Plant Archives Vol. 25, No. 1, 2025 pp. 2679-2694 e-ISSN:2581-6063 (online), ISSN:0972-5210

Plant Archives

Journal homepage: http://www.plantarchives.org

DOI Url : https://doi.org/10.51470/PLANTARCHIVES.2025.v25.no.1.387

SUSTAINABLE INTENSIFICATION OF AGRICULTURE: BALANCING PRODUCTIVITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT – A REVIEW

Anil Kumar[1]*, Kiran Sourav Das[2], S. Dayanandanaik[3], Rashmi Mishra[4], Gautam Veer Chauhan[5], Smriti Hansda[6], Sukhdham Singh[7] and Ranjeet Singh Bochalya[8]

[1]Department of Agronomy, Eklavya University, Damoh - 470 661, Madhya Pradesh, India.

[2]Department of Extension Education, College of Agriculture, Odisha University of Agriculture and Technology, Bhubaneswar - 751 003, Odisha, India.

[3]Department of Agronomy, University of Agricultural Sciences, G.K.V.K., Bengaluru - 560 065, India.

[4]Veterinary Parasitology, ICAR- Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar, Bareilly – 243 122, Uttar Pradesh, India.

[5]ICAR-CRIDA, KVK, Ranga Reddy, Hyderabad - 501 505, India.

[6]College of Agriculture, Bhawanipatna, Odisha University of Agriculture and Technology, Odisha, India.

[7]Department of Agronomy, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel University of Agriculture & Technology, Modipuram, Meerut- 250110, India

[8]Department of Agriculture, Maharishi Markandeshwar (Deemed to be University), Mullana- Ambala - 133 207, Hariyana, India

*Corresponding author E-mail : agronomyanil@gmail.com

(Date of Receiving-17-01-2025; Date of Acceptance-30-03-2025)

ABSTRACT

Agriculture is confronted with a double challenge of raising food production to address the needs of an expanding global population while reducing environmental degradation. Sustainable intensification (SI) is a notion that seeks to increase agricultural productivity without increasing agricultural land or the adverse ecological footprint. This review addresses major strategies, challenges, and advantages of SI, emphasizing new agricultural techniques like precision agriculture, integrated pest management, conservation agriculture, and agroecology. A multidisciplinary strategy involving technological innovations, sustainable land management, and resource-saving farming methods must be adopted in implementing SI. In addition, policy support, economic incentives, and farmer-focused approaches are equally important in making SI widely acceptable. This research underscores the environmental, economic and social advantages of SI as well as challenges of climate variability, knowledge gaps and infrastructure needs. Directions for future research that involve the application of artificial intelligence, big data analytics, and climate-resilient crop varieties are discussed to make SI more feasible and efficient in various agro-ecological zones.

Key words : Sustainable intensification, Agricultural productivity, Environmental sustainability, Conservation agriculture, Agroecology, Precision farming, Climate-smart agriculture.

Introduction

The agricultural sector plays a vital role in global food security, economic stability, and environmental sustainability (Godfray and Garnett, 2014). Despite this, intensive agriculture has resulted in immense problems, such as land degradation, water shortage, loss of biodiversity, and climate change (Kopittke *et al*., 2019). Agricultural intensification has always depended on higher inputs like fertilizers, pesticides and irrigation, increasing productivity but also polluting the environment (Shrestha *et al*., 2021.

The scope for sustainable intensification in an agroecosystem is determined by its existing resource base and productivity levels (Pretty, 2018). In highly advanced, input-intensive farming systems, yields may already be close to their maximum potential, constrained by factors such as soil quality, climate, and plant physiology (Keating *et al*., 2010). While sustainability can be significantly enhanced in these systems, substantial productivity gains may be challenging. Conversely, many resource-constrained smallholder farms, encompassing both crop and livestock production, hold considerable potential for

Fig. 1 : Image show as sustainable intensification (Source,Hoshide *et al*., 2023).

yield improvement (Herrero *et al*., 2010; Pretty *et al*., 2011). As smallholder farmers often face malnutrition and primarily depend on their agricultural output for survival (Garrity *et al*., 2010), sustainable intensification in these systems can not only enhance present-day human well-being but also lay a stronger foundation for future food security.

Sustainable intensification (SI) has come to represent the answer to all these challenges through enhanced per unit area yield output and environmental degradation mitigation (Cassman and Grassini, 2020). SI seeks to maximize the efficiency of resource use, minimize ecological footprints and promote long-term agricultural sustainability (Xie *et al*., 2019). SI combines technological innovations, ecological principles, and land management for sustaining productivity while conserving resources (Shi *et al*., 2022).

This review discusses diverse SI strategies, their implications on agricultural productivity and environmental mitigation, as well as the socio-economic determinants that affect SI uptake. In addition, it calls attention to policy structures, farmers' involvement, and interdisciplinary as drivers for the promotion of sustainable agricultural systems worldwide (Godfray, 2014).

Intensification

In the context of sustainable intensification (SI), intensification is generally understood in two terms: as a rise in yield (Godfray and Garnett, 2014) or as an enhancement in input efficiency—achieving "more output per unit input" (Montpelier Panel, 2013). When the focus is on yield, it is a straightforward measure for quantifying intensification. But when input efficiency is the concern, measurement becomes complicated. For example, increased production per land unit can sometimes result from the overuse of inputs, eventually reducing overall efficiency (Tilman *et al*., 2002). To respond to such situations, a better measure of intensification is required.

Eco-efficiency is a general framework for quantifying the intensification of agroecosystems (Gadanakis *et al*., 2015; Keating *et al*., 2010). This method compares the performance of each cropping system to an eco-efficiency frontier, which is the best use of all inputs. Finding this frontier involves expressing all inputs and outputs in monetary terms for different representative cropping systems (Tilman, 2011). Linear programming models can then be used to find the current frontier of best use of resources (Gadanakis *et al*., 2015). Every agricultural system receives an eco-efficiency rating depending on how close it is to this frontier. Though inclusive, the technique has been faulted for using market prices as a basis for inputs and outputs since prices in the market are not constant and may interfere with accuracy (ISPC, 2014; Shriar, 2000).

