound to be generally relevant than another. Agrarian manageability suggests the need to fit these components to the particular conditions of various rural frameworks (Horlings and Marsden 2011). Difficulties, procedures and results will likewise differ crosswise over rural segments: in the UK, for instance, Elliot et al. (2013) found that animals and dairy activities progressing towards maintainability had specific troubles in lessening contamination while endeavoring to build yields. Thirdly, these frameworks frequently include progressively complex blends of tamed plant and creature species and related administration systems, requiring more noteworthy abilities and learning by ranchers. To build generation effectively and reasonably, ranchers need to comprehend under what conditions agrarian sources of info (seeds, manures and pesticides) can either supplement or negate organic procedures and biological community benefits that intrinsically bolster horticulture (Royal Society

2009). In all cases, ranchers need to see with their own eyes that additional multi-faceted nature and expanded learning sources of info can result in considerable net advantages to efficiency. Fourthly, these frameworks rely upon new arrangements of social capital, involving relations of trust typified in social associations, flat and vertical organizations among foundations, and human capital containing authority, resourcefulness, the executive's aptitudes and ability to advance. Rural frameworks with large amounts of social and human resources can advance despite vulnerability (Friis-Hansen 2012), and agriculturist to-rancher learning has been appeared to be especially essential in actualizing the setting explicit, information concentrated and regenerative practices of feasible strengthening (Rosset and Martínez-Torres 2012).

Regular reasoning about agricultural maintainability has frequently expected that it suggest a net decrease in info use, in this way making such frameworks basically broad (requiring more land to deliver a similar measure of sustenance). Natural frameworks regularly acknowledge lower yields per territory of land so as to decrease input use and increment the positive effect on common capital. Be that as it may, such natural frameworks may at present be effective if the board, learning and data are substituted for bought outer sources of info. Ongoing proof demonstrates that effective horticultural manageability activities and undertakings emerge from movements in the components of rural creation- for instance from utilization of manures to nitrogen-settling vegetables; from pesticides to accentuation on regular adversaries; from furrowing to zero-culturing). A superior idea is one that fixates on increase of assets, improving utilization of existing assets (for example land, water and biodiversity) and innovations (IAASTD 2009; Royal Society 2009; NRC 2010).

Similarity of the terms 'economical' and 'heightening' was indicated during the 1980s and after that initially utilized related in a paper inspecting the status and capability of African farming (Pretty 1997). Until this point, 'heightening' had turned out to be synonymous for a kind of agribusiness that definitely caused damage while delivering sustenance (for example Conway and Barbier 1990). Similarly, 'supportable' was viewed as a term to be connected to everything that can possibly be great about horticulture. The mix of the terms was an endeavor to show that attractive finishes (more nourishment, better condition) could be accomplished by an assortment of methods. The term was additionally advanced by its utilization in various key reports: Reaping the Benefits (Royal Society 2009), The Future of Food and Farming (Foresight 2011) and Save and Grow (FAO 2011). Supportable strengthening (SI) is characterized as a procedure or framework where yields are expanded without unfriendly ecological effect and without the development of more land (Royal Society 2009). The idea is therefore generally open, in that it doesn't expressive or benefit a specific vision of rural generation (Smith 2013). It underscores closes as opposed to implies, and does not pre-decide advancements, species blend or specific structure segments. Feasible strengthening can be recognized from previous originations of 'agricultural escalation' because of its unequivocal accentuation on a more extensive arrangement of drivers, needs and objectives than exclusively efficiency upgrade.

6.5.1 Sustainable Intensification: Emergent Criticisms

Currently, the evolving conceptual and theoretical field of SI has been shaped by a number of debates as Garnett and Godfray (2012) reviewed key contentions and debates surrounding SI, classifying these into three groups. The first relates to the vision and mode of SI, wherein the term is assumed to set down particular forms of agriculture deemed incompatible for various reasons. The second questions the justification for SI, and a third set of questions relates to the theoretical basis of SI: which is more important, 'sustainable' or 'intensification', and how do they relate to each other?

One conflict identifies with the potential for SI to be deciphered just as a 'productivist' venture. Much analysis of regular agribusiness center around worries over vast scale mechanical monocultures concerned just with expanding yields and the gross profitability of frameworks. Notwithstanding, a great horticulture would likewise be proficient in its utilization of assets, and impartial in giving access to its nourishment created (Foresight 2011). In partner SI with an account that proposes creation is the main key standard for agribusiness, a few pundits have asked whether the idea speaks to an adequately extreme takeoff from 'the same old thing'. Some have featured unmistakable and contending 'solid' and 'frail' translations of SI. 'Frail' elucidations might be available to the charge of advancing 'an obvious paradoxical expression' (Lang and Barling 2012) that may basically be utilized as a 'greenwash'. Such a view is exemplified by the ongoing declaration of a UK MP who communicated worry that '… is there not a threat that it [SI] will be utilized as a Trojan pony for the individuals who need us to have parcels more biotech and GM, etc.? … is there a potential clash between how this thought may be utilized and the eventual fate of little scale cultivating?' (Lucas 2011). Certain in the 'Trojan pony' contention is the idea of a relationship between 'expansive scale' and specific innovations, and a qualification between the estimations of 'huge' and 'little', with an understood inclination for just the last mentioned. This focuses to a pressure between various originations of what is great in farming, and uncovers a portion of the intricacy that SI must explore. Garnett and Godfray (2012) feature the center standards of the term, which has a transparency that 'means a yearning of what is to be accomplished as opposed to a depiction of existing generation frameworks, regardless of whether this be regular high-input cultivating, or smallholder agribusiness, or methodologies dependent on natural strategies. Practically speaking, it may not be anything but difficult to recognize approaches. For instance, protection farming (CA) and coordinated nuisance the board (IPM) can both be thought of differently as SI, as agro ecology, as 'atmosphere brilliant horticulture', as 'environmental escalation' or basically as a 'greener agribusiness' (Kassam et al. 2009). These terms ponder contrasting needs horticultural information sources and yields yet 'all should draw in with the truth that there are hard exchange offs between various alluring results and awkward decisions for all partners' (Garnett and Godfray 2012). Going past privileging a specific rural innovation, concentrating just on alluring social– natural results, there is a need to assess any innovation, approach or practice even-mindedly and observationally, and judge it on its benefits: does it produce