Sustainability

Sustainability is a generic and dynamic notion, with ever-changing definitions arising (Bosshard, 2000; Pretty, 1997). Due to its nature, no one indicator can be applied universally to all agricultural systems to measure sustainability. Rather, a number of different frameworks have been suggested to estimate sustainability in smallholder farming systems, using numerous individual indicators representing different sustainability-associated properties. The choice of suitable metrics is influenced by the ecological context, social environment, and the particular priorities of the farmers in question (Steiner *et al*., 2000).

The most commonly employed method for assessing sustainability is the "pillars of sustainability" approach (McCune *et al*., 2011; Steiner *et al*., 2000). This methodology specifies sustainability through pillars, with each pillar a unique field of sustainability and each having certain indicators. Steiner (2000) recommends using pillars that denote natural capital, social capital, and economic capital. Yet, other models have been constructed, some only based on biophysical attributes (McCune *et al*., 2011) and others combining biophysical and economic attributes (Snapp *et al*., 2010).

Irrespective of the particular pillars employed, the framework generally uses a web diagram with spokes emanating from a central point, where each spoke is a sustainability pillar. The size and symmetry of the resultant sustainability polygon give information on the overall sustainability of the system (Steiner *et al*., 2000). This graphical presentation allows for the identification of strengths and weaknesses in various sustainability areas, making more specific interventions possible for enhancing agricultural sustainability.

Table 1 : Overview of sustainable intensification (SI) metrics and indicators documented in the literature.

Domain	Indicator	Field/Plot scale	Farm/Household scale	Community scale
Productivity	Biological inputs	Kg chemical inputs replaced		% Farmers using biol. Inputs
	Crop diversity	Crop species/ genotype Richness	Crop species richness	
	Input efficiency	Partial factor productivity	Eco-efficiency score	
	Internal nutrient Cycling	N mineralization rate	Use of farmgen. inputs Cycling index	Participatory resource mapping
	Pest pressure	% Crop plants damaged #pests/plant or sample		
	Resilience		$ crops lost to disaster	
	Soil quality	Numerous metrics including Soil quality indices		
	Water efficiency	yield/mm rainfall kg grain/m^3water /ha	Kg total product /m^3 HO_2	
	Yield	Kg or$ product/ha Kg product/animal/day		
Economic sustainability	Agricultural income		Net income from farming Benefit/cost ratio	
	Crop value	$product-$expenses Benefit/cost ratio		
	Input access			%Farmer's w/input Access
	Labour productivity		$product/person day	
	Market access			Distance to nearest Market
	Risk	Probability income> expenses Std. dev. in income/ha		
Human wellbeing	Food security		Month's avail. Grain stores	% Farmers reducing food consumption
	Nutrition			Child stunting rate
	Risk		Probability that crops meet	

Table 1 continued....

Table 1 continued....

			Household calorie demand	
Environmental sustainability	Biodiversity	Functional diversity	Presence and abundance of indicator species	Abundance of species of Conservation concern
	Sequestration	Soil organic carbon	Standing tree biomass C sequestration rate	Standing tree biomass
	Environmental impact		Environmental Impact Quotient of pesticides used Lifecycle analysis	
	Erosion	T soil lost/ha/year change in soil depth	Volume of gully erosion Area of rill erosion	%Farmers rep. erosion Participatory erosion mapping
	GHG emissions	TCO/kg grain yield 2TCO*/ha^2	100/kg milk or meat2yield	
	Resilience		Relative soil loss due to disaster	Functional redundancy in the ecosystem
	Soil biological activity	Microbial biomass Decomposition rate Biological N fixation rate		
	Soil cover/perennial cover	%Bare ground Prop. of year vegetated	%Tree cover # trees / ha	Prop. area in surrounding landscape perennial.
Social sustainability	Adoption			% of households adopt. Adopted on % of land
	Equity/gender equity		WEAI** Distribution of labour between genders	Uptake & benefits among weather & poorer farmers % Female participants

(Source: Smith *et al.*, 2017).

Sustainable Intensification Indicators Identified in the Literature

Table 2 categorizes sustainable intensification (SI) indicators based on SI domains and scales. Indicators are distinguished by their frequency of citation in the literature:

Purpose of the Review

The main purpose of this review is to present a thorough examination of the principles, applications, and implications of Sustainable Intensification (SI), with an emphasis on its contribution to balancing agricultural productivity and environmental sustainability (Weltin *et al*., 2018). The review aims to present a multidimensional view by synthesizing scientific, technological, and socio-economic dimensions of SI. In particular, the review aims to:

Discuss major strategies and technologies driving SI, such as precision farming, conservation agriculture, agroecology, climate-smart agriculture, integrated pest management, and sustainable soil and water management (Hussain *et al*., 2024). Also, discuss the contributions of biotechnology, digital agriculture, and renewable energy sources towards improving resource efficiency and minimizing environmental footprints (Abhilash *et al*., 2021).

Evaluate the environmental and socio-economic

Table 2 : Sustainable Intensification Indicators.

Domain	Field/Plot scale	Farm/Household	Community
Productivity	Adaptive capacity Alternative pest mgt. **biological inputs** Biomass production **Crop diversity** Cropping intensity Fodder production **INPUTEFFICIENCY** Input intensity **INTERN.NUT.CYCLING** Irrigation **Pest pressure** **SOILQUALI TY** Stocking rate **WATEREFFICIE NCY YIELD** Yield gap Yield variability	Chemical input reduction **Crop diversity** Cropping intensity Fodder quality **INPUTEFFICIE NCY** **INTERNALNUT.CYCLING** **RESILIENCE** **WATER EFFICIENCY**	Alternative pest management **Biological inputs** **INTERNALNUTRIENTCYCLI NG** Irrigation
Economic Sustainability	**Crop value** Labor intensity **Risk**	**AGRICULTURALINCOME** Capital access Capital productivity Household purchases **LABORPRODUCTIVITY**	Capital access **Input access** **Market access** Seed/stock access
Human wellbeing		Food safety **Food security** Food self-sufficiency Labor reduction **Risk**	Food safety **Food security** Labor reduction **NUTRITION** Quality of life Water quality
Environmental sustainability	Beneficial organisms **BIODIVERSITY** **C sequestration** Chemical input reduction Ecological thresholds **ENVIRON.IMPA CT EROSION** **GHG emissions** Nutrient balance Nutrient export **Soil biologicala activity** **Soil cover**	**C sequestration** **ENVIRONMENTALIM PACT EROSION** **GHG emissions** **Perennial cover** **RESILIENCE**	**BIODIVERSITY** **C sequestration** **EROSION** Nutrient balance **Perennial cover** **RESILIENCE**
Social sustainability	Animal welfare	Empowerment **Gender equity** **Information access** **RESILIENCE** **Social capital**	**Adoption** Empowerment **Equity** **FARMERKNOWLEDGEINTE G.** **FARMERPARTICIPATION** Farmer preference **Gender equity** **Information access** **RESILIENCE** Resource conflict **Risk** **Social capital** Ways of life

(Source: Smith *et al*., 2017).

effects of SI practices, especially in regard to biodiversity conservation, soil health, management of water resources, carbon sequestration, and livelihoods of rural areas (Sadiq *et al.*, 2024). Also, assess how SI achieves climate resilience, mitigates greenhouse gas emissions, and boosts economic stability for farming communities through improved market access and sustainable income generation (Dubey *et al.*, 2024).

Emphasize challenges in applying SI at a global level, taking into account economic, infrastructural, and policy-related limitations (Kumar and Singh, 2024). These involve restricted access to financial resources for smallholder farmers, poor technological infrastructure, fragmented landholding patterns and resistance to change based on socio-cultural reasons (Kabato *et al.*, 2025). Variations in government policies, absence of integrated international frameworks, and inadequate extension services also impede large-scale adoption (Toromade and Chiekezie, 2024). Overcoming these obstacles demands multi-stakeholder coordination, focused financial assistance, and adaptive policy interventions suited to regional conditions (Sukprasert and Phadungkit, 2024).

Offer policy suggestions to ensure successful adoption of SI, such as financial rewards, government policy and capacity development programs for farmers (Piñeiro *et al.*, 2020). This involves creating targeted subsidy schemes to facilitate the shift to sustainable practices, enforcing regulatory mechanisms that encourage ecologically friendly inputs and investing in extension services and training programs (Carlisle *et al.*, 2019). Promoting public-private initiatives, developing knowledge-sharing networks, and incorporating SI into national agricultural policy can also increase adoption and long-term sustainability (Scorrano *et al.*, 2025).

Pinpoint emerging research avenues, especially those related to digital agriculture, applications of artificial intelligence and climate-resilient cropping systems (Mohamed, 2023). Also, discuss developments in genome editing, sensor-based irrigation, blockchain for supply chain traceability, and integration of machine learning for predictive crop management analytics (Balyan *et al.*, 2024). Examine the socio-economic effects of SI uptake and the contribution of policy structures in enabling technology-led agricultural change.

Sustainable Intensification Indicators and Associated Metrics

Table 3 presents sustainable intensification (SI) indicators along with their corresponding metrics, categorized by scale. Indicators in *italics* have limited or no associated metrics, while underlined indicators are subject to debate within the SI literature. Detailed descriptions of SI metrics and related controversies are provided in the section "Descriptions of SI Metrics."

Sustainable Intensification Indicators and Associated Metrics

Table 4 outlines sustainable intensification (SI) indicators related to economic sustainability, along with their associated metrics, categorized by scale. Indicators in *italics* have limited or no associated metrics, while underlined indicators are debated within the SI literature. Further details on SI metrics and related discussions are provided in the section "Descriptions of SI Metrics."

Importance and Benefits of Sustainable Intensification (SI)

Sustainable Intensification (SI) is a key approach to addressing global food security while minimizing environmental impacts. It focuses on increasing agricultural productivity using fewer resources while maintaining ecosystem health and social well-being. The major benefits of SI include:

Significance and Advantages of Sustainable Intensification (SI)

Improved Food Security

Sustainable intensification is significant in enhancing food security through improved crop and livestock production, which ensures that food output is consistent with the needs of an expanding world population (Gaffney *et al.*, 2019). Smallholder farmers can improve their farming productivity by embracing SI techniques, thus alleviating hunger and malnutrition, especially among poor farming households in resource-scarce environments (Dawson *et al.*, 2019).

Effective Resource Use

One of the main advantages of SI is that it can maximize the utilization of valuable agricultural resources like land, water, and nutrients, thus reducing waste and inefficiencies in food production systems (Sarkar *et al.*, 2020). With better management practices, SI ensures soil fertility and promotes biodiversity, thus ensuring long-term sustainability of agricultural productivity while conserving natural ecosystems (Rehman *et al.*, 2022).

Environmental Sustainability

Sustainable intensification plays an important role in the conservation of the environment by limiting the demand for deforestation and avoiding land degradation since it targets increasing yields from already cultivated land instead of cultivating more land (Raj *et al.*, 2021). It also contributes to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions

Table 3 : Sustainable Intensification Indicators of Productivity with Their Associated Metrics, Organized by Scale.

Indicator	Field scale metrics	Farm/Household metrics	Communitymetrics
Adaptive capacity	Maintain yield under future scenarios		
Alternative Pest management	Yield effects of alt. pest mgt.		%farmers using alt. pest mgt.
Animal health	Disease incidenceFarmer-reported condition Growth rate, Mortality rate		
Biological inputs	Kg chemical in puts replaced		% Farmers using biol. inputs
Biomass production	kg/h biomass produced		
Crop diversity	Crop genotype richness Crop species richness	Crop species richness	
Cropping intensity	#ofcrops/unittime	R factor (cropping frequency)	
Fodder production	Farmer-assessed range condition Primary production of range land T biomass produced /ha		
Fodder quality		Consumption of legumes Nutritional content of fodder Presence of toxins	
Input efficiency	Efficiency equivalent ratio Partial factor productivity	Eco-efficiency score Energy efficiency analysis	
Input intensity	Capital intensity in $ / ha Energy intensity/ha Fertilizer rate in kg/ha		
Internal nutrient Cycling	Mineralizable soil N N mineralization rate	Cycling index Farm-generated inputs used	Participatory resource mapping
Irrigation	Mm irrigation water applied		%farmers irrigating
Pest pressure	Farmer reported Pest pressure # pests/ plant or sample#Pest species suppressed % crop plants damaged Weed infestation score		
<u>Resilience</u> (see also environ. and social metrics)		$ crops lost due to disaster	
Soil quality	Numerous metrics of physical, chemical and biological properties Soil quality indices		
Stocking rate	#animals/ haLiveweight/ha		
Water efficiency	kg grain / m^3 water / ha Relative water use efficiency Yield / mm rainfall Yield/mm ET*. water	$ animal products / m^3 evapotranspiration from Kg total products /m^3water Land used to grow feed	
Yield	$ product / ha kg product/ha Kg product/animal/day Kg meat /kg grain consumed Land equivalent ratio		
Yield gap	Actual yield–attainable yield		
Yield variability	Coefficient of variation		