more nourishment per unit of asset; and does it do as such without damage to the earth? It stays clear, however, that better agrarian and nourishment frameworks could be envisioned by decreasing sustenance squander, expanding network commitment and lessening imbalance, paying little respect to the types of creation in fields and ranches (Stock 2015). As essential in horticultural frameworks to agriculturists and specialists are comes back to work, and the conveyance of advantages among ladies and men.

Notwithstanding, even the transparency of SI tosses some troublesome inquiries into alleviation. Characterizing 'maintainability' has dependably been hard. Similarly as with various adaptations of supportability, it is conceivable to contend that SI has 'light' and 'dim' green understandings. Characterizing limits – among horticulture and other financial divisions or around units of scene (ranches, watersheds, scenes) or around time ranges (5-year designs, decades, crosswise over ages) – is additionally troublesome as a result of fragmented learning, consistently advancing conditions and various human qualities (Garnett and Godfray 2012). Once more, results are critical: social and political changes might be expected to guarantee that yield increments conveyed through SI really decrease appetite and neediness (Holt-Giménez and Altieri 2013). Wording can shroud varieties by and by, and regularly manageability results. For instance, IPM establishes a wide scope of strategies, practices and advancements accessible to decrease irritation, weed and sickness dangers. A few methodologies focus on agroecological the executives and territory configuration, utilizing the administrations of biodiversity on and off homestead. Others focus on booking of pesticides. Jacobsen et al. (2013) contend, numerous contentions about nourishing the world expect that we need a greater amount of our current, western eating routine, yet it ought to be clear that the total populace can all the more likely be bolstered, both agronomically, naturally and concerning human wellbeing, with an eating regimen not the same as what is most basic in the created present reality.' It isn't constantly acknowledged that yields should be expanded (Tomlinson 2013). Elliot et al. (2013) argument out that in specific cases, SI 'may not be a suitable technique because other biological community capacities might be esteemed more exceedingly than increments in nourishment creation.

A typical protest made about numerous agroecological approaches for SI is their apparent requirement for expanded work (Tripp 2005). Be that as it may, maintainability concerns are exceedingly site explicit: at times more work isn't required; in others the additional work required is viewed as an important commitment to neighborhood economies (De Schutter and Vanloqueren 2011). In a few settings, work is profoundly constraining, particularly where HIV-AIDS has evacuated a vast extent of the dynamic populace; in different settings, there is copious work accessible as there is couple of other business openings in the economy. Effective frameworks of maintainable strengthening by definition fit answers for nearby needs and settings, thus consequently assess work accessibility. In Kenya and Tanzania, for instance, female proprietors of raised beds for vegetable generation utilize neighborhood individuals to deal with vegetable development and promoting (Muhanji et al.

2011). Work for yield and domesticated animals the board is in this manner not really a limitation on new innovations.

In Burkina Faso, work gatherings of young fellows have risen for soil protection. Tassas and zai planting pits are most appropriate to landholdings where family work is accessible, or where ranch hands can be employed. The system has prompted a system of youthful day workers who have aced this procedure. Attributable to the accomplishment of land recovery, agriculturists are progressively purchasing corrupted land for development, and paying workers to burrow zai pits and build the stone dividers and half-moon structures, which have changed efficiency. This is one reason why >3 Mha of land are currently restored and beneficial. In different settings, however, movements to manageable frameworks, for example, consolidating agroforestry into maize frameworks in Africa has prompted both diminished and expanded work prerequisites, contingent upon the neighborhood social and environmental setting.

6.5.2 Sustainable Intensification: Evidences and Impacts

Archiving and assessing proof from SI is muddled and at times argumentative. In the first place, applied decent variety and the inclusivity of the methodology imply that it is hard to 'bound' assessments. Agroecological approaches include numerous practices, adjusted from spot to put contingent upon farmer and community needs. There might be no unmistakable calculated, methodological or down to earth separating line among 'elective' and 'ordinary' practice. Contingent upon need and capacity, agriculturists may apply agroecological standards to industrial farms, or present the automation and inorganic contributions to generally agroecologically-overseen farms (Milder et al. 2012). Where studies seek to demonstrate simultaneous improvements to yields and environmental outcomes, results are highly sensitive to the variables and parameters selected to capture environmental improvements, the time scales involved and any weightings used (Elliot et al. 2013).

A few evaluations have been found to experience the ill effects of methodological flaws (Milder et al. 2012). In the first place, in spite of the heterogeneity of practices associated with any heightening procedure, appraisals regularly focus around yields from explicit, named methodologies –, for example, CA, agroforestry or IPM. Investigation of particular methodologies is likewise troublesome. For instance, proof on results from CA and the arrangement of rice escalation (SRI) is blended, and debate on the general relevance and adaptability of these methodologies has been 'prominent, continued and now and again bitter and emotive' (Sumberg et al. 2013). Furthermore, amalgamations, meta-examinations and reviews have so far concentrated essentially on yield increments as opposed to on various results and advantages (however observe Milder et al. 2012). At last, there is not yet adequate information on how extraordinary agroecological techniques may meet total territorial and worldwide objectives.