(Source, Smith *et al.*, 2017).

through climate-smart agricultural practices like precision farming, conservation tillage, and integrated pest management (Kabato *et al*., 2025). In supporting lower dependence on chemical inputs like synthetic fertilizers and pesticides, SI also discourages the contamination of soil, water bodies and surrounding ecosystems (Albou *et al*., 2024).

Sustainable Intensification Indicators and Associated Metrics

The following table presents sustainable intensification (SI) indicators related to environmental sustainability, along with their associated metrics, categorized by scale. Indicators in *italics* have limited or no associated metrics, while underlined indicators are debated within the SI literature. Further details on SI metrics and any associated contentions are provided in the section "Descriptions of SI Metrics."

Economic and Social Benefits

Along with its climate and food security benefits, SI also enhances the economic sustainability of farming systems through enhancing yields while at the same time lowering the cost of inputs, hence enhancing farm profitability (Snapp and Pound, 2017). The use of sustainable agricultural practices generates employment in rural regions, leading to economic stability and growth (Pretty, and Pervez Bharucha, 2015). Additionally, SI enhances rural livelihoods by enhancing farmers' adaptation to climate change, economic shocks, and other uncertainties, making them long-term socio-economic sustainable (Shikwambana *et al*., 2022).

Sustainable Intensification Indicators and Associated Metrics

The following table presents sustainable intensification (SI) indicators related to social sustainability, along with their associated metrics, categorized by scale. Indicators in *italics* have limited or no associated metrics, while underlined indicators are debated within the SI literature. Further details on SI metrics and any associated contentions are provided in the section "Descriptions of SI Metrics."

Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation

SI assists agricultural systems to adapt and respond to the impacts of climate change by supporting agroecological approaches that increase resilience to extreme weather conditions, including droughts and floods (Sinclair *et al*., 2019). Conservation agriculture, agroforestry, and integrated crop-livestock systems are some of the techniques that lead to carbon sequestration, lowering the net carbon footprint of agriculture while guaranteeing long-term environmental and food security advantages (Wijerathna-Yapa and Pathirana, 2022). Through the integration of sustainable farming practices, SI offers a proactive response to addressing climate-related issues in food production (Borsetta *et al*., 2025).

Sustainable Intensification Indicators and Associated Metrics

Table 7 presents sustainable intensification (SI) indicators related to human well-being, along with their associated metrics, categorized by scale. Indicators in *italics* have limited or no associated metrics, while underlined indicators are debated within the SI literature. Further details on SI metrics and any associated contentions are provided in the section "Descriptions of SI Metrics."

Sustainable Intensification Strategies

SI encompasses a variety of approaches that combine ecological principles and innovative agriculture practices. The key strategies are:

Conservation Agriculture : Conservation agriculture entails a group of soil management practices, such as no-till farming, cover cropping, and crop rotation, that improve soil structure, enhance water retention, and minimize erosion (Stagnari *et al*., 2010). These practices help in sustaining soil organic matter, enhancing microbial diversity, and minimizing the use of synthetic fertilizers (Pretty *et al*., 2011). Conservation agriculture also reduces greenhouse gas emissions by minimizing soil disturbance and encouraging carbon sequestration, and hence it is an important approach to sustainable agriculture (Francaviglia *et al*., 2023).

Precision Agriculture : Precision agriculture makes use of cutting-edge technologies like remote sensing, drone technology, GPS-guided agricultural machinery, and big data analysis to maximize the usage of resources and enhance decision-making (Vellingiri *et al*., 2025). It makes possible site-specific management of crops based on evaluating real-time information about soil fertility, moisture content and pest outbreaks, thus maximizing input efficiency and minimizing environmental degradation (Sarma *et al*., 2024). Precision agriculture reduces wastage, enhances predictability of yields and enables sustainable land management with the help of automation and artificial intelligence (Adewusi *et al*., 2024).

Agroecology : Agroecology brings ecological principles into farming systems to increase biodiversity, encourage natural pest control, and decrease reliance on synthetic inputs (Nicholls *et al*., 2017). It emphasizes sustainable land use by crop diversification, polyculture,

Table 4 : Sustainable Intensification Indicators of Economic Sustainability with Their Associated Metrics, Organized by Scale.

Indicator	Field scale metrics	Farm/Household metrics	Community metrics
Agricultural income		Benefit/cost ratio Disposable income Losses to disaster Net income from farming	
Capital access		Farmer reported change in Access to credit	% of households reporting Access to credit
Capital productivity		Benefit/cost ratio Total factor productivity	
Crop value	Benefit/cost ratio $product/ha $product-$expenses		
Household purchases		Farmer reported change in house hold consumption % Change in household consumption	
Input access			%farmers reporting access to input% farmers reporting use ofinput
Labor intensity	Person time/ha		
Labor productivity		$product/person day Kg product/person day	
Market access			Distance to nearest market
Risk (also see social and human wellbeing metrics)	Prob. that income/expenses Std.dev.in income/ha		
Seed/stock access			% of farmers reporting Access constraints

(Source, Smith *et al*., 2017).

and agroforestry while maintaining soil health and climate change resilience (Altieri *et al*., 2015). Through organic farming practices, agroecology increases ecosystem services, enhances food security, and benefits smallholder farmers through locally adapted, knowledge-based practices (Diyaolu *et al*., 2024).