Halfway of the fact that SI is an umbrella term that incorporates a wide range of agrarian practices and advances, and on the grounds that it is more a methodology than an unmistakable arrangement of advances and procedures, the exact degree of existing SI practice is likewise obscure. Milder et al. (2012) estimate that all around somewhere in the range of 200 Mha of farming area are developed under some type of agroecological routine. Smallholder creation is especially reliant on sound biological systems nearby homesteads, and it has been assessed that a large portion of the world's smallholders practice some type of asset moderating agribusiness (IFAD and UNEP 2013).

Various amalgamations have featured expanded yields (among other positive social– environmental results) because of the use of agroecological techniques and update. These again have stressed the helpful results of both– and methodologies as opposed to either– or. Results are vital; pathways contrast. Yields, however, can be a rough proportion of the effective yields or effects of horticultural frameworks, especially where increasingly feasible frameworks are relied upon to impactsly affect the common segments of both farming and wild frameworks and territories. It is in creating nations that probably the most noteworthy advancement towards economical strengthening has been made in the previous two decades. The biggest examination involved the investigation of 286 undertakings in 57 nations (Pretty et al. 2006). Taking all things together, some 12•6 million ranchers on 37 Mha were occupied with changes towards farming supportability in these 286 activities (Pretty 2008).

The Government Office of Science, UK Foresight programme commissioned reviews and analyses from 40 projects in 20 countries of Africa where SI had been developed in the 2000s (Pretty et al. 2011, 2014). The cases comprised crop improvements, agroforestry and soil conservation, CA, IPM, fodder crop integration, horticultural intensification, livestock aquaculture, and novel policies and partnerships. These projects had documented benefits for 10·4 million farmers and their families and improvements on approx. 12·75 Mha by early on 2010. Across the projects, yields of crops rose on average by a factor of 2·13 (i.e. slightly more than doubled). The time scale for these improvements varied from 3 to 10 years. It was estimated that this resulted in an increase in aggregate food production of 5·79 Mt $year^{-1}$, equivalent to 557 kg per farming household. Milder et al. (2012) undertook a broad review of five sets of agro ecological systems, examining their contribution to yields, as well as nine distinct ecosystem services which were relevant to both on- and off-farm beneficiaries. In 1989, the US National Research Council (NRC) distributed the original Alternative Agriculture. Incompletely determined by expanded expenses of compost and pesticide contributions, in addition to developing shortage of common assets, (for example, groundwater for water system), and proceeded with soil disintegration, agriculturists had been embracing novel methodologies in a wide assortment of homestead frameworks. The NRC noticed that 'elective horticulture' was 'not a solitary arrangement of cultivating rehearses', that they were good with substantial and little ranches and that they were regularly broadened. Such option farming frameworks utilized harvest turns, IPM, soil and water rationing culturing, creature generation frameworks that underlined sickness counteractive action without anti-microbials, and hereditary enhancement of yields

to oppose nuisances and illness and use supplements all the more productively. Very much-estimated elective cultivating frameworks 'almost constantly utilized less manufactured compound pesticides, composts and anti-infection agents per unit of creation than practically identical ordinary homesteads' (NRC 1989). They likewise required 'more data, prepared work, time and the board aptitudes per unit of generation. The NRC (1989) dispatched 11 point by point contextual investigations of 14 cultivates as models of viable and distinctive ways to deal with accomplishing comparable points: monetarily fruitful homesteads with a positive effect on normal capital. The NRC (2010) led follow-up concentrates in 2008 on ten of the first homesteads. These included incorporated crop– animal's endeavors, foods grown from the ground ranches, one hamburger cows farm and one rice ranch. Following 22 years, regular highlights of ranches notwithstanding: In France, the IAD (2011) has required another European horticulture based around keeping up solid soil, biodiversity, suitable preparation and fitting plant assurance strategies. Testing 26 markers classed into seven subjects (financial suitability, social reasonability, input effectiveness, soil quality, water quality, GHG discharges and biodiversity) crosswise over 160 distinct kinds of ranch, the creators found that positive natural externalities can be both accomplished and estimated. Together, these pointers contain an extensive scorecard that can be connected to test advance towards the generation of positive environmental externalities just as support of profitability.

(a) All ranches underscoring the significance of keeping up and developing their characteristic asset base and augmenting the utilization of inner assets;
(b) All ranchers stressing the estimations of ecological maintainability and the significance of shut supplement cycles;
(c) The crop ranches accentuating watchful soil the executives, the utilization of harvest turns and spread yields; the domesticated animals ranches proceeding with the board rehearses that did not utilize hormones or anti-infection agents;
(d) More agriculturists taking an interest in non-customary item and direct deals markets (through ranchers markets as well as the web); some moving at a higher cost than normal with named attributes (for example natural, normally raised domesticated animals);
(e) Farms depending vigorously on relatives for work and the board; and
(f) The difficulties and dangers focused on rising area and rental qualities related with urban advancement weight, the accessibility of water and the spread of new weed species.

Farmers adopting SI approaches have been able to increase food outputs by sustainable intensification in two ways. The first is multiplicative – by which yields per hectare have increased by combining use of new and improved varieties with changes to agronomic–agro ecological management. The second is improved food outputs by additive means – by which diversification of farms resulted in the emergence of a range of new crops, livestock or fish that added to the existing staples or vegetables already being cultivated. These additive system enterprises included the following. Environmental externalities have been shown to be positive. Carbon

content of soils is improved where legumes and shrubs are used, and where conservation agriculture increases the return of organic residues to the soil. Legumes also fix nitrogen in soils, thereby reducing the need for inorganic fertilizer on subsequent crops. In IPM-based projects, most have seen reductions in synthetic pesticide use (e.g. in cotton and vegetables in Mali, pesticide use fell to an average of 0·25 L ha^{-1} from 4·5 L ha^{-1}: Settle and Hama Garba 2011). In some cases, biological control agents have been introduced where pesticides were not being used at all, or habitat design has led to effective pest and disease management (Royal Society 2009; Khan et al. 2011). The greater diversity of trees, crops (e.g. beans, fodder shrubs and grasses) and non-cropped habitats has generally helped to reduce runoff and soil erosion, and thus increased groundwater reserves. Projects across sub-Saharan Africa, where nutrient supply is a key constraint, have used a mix of inorganic fertilizers, organics, composts, legumes, and fertilizer trees and shrubs to improve nutrient availability, in conjunction with conservation tillage to improve soil health. Policy and institutional support has also been important. The Malawi fertilizer subsidy programme is a rare example of a national policy that has led to substantial changes in farm use of fertilizers and the rapid shift of the country from food deficit to food exporter (Dorward and Chirwa 2011). In this case, the importance of both bonding social capital between farmers in groups and linking social capital between national institutions and farmers was critical to rapid adoption.

(a) Aquaculture for fish raising (in fish ponds or concrete tanks) (Brummett and Jamu 2011).
(b) Small patches of land used for raised beds and vegetable cultivation (Muhanji et al. 2011).
(c) Rehabilitation of formerly degraded land (Sawadogo 2011).
(d) Fodder grasses and shrubs that provide food for livestock (and increase milk productivity) (Wambugu et al. 2011).
(e) Raising of chickens, and zero-grazed sheep and goats (Roothaert et al. 2011).
(f) New crops or trees brought into rotations with staple yields not affected, such as pigeonpea, soyabean, indigenous trees (Asaah et al. 2011).
(g) Adoption of short-maturing varieties (e.g. sweet potato, cassava) that permit the cultivation of two crops per year instead of one (Roothaert and Magado 2011)

References

Adesemoye, A. O., Torbert, H. A., & Kloepper, J. W. (2009). Plant growth promoting rhizobacteria allow reduced application rates of chemical fertilizers. *Microbial Ecology, 58*, 921–929. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00248-009-9531-y.

Antolin-Llovera, M. A., Ried, M. K., Binder, A., & Parniske, M. (2012). Receptor kinase signaling pathways in plant-microbe interactions. *Annual Review of Phytopathology, 50*, 451–473. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-phyto-081211-173002.

Asaah, E. K., Tchoundjeu, Z., Leakey, R. R. B., Takousting, B., Njong, J., & Edang, I. (2011). Trees, agroforestry and multifunctional agriculture in Cameroon. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability, 9*, 110–119.

Atieno, M., Herrmann, L., Okalebo, R., & Lesueur, D. (2012). Efficiency of different formulations of Bradyrhizobium japonicum and effect of coinoculation of Bacillus subtilis with two different strains of Bradyrhizobium japonicum. *World Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology, 28*, 2541–2550. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11274-012-1062-x.

Badri, D. V., Zolla, G., Bakker, M. G., Manter, D. K., & Vivanco, J. M. (2013). Potential impact of soil microbiomes on the leaf metabolome and on herbivore feeding behavior. *The New Phytologist, 198*, 264–273. https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.12124.

Barea, J. M. (2015). Future challenges and perspectives for applying microbial biotechnology in sustainable agriculture based on a better understanding of plant-microbe interactions. *Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition, 15*, 261–282. https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-95162015005000021.

Beck, U. (1986). *Risikogesellschaft. Auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Brosius, F. (1998). *SPSS 8. Professionelle Statistik unter Windows*. Bonn: MITP.

Brummett, R. E., & Jamu, D. M. (2011). From researcher to farmer: Partnerships in integrated aquaculture–agriculture systems in Malawi and Cameroon. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability, 9*, 282–289.

Burney, J. A., Davis, S. J., & Lobell, D. B. (2010). Greenhouse gas mitigation by agricultural intensification. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 107*, 12052–12057.

Chen, C., McIver, J., Yang, Y., Bai, Y., Schultz, B., & McIver, A. (2007). Foliar applicationoflipochitooligosaccharides(Nodfactors)totomato(*Lycopersicon esculentum*) enhancesfloweringandfruitproduction. *Canadian Journal of Plant Science, 87*, 365–372. https://doi.org/10.4141/P06-164.

Chen, X. P., et al. (2011). Integrated soil-crop system management for food security. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 108*, 6399–6404.

Compant, S., Clement, C., & Sessitsch, A. (2010a). Plant growth-promoting bacteria in the rhizo- and endosphere of plants: Their role, colonization, mechanisms involved and prospects for utilization. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 42*, 669–678. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2009.11.024.

Compant, S., van der Heijden, M. G. A., & Sessitsch, A. (2010b). Climate change effects on beneficial plant-microorganism interactions. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology, 73*, 197–214. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6941.2010.00900.x.

Conway, G. (1997a). *The doubly green revolution*. London: Penguin.

Conway, G. (1997b). *The doubly green revolution: Food for all in the 21st century*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Conway, G. R., & Barbier, E. B. (1990). *After the green revolution. Sustainable agriculture for development*. London: Earthscan.

Cretoiu, M. S., Korthals, G. W., Visser, J. H. M., & van Elsas, J. D. (2013). Chitin amendment increases soil suppressiveness toward plant pathogens and modulates the actinobacterial and oxalobacteraceal communities in an experimental agricultural field. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology, 17*, 5291–5301. https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.01361-13.

De Schutter, O., & Vanloqueren, G. (2011). The new green revolution: How twenty-first-century science can feed the world. *Solutions, 2*, 33–44.

DEFRA (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs). (2012). *Green food project conclusions*. London: DEFRA.