Integrated Pest Management (IPM): Integrated Pest Management (IPM) is a comprehensive strategy that integrates biological control, cultural methods, mechanical practices, and chemical controls to keep pest populations in check while limiting environmental and human health hazards (Baker *et al*., 2020). It includes the use of natural enemies, crop rotation, intercropping, habitat manipulation, and resistant cultivars to produce a balanced environment that discourages pests (Karuppuchamy and Venugopal, 2016). By combining precise monitoring, pheromone traps, and selective pesticide spraying as a last resort, IPM increases sustainable agriculture through reduced chemical application, the avoidance of pesticide resistance, and biodiversity in agricultural ecosystems (Angon *et al*., 2023).

Climate-Smart Agriculture (CSA): Climate-Smart Agriculture (CSA) involves a variety of techniques aimed at making agriculture more resilient to climate change while increasing productivity and lowering greenhouse gas emissions (Hussain *et al*., 2022). Critical approaches involve precise water management like drip irrigation and rainwater collection, the cultivation of heat- and drought-tolerant crop species through breeding and biotechnology, and agroforestry for carbon sequestration (Singh and Rao, 2023). The use of climate forecasting technologies and early warning systems is also integrated in CSA to enable farmers to make smart decisions, which is crucial in fostering sustainability and food security despite climate variability (Raihan, 2024).

Table 5 : Sustainable Intensification Indicators of Environmental Sustainability with Their Associated Metrics, Organized by Scale.

Indicator	Field scale metrics	Farm/Household metrics	Community metrics
Beneficial macro-organisms	Parasitism rate of pests by beneficials Pollination rate Pollinator diversity Population of beneficial organism		
Biodiversity	Functional diversity	Functional diversity Presence and abundance of indicator species	Abundance of species of conservation concern Functional diversity Presence and abundance of indicator species
C sequestration	Soil organic carbon Standing tree biomass	C sequestration rate Soil organic carbonStanding tree biomass	Standing tree biomass
Chemical input reduction	kg chemical input replaced	Reduction in kg inputs applied Reduction in # input applications	
Ecological thresholds	Carrying capacity		
Environmental impacts(see also Water quality and GHG emissions)	Mj inputs / kg of product Mj inputs/Mj food energy output	$ value of inputs used in system Ecological footprint analysis Environmental impact quotient of pesticides usedLifecycle analysis	
Erosion	C-value (erosivity) Farmer reported change in soil depth T soil lost / ha / year	Volume of gully erosion area of rill erosion / landslides Land area with erosion controltechnologies implemented	% farmers reporting erosion Participatory erosion mapping
GHG emissions	NH_4 emissions T CO_2 / kg grain yield T CO_2 / ha	T CH_4 / kg feed digested T CO_2 / kg milk or meat yield	
<u>Nutrient balance</u>	Nutrients applied – nutrient export in grain Total nutrient import – total nutrient export		Participatory resource mapping
Nutrient export	N removed for use as fodder NH_4 volatilization NO_3 leeching		
Perennial cover		# trees / ha % cover at canopy and bush level % tree cover	Deforestation rate Prop. area in surrounding landscape perennially vegetated
<u>Resilience</u>(see also productive and social metrics)		Relative soil loss due to disaster	Functional redundancy in the ecosystem
Soil biological activity	Biological N fixation rate Decomposition rate Microbial biomass N mineralization rate Soil respiration		
Soil cover	% bare ground Prop. of year vegetated		

(Source: Smith *et al.*, 2017).

Table 6 : Sustainable Intensification Indicators of Social Sustainability with Their Associated Metrics, Organized by Scale.

Indicator	Field scale	Farm / Household scale	Community scale
Adoption			% of households adopting Adopted on % of total land # of hhlds that have adopted # of hectares whereadopted
Animal welfare	Sufficient space for unimpaired health		
Empowerment		Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index	% farmers reporting better positioned to solve problems
Equity			Differences in social network connectivity % households producing profitable cash crop Uptake and benefits among better off and poorerfarmers
Farmer knowledge integration			% farmers receiving agricultural information from other farmers Use of farmers' criteria for evaluation of SI efforts
Farmer participation			Full participation in R&D, extension, and impact eval.
Farmer preference			Farmers' criteria for evaluation of agricultural technologies % farmers favoring a technology
Gender equity		Distribution of labor between men and women Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index	% project participants or technology users who are women
Information access		Connectivity to farmer knowledge network Farmer reported access to extension and other sources	% farmers reporting knowledge of an SI practice Scores on test of knowledge about specific SI practice
Resilience(see also productive and environmental metrics)		Farmer reported adaptation in responses to challenges	Costs of recovery from disaster (social and monetary)
Resource conflict			Farmer reported conflict intensity
Risk (see also economic andhuman wellbeing metrics)			Communityrisk mapping
Social capital		Connectivity to social networks Membership in organizations # of social connections	Community social capital index Social network structure at community level
Ways of life	*No metrics identified*		

(Source, Smith *et al*., 2017)

Table 7 : Sustainable Intensification Indicators of Human Well-Being with Their Associated Metrics, Organized by Scale.

Indicator	Field scale metrics	Farm/Household metrics	Community metrics
Food safety		Environmental impac tquotient of pesticides used	Toxin concentration of foodstuffs
Food security (also see nutrition metrics)		Days additional food from adopting technology Months of available grain stores reported by farmers	% farmers reporting reduced food consumption
Food self-sufficiency		Calorie production meets household needs Nutrient consumption / unit agricultural input Nutrient production meets household needs	
Labor reduction		Reduction in overall time req. to perform agricultural activities	% farmers reporting reduced time needed for ag. activities
Nutrition		Food consumption score	Child stunting rate Comm. nutrient demand/ comm.nutrient consumption % farmers reporting access to a healthy diet
Risk (also see economic andsocial metrics)		Prob. that crops meet household calorie demand	
Quality of life			% farmers reporting pos. or neg. changes in family health % farmers reporting pos. or neg. changes in quality of life
Water quality			Bacterial count of water source NO_3 concentration of water

(Source, Smith et al., 2017)

Challenges to Implementing Sustainable Intensification

Although, it has promise, SI is confronted with a number of challenges that limit its general adoption and success. These challenges are rooted in financial limitation, technology limits, policy inadequacies, and climate change uncertainties, which demand specialist intervention and strategic planning. All these challenges must be addressed in a concerted approach that involves financial investment, capacity-building programs, complementary policies, and adaptation to climate change. The principal challenges are:

Economic Limitations: The high capital requirements for precision agriculture and sustainable technology are major obstacles to adoption, especially for smallholder and resource-poor farmers. The costs of sophisticated machinery, intelligent irrigation systems, and organic inputs can be too much without proper funding. Moreover, the unavailability of cheap credit, subsidies, and institutions further adds to these issues. The economic returns on sustainable intensification are also uncertain owing to fluctuating yields, changing market prices, and a lack of access to high-value markets for sustainably made products. These economic impediments need to be overcome through targeted interventions by policy, new modes of financing, and enhanced market connections to make sustainable intensification affordable and economically sustainable.