Desbrosses, G. J., & Stougaard, J. (2011). Root nodulation: A paradigm for how plant-microbe symbiosis influences host developmental pathways. *Cell Host & Microbe, 10*, 348–358. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chom.2011.09.005.

Dirzo, R., & Raven, P. H. (2003). Global state of biodiversity and loss. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources, 28*, 137–167.

Dong, Z., Canny, M. J., McCully, M. E., Roboredo, M. R., Cabadilla, C. F., Ortega, E., et al. (1994). A nitrogen-fixing endophyte of sugarcane stems'. A new role for the apoplast. *Plant Physiology, 105*, 1139–1147.

Dorward, A., & Chirwa, E. (2011). The Malawi agricultural input subsidy programme: 2005/06 to 2008/09. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability, 9*, 232–247.
Dreze, J., & Sen, A. (1989). *Hunger und Public Aclion*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Drogue, B., Doré, H., Borland, S., Wisniewski-Dyé, F., & PrigentCombaret, C. (2012). Which specificity in cooperation between phytostimulating rhizobacteria and plants? *Research in Microbiology, 163*, 500–510. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resmic.2012.08.006.
Dyachok, J., Wiweger, M., Kenne, L., & andvonArnold, S. (2002). Endogenousnod- factor-like signalmoleculespromoteearlysomaticembryodevelopment inNorwayspruce. *Plant Physiology, 128*, 523–533. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.010547.
Elliot, J., Firbank, L. G., Drake, B., Cao, Y., & Gooday, R. (2013). *Exploring the concept of sustainable intensification*. http://www.snh.gov.uk/docs/A931058.pdf. (31 August 2014).
Engelmoer, D. J. P., Behm, J. E., & Kiers, E. T. (2014). Intense competition between arbuscular mycorrhizal mutualists in an in vitro root microbiome negatively affects total fungal abundance. *Molecular Ecology, 23*, 1584–1593. https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.12451.
Estévez, J., SoriaDíaz, M. E., FernándezdeCórdoba, F., Móron, B., Manyan, H., Gil, A., et al. (2009). DifferentandnewNodfactorsproducedby *Rhizobium tropici* CIAT899followingNastress. *FEMS Microbiology Letters, 293*, 220–231. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6968.2009.01540.x.
Evangelisti, E., Rey, T., & Schornack, S. (2014). Cross-interference of plant development and plant–microbe interactions. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology, 20*, 118–126. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbi.2014.05.014.
FAO. (1983). *World food security: A reappraisal of the concepts and approaches*. Rome: Director Generals Report.
FAO. (1996). *Rome declaration on world food security*. Rome: FAO.
FAO. (2002). *Factsheet on food quality and safety*. Rome: FAO.
FAO. (2011). *Save and grow: A policymaker's guide to the sustainable intensification of smallholder crop production*. Rome: FAO.
FAO. (2013). *Climate-smart agriculture sourcebook*. Rome: FAO.
Foley, J. A., et al. (2011). Solutions for a cultivated planet. *Nature, 478*, 337–342.
Foresight. (2011). *The future of global food and farming*. Final project report. London: Government Office for Science London.
Friis-Hansen, E. (2012). The empowerment route to well-being: An analysis of farmer field schools in East Africa. *World Development, 40*, 414–427.
Gaiero, J. R., Mccall, C. A., Thompson, K. A., Day, N. J., Best, A. S., & Dunfield, K. E. (2013). Inside the root microbiome: Bacterial root endophytes and plant growth promotion. *American Journal of Botany, 100*, 1738–1750. https://doi.org/10.3732/ajb.1200572.
Garnett, T., & Godfray, C. H. (2012). *Sustainable intensification in agriculture: Navigating a course through competing food system priorities*. Food Climate Research Network and the Oxford Martin Programme on the Future of Food, University of Oxford, UK.
Garrity, D. P., Akinnifesi, F. K., Ajayi, O. C., et al. (2010). Evergreen agriculture: A robust approach to sustainable food security in Africa. *Food Security, 2*, 197–214.
Gaskell, G., Bauer, M., & Durant, J. (1998). Public perceptions of biotechnology in 1996 Eurobarometer 46.1. In J. Durant, M. Bauer, & G. Gaskell (Eds.), *Biotechnology in the public sphere. A European sourcebook* (pp. 189–214). London: Science Museum.
Gittinger, J. P., Leslie, J., & Hoisington, C. (Eds.). (1987). *Food policy: Integrating supply, distribution and consumption* (EDI series in economic development). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Godfray, H. C. J., et al. (2010). Food security: The challenge of feeding 9 billion people. *Science, 327*, 812–818.
Gough, C., & Cullimore, J. (2011). Lipo-chitooligosaccharide signaling in endosymbiotic plant-microbe interactions. *Molecular Plant-Microbe Interactions, 8*, 867–878. https://doi.org/10.1094/MPMI-01-11-0019.
Gray, E. J., & Smith, D. L. (2005). Intracellular and extracellular PGPR: Commonalities and distinctions in the plant-bacterium signaling processes. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 37*, 395–412. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2004.08.030.

Guasch-Vidal, B., Estévez, J., Dardanelli, M. S., Soria-Díaz, M. E., de Córdoba, F. F., Balog, C. I., et al. (2013). HighNaClconcentrationsinducethenodgenesof *Rhizobiumtropici* CIAT899intheabsenceofflavonoidinducers. *Molecular Plant-Microbe Interactions, 26*, 451–460. https://doi.org/10.1094/MPMI-09-12-0213-R.

Habermas, J. (1969). *Technik und Wissenschaft als Ideologie*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Hampel, J., & Renn, O. (Eds.). (1999). Gentechnik in der Öffentlichkeit. *Wahrnehmung und Bewertungeiner umstrittenen Technologie.* Frankfurt am Main/New York: Campus.

Hartmann, A., Rothballer, M., Hense, B. A., & Schröder, P. (2014). Bacterial quorum sensing compounds are important modulators of microbe-plant interactions. *Frontiers in Plant Science, 5*, 131. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2014.00131.

Hassan, S., & Mathesius, U. (2012). The role of flavonoids in root– Rhizosphere signalling: Opportunities and challenges for improving plant– Microbe interactions. *Journal of Experimental Botany, 9*, 3429–3444. https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/err430.

He, Z., Piceno, Y., Deng, Y., Xu, M., Lu, Z., DeSantis, T., et al. (2012). The phylogenic composition and structure of soil microbial communities shifts in response to elevated carbon dioxide. *The International Society for Microbial Ecology, 6*, 259–272. https://doi.org/10.1038/ismej.2011.99.

Holt-Giménez, E., & Altieri, M. A. (2013). Agroecology, food sovereignty, and the new green revolution. *Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems, 37*, 90–102.

Horlings, L. G., & Marsden, T. K. (2011). Towards the real green revolution? Exploring the conceptual dimensions of a new ecological modernisation of agriculture that could 'feed the world'. *Global Environmental Change, 21*, 441–452.

IAASTD. (2009). *Agriculture at a crossroads. International assessment of agricultural knowledge, science and technology for development*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

IFAD and UNEP. (2013). *Smallholders, food security, and the environment*. Rome: International Fund for Agricultural Development.

Jacobsen, S., Sørensen, M., Pedersen, S. M., & Weiner, J. (2013). Feeding the world: Genetically modified crops versus agricultural biodiversity. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development, 33*, 651–662.

Jung, W. J., Mabood, F., Souleimanov, A., Park, R. D., & Smith, D. L. (2008). Chitinases produced by Paenibacillus illinoisensis and Bacillus thuringensis subsp. pakistani degrade Nod factor from Bradyrhizobium japonicum. *Microbiological Research, 163*, 345–349. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micres.2006.06.013.

Kassam, A., Friedrich, T., Shaxson, F., & Pretty, J. (2009). The spread of conservation agriculture: Justification, spread and uptake. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability, 7*, 292–320.

Keyzer, M. A., Merbis, M. D., Pavel, I. F. P. W., & van Wesenbeeck, C. F. A. (2005). Diet shifts towardsmeat and the effects on cereal use: Can we feed the animals in 2030? *Ecological Economics, 55*, 187–202.

Khan, Z., Midega, C., Pittchar, J., Pickett, J., & Bruce, T. (2011). Push-pull technology: A conservation agriculture approach for integrated management of insect pests, weeds and soil health in Africa. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability, 9*, 162–170.

Lakshmanan, V., Kitto, S. L., Caplan, J. L., Hsueh, Y.-H., Kearns, D. B., Wu, Y.-S., et al. (2012). Microbe-associated molecular patterns-triggered root responses mediate beneficial rhizobacterial recruitment in Arabidopsis. *Plant Physiology, 160*, 1642–1661. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.112.200386.

Lang, T., & Barling, D. (2012). Food security and food sustainability: Reformulating the debate. *Geographical Journal, 178*, 313–326.

Lebeis, S. L. (2015). Greater than the sum of their parts: Characterizing plant microbiomes at the community level. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology, 24*, 82–86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbi.2015.02.004.

Lee, K. D., Gray, E. J., Mabood, F., Jung, W. J., Charles, T., Clark, S. R. D., et al. (2009). The class IId bacteriocin thuricin 17 increases plant growth. *Planta, 229*, 747–755. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00425-008-0870-6.

Lucas, C. (2011). *Oral evidence taken before the environmental audit committee on sustainable food*. 11 May 2011. http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmenvaud/c879-i/c87901.htm (31 August 2014).

Lv, D., Ma, A., Tang, X., Bai, Z., Qi, H., & Zhuang, G. (2013). Profile of the culturable microbiome capable of producing acyl-homoserine lactone in the tobacco phyllosphere. *Journal of Environmental Sciences, 25*, 357–366. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1001-0742(12)60027-8.

Mabood, F., Zhou, X., Lee, K. D., & Smith, D. L. (2006). Methyl jasmonate, alone or in combination with genistein, and Bradyrhizobium japonicum increases soybean (Glycine max L.) plant dry matter production and grain yield under short season conditions. *Field Crops Research, 95*, 412–419. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2005.04.013.

Mabood, F., Zhou, X., & Smith, D. L. (2014). Microbial signaling and plant growth promotion. *Canadian Journal of Plant Science, 94*, 1051–1063. https://doi.org/10.4141/cjps2013-148.

Masciarelli, O., Llanes, A., & Luna, V. (2014). A new PGPR co-inoculated with Bradyrhizobium japonicum enhances soybean nodulation. *Microbiological Research, 169*, 609–615. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micres.2013.10.001.

Maxwell, O. (1995). *Land, labor. Food, and farming: A household analysis of urban agriculture in Kampala*. Uganda, Ph.D., dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Maxwell, S., & Smith, M. (1992). *Household food security: A conceptual review*. Mimeo: Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex.

Mengual, C., Schoebitz, M., Azcón, R., & Roldán, A. (2014). Microbial inoculants and organic amendment improves plant establishment and soil rehabilitation under semiarid conditions. *Journal of Environmental Management, 134*, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2014.01.008.

Milder, J. C., Garbach, K., DeClerck, F. A. J., Driscoll, L., & Montenegro, M. (2012). *An assessment of the multi-functionality of agroecological intensification*. A report prepared for the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

Muhanji, G., Roothaert, R. L., Webo, C., & Stanley, M. (2011). African indigenous vegetable enterprises and market access for small-scale farmers in East Africa. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability, 9*, 194–202.