Knowledge Gaps : There is limited awareness and training among farmers regarding SI practices, which prevents its broad adoption. Most farmers, especially in developing countries, do not have access to technical information, demonstration schemes, and extension services to apply sustainable intensification. Lack of properly organized training programs, and inadequate dissemination of research results, prevents knowledge transfer. Closing these gaps calls for investments in farmer training, extension, online learning platforms, and participatory research methods that combine local knowledge with contemporary SI methods.

Policy and Governance Challenges: Effective implementation of Sustainable Intensification (SI) calls for robust policy environments, regulatory backing, and well-crafted incentives to promote take-up. Most countries do not have integrated policies that merge environmental sustainability and agricultural productivity. Good governance should involve economic incentives like subsidies for sustainable agriculture, tax relief for environmentally friendly farming inputs, and rural infrastructure investment. Governments also need to enhance institutional arrangements by improving extension services, encouraging public-private partnerships, and knowledge-sharing networks. Clear regulatory systems, efficient approval procedures for sustainable innovations and global collaboration on sustainability standards can further drive the shift towards SI.

Climate Variability : Unpredictable weather conditions such as uneven rainfall, extended droughts, and rapid temperature fluctuations are major concerns to the viability of some SI approaches. Climate variability has the potential to affect agricultural production, interfere with planting and harvesting calendars, as well as promote the outbreak of pests and diseases. It is necessary to implement climate-resilient agricultural practices like diversified cropping systems, drought-tolerant crop varieties, efficient irrigation management, and better soil conservation measures to reduce the negative impacts of climate change on SI adoption.

Future Directions and Recommendations

In order to increase the adoption of SI, the following are suggested:

Strengthening research and development in green agriculture technologies by investing in innovation areas like precision agriculture, climate-resilient crops, integrated pest management, and soil health improvement. Enhancing collaboration between research centers, agribusiness companies, and policy makers is capable of increasing the pace of developing and deploying state-of-the-art agricultural technology. Moreover, creating open-access research, increasing knowledge-sharing forums, and giving monetary incentives to innovations with sustainability objectives can drive further sustainable intensification progress.

Scaling up farmer education and extension services through focused training programs, online learning platforms, and participatory workshops. Offering access to real-time agricultural advisories, demonstration farms, and community-based knowledge-sharing networks can inform farmers about sustainable intensification practices. Building on strengthened partnerships between agricultural extension officers, research institutions, and farmer cooperatives will enable better dissemination of best practices, foster peer-to-peer learning, and drive adoption of innovative, resource-conserving farming methods.

Instituting policy incentives for sustainable practices through the provision of specific subsidies on eco-friendly inputs for farming, tax relief to farmers using sustainable methods, and direct funding to shift to low-impact farming systems. Governments must establish regulatory systems that facilitate conservation activities, support sustainable supply chains, and reward research in new farming technologies. Policies should also target improved market access for sustainably produced products, guarantee fair pricing arrangements, and include sustainability considerations in agricultural trade agreements.

Facilitating global cooperation in sustainable agriculture research through the development of partnerships among international research centers, government agencies, and private institutions. Facilitating cross-border knowledge sharing, collaborative funding projects, and joint field trials can promote the generation and dissemination of new sustainable practices. The creation of international research consortia and best-practice sharing platforms, data, and technologies can drive progress toward climate-resilient, resource-conserving agricultural systems. In addition, policy harmonization and establishment of international standards for sustainable agriculture can enable international collaboration and mass-scale adoption of sustainable intensification measures.

Conclusion

Sustainable intensification offers a promising avenue for enhancing food security while reducing its environmental footprints. By marrying modern technology with ecological practices, SI has the potential to increase agriculture productivity while protecting natural resources. Main strategies like precision farming, conservation agriculture, and agroecology are scalable solutions to maximize resource efficiency and lower ecological footprints. Yet, effective SI implementation needs a multi-dimensional strategy involving robust policy support, active farmer engagement, and continuous research and development. Investments in climate-resilient agriculture, digital farming technologies and capacity-building programs are critical to spur large-scale adoption. Moreover, international cooperation and knowledge-sharing platforms can help speed up the development of innovative and region-specific SI strategies. In reply to the future challenges, a holistic framework that integrates economic incentives, technological innovations, and sustainable land management approaches will play a key role in the attainment of long-term agricultural resilience and environmental sustainability.

References

Abhilash, Rani A., Kumari A., Singh R.N. and Kumari K. (2021). Climate-smart agriculture: an integrated approach for attaining agricultural sustainability. *Climate change and resilient food systems: issues, challenges, and way forward*, 141-189.

Adewusi, A.O., Asuzu O.F., Olorunsogo T., Iwuanyanwu C., Adaga E. and Daraojimba D.O. (2024). AI in precision agriculture: A review of technologies for sustainable farming practices. *World J. Adv. Res. Rev.*, **21(1)**, 2276-2285.

Albou, E.M., Abdellaoui M., Abdaoui A. and Boughrous A.A. (2024). Agricultural practices and their impact on aquatic ecosystems–a mini-review. *Ecological Engineering & Environmental Technology*, *25*.

Altieri, M.A., Nicholls C.I., Henao A. and Lana M.A. (2015). Agroecology and the design of climate change-resilient farming systems. *Agronomy for sustainable development*, **35(3)**, 869-890.

Angon, P.B., Mondal S., Jahan I., Datto M., Antu U.B., Ayshi F.J. and Islam M.S. (2023). Integrated pest management (IPM) in agriculture and its role in maintaining ecological balance and biodiversity. *Adv. Agricult.*, **2023(1)**, 5546373.