Nelson, L. M. (2004). Plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR): Prospects for new inoculants. *Crop Management, 3*. https://doi.org/10.1094/CM-2004-0301-05-RV.

Norse, D. (2012). Low carbon agriculture: Objectives and policy pathways. *Environmental Development, 1*, 25–39.

NRC. (1989). *Alternative agriculture*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

NRC. (2010). *Towards sustainable agricultural systems in the 21st century. Committee on twenty-first century systems agriculture*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Oláh, B., Brière, C., Bécard, G., Dénarié, J., & Gough, C. (2005). Nod factors and a diffusible factor from arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi stimulate lateral root formation in *Medicago truncatula* via the DMI1/DMI2 signalling pathway. *The Plant Journal, 44*, 195–207. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-313X.2005.02522.x.

Oldroyd, G. E. D. (2013). Speak, friend, and enter: Signalling systems that promote beneficial symbiotic associations in plants. *Nature Reviews. Microbiology, 11*, 252–263. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro2990.

Orrell, P., & Bennett, A. E. (2013). How can we exploit above-belowground interactions to assist in addressing the challenges of food security? *Frontiers in Plant Science, 4*, 432. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2013.00432.

Peters, H. P. (1999). Das Bedu¨ rfnis nach Kontrolle der Gentechnik und das Vertrauen in wissenschaftliche Experten. In J. Hampel & O. Renn (Eds.), *Gentechnik in der Öffentlichkeit. Wahrnehmung und Bewertung einer umstrittenen Technologie* (pp. 225–245). Frankfurt am Main/New York: Campus.

Pisa, G., Magnani, G. S., Weber, H., Souza, E. M., Faoro, H., Monteiro, R. A., et al. (2011). Diversity of 16S rRNA genes from bacteria of sugarcane rhizosphere soil. *Brazilian Journal of Medical and Biological Research, 44*, 1215–1221. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0100-879X2011007500148.

Poleman, T. T., & Thomas, L. T. (1995). Income and dietary change: International comparisonsusing purchasing-power parity conversions. *Food Policy, 20*, 149–159.

Pretty, J. (1997). The sustainable intensification of agriculture. *Natural Resources Forum, 21*, 247–256.

Pretty, J. (2008). Agricultural sustainability: Concepts, principles and evidence. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Science, 363*, 447–466.

Pretty, J., Noble, A. D., Bossio, D., Dixon, J., Hine, R. E., Penning de Vries, F. W. T., & Morison, J. I. L. (2006). Resource-conserving agriculture increases yields in developing countries. *Environmental Science & Technology, 3*, 24–43.

Pretty, J., Toulmin, C., & Williams, S. (2011). Sustainable intensification in African agriculture. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability, 9*, 5–24.

Pretty, J., Bharucha, Z. P., & Hama Garba, M. et al. (2014). *Foresight and African agriculture: Innovations and policy opportunities*. Report to the UK Government Foresight Project. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300277/14-533-future-african-agriculture.pdf. (31 August 2014).

Prudent, M., Salon, C., Souleimanov, A., Emery, R. J. N., & Smith, D. L. (2015). Soybean is less impacted by water stress using Bradyrhizobium japonicum and thuricin-17 from Bacillus thuringiensis. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development, 35*, 749–757. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-014-0256-z.

Quecine, M. C., Araújo, W. L., Rossetto, P. B., Ferreira, A., Tsui, S., Lacava, P. T., et al. (2012). Sugarcane growth promotion by the endophytic bacterium Pantoea agglomerans 33.1. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology, 78*, 7511–7518. https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00836-12.

Rayner, S. (1992). Cultural theory and risk analysis. In S. Krimsky & D. Golding (Eds.), *Social theories of risk* (pp. 83–116). Westport: Praeger.

Reutlinger, S. (1985). Food security and poverty in LDCs. *Finance and Development, 22*(4), 7–11.

Roothaert, R. L., & Magado, R. (2011). Revival of cassava production in Nakasongola District, Uganda. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability, 9*, 76–81.

Roothaert, R. L., Ssalongo, S., & Fulgensio, J. (2011). The Rakai chicken model: An approach that has improved fortunes for Ugandan farmers. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability, 9*, 222–231.

Rose, C. M., Venkateshwaren, M., Volkening, J. D., Grimsrud, P. A., Maeda, J., Bailey, D. J., et al. (2012). Rapid phosphoproteomic and transcriptomic changes in the rhizobia-legume symbiosis. *Molecular & Cellular Proteomics, 11*, 724–744. https://doi.org/10.1074/mcp.M112.019208.

Rosset, P. M., & Martínez-Torres, M. E. (2012). Rural social movements and agroecology: Context, theory, and process. *Ecology and Society, 17*, 17.

Royal Society. (2009). *Reaping the benefits: Science and the sustainable intensification of global agriculture*. London: The Royal Society.

Rudrappa, T., Czymmek, K. J., Paré, P. W., & Bais, H. P. (2008). Root-secreted malic acid recruits beneficial soil bacteria. *Plant Physiology, 148*, 1547–1556. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.108.127613.

Ruiz-Lozano, J. M., Porcel, R., Azcon, C., & Aroca, R. (2012). Regulation by arbuscular mycorrhizae of the integrated physiological response to salinity in plants: New challenges in physiological and molecular studies. *Journal of Experimental Botany, 11*, 4033–4044. https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/ers126.

Santi, C., Bogusz, D., & Franche, C. (2013). Biological nitrogen fixation in non-legume plants. *Annals of Botany, 111*, 743–767. https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mct048.

Sawadogo, H. (2011). Using soil and water conservation techniques to rehabilitate degraded lands in northwestern Burkina Faso. *International Journal of Sustainable Agriculture, 9*, 120–128.