Baker, B.P., Green T.A. and Loker A.J. (2020). Biological control and integrated pest management in organic and conventional systems. *Biological Control*, **140**, 104095.

Balyan, S., Jangir H., Tripathi S.N., Tripathi A., Jhang T. and Pandey P. (2024). Seeding a sustainable future: navigating the digital horizon of smart agriculture. *Sustainability*, **16(2)**, 475.

Borsetta, G., Zovi A. and Vittori S. (2025). Long-Term Frameworks for Food Security and Sustainability Through Climate-Smart Interconnected Agrifood Systems. *Science,* **7(1)**, 15.

Bosshard, A. (2000). A methodology and terminology of sustainability assessment and its perspectives for rural planning. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, **77**, 29–41.

Carlisle, L., De Wit M.M., DeLonge M.S., Calo A., Getz C., Ory J. and Press D. (2019). Securing the future of US agriculture: The case for investing in new entry sustainable farmers. *Elem Sci Anth*, **7**, 17.

Cassman, K.G. and Grassini P. (2020). A global perspective on sustainable intensification research. *Nature Sustainability*, **3(4)**, 262-268.

Dawson, I.K., Park S.E., Attwood S.J., Jamnadass R., Powell W., Sunderland T. and Carsan S. (2019). Contributions of biodiversity to the sustainable intensification of food production. *Global Food Security*, **21**, 23-37.

Diyaolu, C.O. and Folarin I.O. (2024). The Role of Biodiversity in Agricultural Resilience: Protecting Ecosystem Services for Sustainable Food Production.

Dubey, S., Yadav R., Singhal V. and Dixit A. (2024). Sustainable Development in Agriculture: Soil Management. *Smart Agritech: Robotics, AI, and Internet of Things (IoT) in Agriculture*, 113-141.

Francaviglia, R., Almagro M. and Vicente-Vicente J.L. (2023). Conservation agriculture and soil organic carbon: Principles, processes, practices and policy options. *Soil Systems*, **7(1)**, 17.

Gadanakis, Y., Bennett R., Park J. and Areal F.J. (2015). Evaluating the Sustainable Intensification of arable farms. *J. Environ. Manage*., **150**, 288–298.

Gaffney, J., Bing J., Byrne P.F., Cassman K.G., Ciampitti I., Delmer D. and Warner D. (2019). Science-based intensive agriculture: Sustainability, food security, and the role of technology. *Global Food Security*, **23**, 236-244.

Garrity, D.P., Akinnifesi F.K., Ajayi O.C., Weldesemayat S.G., Mowo J.G., Kalinganire A., Larwanou M. and Bayala J. (2010). Evergreen Agriculture: a robust approach to sustainable food security in Africa. *Food Secur.*, **2**, 197–214.

Godfray, H.C.J. and Garnett T. (2014). Food security and sustainable intensification. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci*., **369**, 20120273.

Herrero, M., Thornton P.K., Notenbaert A.M., Wood S., Msangi S., Freeman H.A., Bossio D., Dixon J., Peters M., van de Steeg J. *et al*. (2010). Smart Investments in Sustainable Food Production: Revisiting Mixed Crop-Livestock Systems. *Science*, **327**, 822–825.

Hoshide, A.K., Sarkar R., Larkin R. and Abreu D.C.D. (2023). Ecological intensification and sustainable intensification: increasing benefits to and reducing impacts on the environment to improve future agricultural and food systems. *Front. Environ. Sci.*, **11**, 1301995.

Hussain, A., Elkarmout A.F., Mansour E.Z., Awais M., Usman M., Ahmad H. and Ahmad T. (2024). An Environment Friendly Practice, the Climate Smart Agriculture Crop Production and Soil Management Systems: A review. *J. Sust. Agricult. Environ. Sci.*, **3(3)**, 101-124.

Hussain, S., Amin A., Mubeen M., Khaliq T., Shahid M., Hammad H.M. and Nasim W. (2022). Climate smart agriculture (CSA) technologies. *Building climate resilience in agriculture: Theory, practice and future perspective*, 319-338.

ISPC (2014). Data, metrics and monitoring in CGIAR - A strategic study. Rome, Italy: CGIAR Independent Science and

Partnership Council.

Kabato, W., Getnet G.T., Sinore T., Nemeth A. and Molnár Z. (2025). Towards Climate-Smart Agriculture: Strategies for Sustainable Agricultural Production, Food Security and Greenhouse Gas Reduction. *Agronomy*, **15(3)**, 565.

Karuppuchamy, P. and Venugopal S. (2016). Integrated pest management. In: *Ecofriendly pest management for food security* (pp. 651-684). Academic Press.

Keating, B.A., Carberry P.S., Bindraban P.S., Asseng S., Meinke H. and Dixon J. (2010). Eco- efficient agriculture: Concepts, challenges and opportunities. *Crop Sci*., **50**, S – 109.

Kopittke, P.M., Menzies N.W., Wang P., McKenna B.A. and Lombi E. (2019). Soil and the intensification of agriculture for global food security. *Environ. Int.*, **132**, 105078.

Kumar, H. and Singh S.K. (2024). Simple Techniques for Improving Sustainability in Agriculture: Practical Solutions for Farmers.

McDermott, J.J., Staal S.J., Freeman H.A., Herrero M. and Van de Steeg J.A. (2010). Sustaining intensification of smallholder livestock systems in the tropics. *Livest. Sci.*, **130**, 95–109.

Mohamed, M. (2023). Agricultural sustainability in the age of deep learning: current trends, challenges, and future trajectories. *Sustainable Machine Intelligence J.*, **4**, 2-1.

Nicholls, C.I., Altierit M.A. and Vazquez L. (2017). Agroecological Principles. *Agroecological practices for sustainable agriculture: Principles, applications and making the transition*, 1.

Piñeiro, V., Arias J., Dürr J., Elverdin P., Ibáñez A.M., Kinengyere A. and Torero M. (2020). A scoping review on incentives for adoption of sustainable agricultural practices and their outcomes. *Nature Sustainability*, **3(10)**, 809-820.

Pretty, J. (2018). Sustainable Intensification of Agriculture. *Nature Sustainability*, **1(8)**, 441–446.

Pretty, J. and Pervez Bharucha Z. (2015). Integrated pest management for sustainable intensification of agriculture in Asia and Africa. *Insects*, **6(1)**, 152-182.

Pretty, J., Toulmin C. and Williams S. (2011). Sustainable Intensification in African Agriculture. *Int. J. Agricult. Sust.*, **9(1)**, 5–24.

Pretty, J.N. (1997). The sustainable intensification of agriculture. *Nat. Resour. Forum*, **21**, 247–

Raihan, A. (2024). A review of recent advances, challenges, and potential future directions of climate-smart agriculture. In: *Proceedings of the international conference on climate-smart agriculture*.

Raj, A., Jhariya M.K., Khan N., Banerjee A. and Meena R.S. (2021). Ecological intensification for sustainable development. *Ecological intensification of natural resources for sustainable agriculture*, 137-170.

Rehman, A., Farooq M., Lee D.J. and Siddique K.H. (2022). Sustainable agricultural practices for food security and ecosystem services. *Environ. Sci. Poll. Res.*, **29(56)**, 84076-84095.

Sadiq, S., Abubakar I.A., Nasif A., Kabiru M.A., Abdullahi A. and Abdullahi L.U. (2024). Modern Approaches to Sustainable Agriculture. *Faculty of Agriculture and Veterinary Sciences, Mewar University, Chittorgarh, Rajasthan, India*, **9**, 2298-2307.

Sarkar, S., Skalicky M., Hossain A., Brestic M., Saha S., Garai S. and Brahmachari K. (2020). Management of crop residues for improving input use efficiency and agricultural sustainability. *Sustainability*, **12(23)**, 9808.

Sarma, H.H., Borah S.K., Chintey R., Nath H. and Talukdar N. (2024). Site specific nutrient management (SSNM): Principles, key features and its potential role in soil, crop ecosystem and climate resilience farming. *J. Adv. Biol. Biotechnol.*, **27**, 211-222.

Scorrano, P., Borin E., Thrassou A., Cavallo F. and Mastroleo G. (2025). Knowledge sharing between businesses and stakeholders for systemic and sustainable regional development. Insights in the agri-food sector. *J. Knowledge Management*.

Shi, X., Zhao J., Jia H., Zhao J., Lu J., Zhao M. and Chu Q. (2022). Seeking sustainable pathway of crop production by optimizing planting structures and management practices from the perspective of water footprint. *Sci. Total Environ.*, **843**, 157091.

Shikwambana, S., Malaza N. and Ncube B. (2022). Enhancing the resilience and adaptive capacity of smallholder farmers to drought in the Limpopo Province, South Africa. *Conservation*, **2(3)**.

Shrestha, J., Subedi S., Timsina K.P., Subedi S., Pandey M., Shrestha A. and Hossain M.A. (2021). Sustainable intensification in agriculture: an approach for making agriculture greener and productive. *J. Nepal Agricult. Res. Council*, **7**, 133-150.

Shriar, A.J. (2000). Agricultural intensity and its measurement in frontier regions. *Agrofor. Syst.*, **49**, 301–318.

Sinclair, F., Wezel A., Mbow C., Chomba S., Robiglio V. and Harrison R. (2019). The contribution of agroecological approaches to realizing climate-resilient agriculture. *GCA: Rotterdam, The Netherlands*.

Singh, H.P. and Rao N.K. (2023). Climate resilient and sustainable development of horticulture-Options and opportunities-A review. *Int. J. Innov. Horticult.*, **12(1)**, 1-14.

Smith, A., Snapp S., Chikowo R., Thorne P., Bekunda M. and Glover J. (2017). Measuring sustainable intensification in smallholder agroecosystems: A review. *Global Food Security*, **12(March)**, 127-138.

Snapp, S. and Pound B. (2017). Farming systems for sustainable intensification. In: *Agricultural Systems* (pp. 93-122). Academic Press.

Snapp, S.S., Blackie M.J., Gilbert R.A., Bezner-Kerr R. and Kanyama-Phiri G.Y. (2010). Biodiversity can support a greener revolution in Africa. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **107**, 20840–20845.

Stagnari, F., Ramazzotti S. and Pisante M. (2010). Conservation agriculture: a different approach for crop production through sustainable soil and water management: a review. *Organic Farming, Pest Control and Remediation of Soil Pollutants: Organic farming, pest control and remediation of soil pollutants*, 55-83.

Steiner, K., Herweg K. and Dumanski J. (2000). Practical and cost-effective indicators and procedures for monitoring the impacts of rural development projects on land quality and sustainable land management. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, **81**, 147–154.

Sukprasert, K. and Phadungkit W. (2024). Integrating Sustainable Development Frameworks into Agricultural Policies: A Policy Analysis Perspective. *Contemp. Issues Behav. Soc. Sci.*, **11(2)**, 1-12.

Tilman, D., Balzer C., Hill J. and Befort B.L. (2011). Global Food Demand and the Sustainable Intensification of Agriculture. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **108(50)**, 20260–20264.

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

Toromade, A.S. and Chiekezie N.R. (2024). GIS-driven agriculture: Pioneering precision farming and promoting sustainable agricultural practices. *World J. Adv. Sci. Technol.*, **6(1)**, 057-072.

Vellingiri, A., Kokila R., Nisha P., Kumar M., Chinnusamy S. and Boopathi S. (2025). Harnessing GPS, Sensors, and Drones to Minimize Environmental Impact: Precision Agriculture. In: *Designing Sustainable Internet of Things Solutions for Smart Industries* (pp. 77-108). IGI Global.

Weltin, M., Zasada I., Piorr A., Debolini M., Geniaux G., Perez O.M. and Schulp C.J. (2018). Conceptualising fields of action for sustainable intensification–A systematic literature review and application to regional case studies. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, **257**, 68-80.

Wijerathna-Yapa, A. and Pathirana R. (2022). Sustainable agro-food systems for addressing climate change and food security. *Agriculture*, **12(10)**, 1554.

Xie, H., Huang Y., Chen Q., Zhang Y. and Wu Q. (2019). Prospects for agricultural sustainable intensification: A review of research. *Land*, **8(11)**, 157.