Schmidt, R., Köberl, M., Mostafa, A., Ramadan, E. M., Monschein, M., Jensen, K. B., et al. (2014). Effects of bacterial inoculants on the indigenous microbiome and secondary metabolites of chamomile plants. *Frontiers in Microbiology, 64*, 111. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2014.00064.

Sen, A. (1981). *Poverty and famines: An essay on entitlement and Deprivution*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Settle, W., & Hama Garba, M. (2011). Sustainable crop production intensification in the Senegal and Niger River basins of francophone West Africa. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability, 9*, 171–185.

Smil, V. (2002). Nitrogen and food production: Proteins for human diets. *Ambio, 31*, 126–131.

Smith, P. (2013). Delivering food security without increasing pressure on land. *Global Food Security, 2*, 18–23.

Snapp, S. S., Blackie, M. J., Gilbert, R. A., Bezner-Kerr, R., & Kanyama-Phiri, G. Y. (2010). *Biodiversity can support a greener revolution in Africa*. Proceedings ofthe National Academy of Sciences, USA107: 20840–20845.

Spence, C., Alff, E., Johnson, C., Ramos, C., Donofrio, N., Sundarsan, V., et al. (2014). Natural rice rhizospheric microbes suppress rice blast infections. *BMC Plant Biology, 14*, 130. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2229-14-130.

Stock, P., Carolan, M., & Rosin, C. (Eds.). (2015). *Food utopias: Reimagining citizenship, ethics and community*. New York: Routledge. (in press).

Subramanian, S. (2014). *Mass spectrometry based proteome profiling to understand the effects of Lipo-Chitooligosaccharide and Thuricin 17 in Arabidopsis thaliana and Glycinemax under salt stress*. Ph.D. Thesis, McGillUniversity, Montréal, QC.

Sumberg, J., Thompson, J., & Woodhouse, P. (2013). Why agronomy in the developing world has become contentious. *Agriculture and Human Values, 30*, 71–83.

Tena, G., Boudsocq, M., & Sheen, J. (2011). Protein kinase signaling networks in plant innate immunity. *Current Opinion in Plant Biology, 14*, 519–529. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbi.2011.05.006.

Teplitski, M., Robinson, J. B., & Bauer, W. D. (2000). Plants secrete substances that mimic bacterial N-Acyl homoserine lactone signal activities and affect population density-dependent behaviors in associated bacteria. *Molecular Plant-Microbe Interactions, 6*, 637–648. https://doi.org/10.1094/MPMI.2000.13.6.637.

Thompson, B., & Amoroso, L. (2011). *FAO's approach to nutrition-sensitive agricultural development*. Rome: FAO http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/agn/pdf/FAO_Approach_to_Nutrition_sensitive_agricultural_development.pdf (31st Aug 2014).

Tilman, D., Cassman, K. G., Matson, P. A., Naylor, R., & Polasky, S. (2002). Agricultural sustainability and intensive production practices. *Nature, 418*, 671–677.

Tomlinson, I. (2013). Doubling food production to feed the 9 billion: A critical perspective on a key discourse of food security in the UK. *Journal of Rural Studies, 29*, 81–90.

Trabelsi, D., & Mhamdi, R. (2013). Microbial inoculants and their impact on soil microbial communities: A review. *BioMed Research International, 1*, 13. https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/863240.

Tripp, R. (2005). The performance of low external input technology in agricultural development: A summary of three case studies. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability, 3*, 143–153.

United Nations. (1975). Report of the world food conference, Rome 5–16 November 1974. New York.

Velázquez, E., Rojas, M., Lorite, M. J., Rivas, R., Zurdo-Piñeiro, J. L., Heydrich, M., et al. (2008). Genetic diversity of endophytic bacteria which could be find in the apoplastic sap of the medullary parenchyma of the stem of healthy sugarcane plants. *Journal of Basic Microbiology, 48*, 118–124. https://doi.org/10.1002/jobm.200700161.

Vitousek, P. M., et al. (1997). Human alteration of the global nitrogen cycle. *Ecological Applications, 7*, 737–750.

Wambugu, C., Place, F., & Franzel, S. (2011). Research, development and scaling-up the adoption of fodder shrub innovations in East Africa. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability, 9*, 100–109.

Wang, N., Khan, W., & Smith, D. L. (2012). Soybean global gene expression after application of lipo-chitoo ligosaccharide from *Bradyrhizobium japonicum* undersub-optimaltemperature. *PLoSONE, 7*, e31571. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0031571.

Zamioudis, C., Mastranesti, P., Dhonukshe, P., Blilou, I., & Pieterse, C. M. J. (2013). Unraveling root developmental programs initiated by beneficial pseudomonas spp. Bacteria. *Plant Physiology, 162*, 304–318. https://doi.org/10.1104/pp.112.212597.

Zapf, W., et al. (1987). *Individualisierung und Sicherheit. Untersuchungen zur Lebensqualita¨t in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. Munich: C.H. Beck.

Zhang, F., & Smith, D. L. (1995). Preincubation of Brady rhizobium japonicum with genistein accelerates nodule development of soybean at suboptimal root zone temperatures. *Plant Physiology, 108*, 961–986.

Zhang, H., Gao, Z.-Q., Wang, W.-J., Liu, G.-F., Shtykova, E. V., Xu, J.-H., et al. (2012). The crystal structure of the MPN domain from the COP9 signalosome subunit CSN6. *FEBS Letters, 586*, 1147–1153. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.febslet.2012.03.029.

Zolla, G., Badri, D. V., Bakker, M. G., Manter, D. K., & Vivanco, J. M. (2013). Soil microbiomes vary in their ability to confer drought tolerance to Arabidopsis. *Applied Soil Ecology, 68*, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2013.03.007.