ISPEC INSTITUTE

CROP HEALTH AND AGROECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT

IN SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE

SCIENCE • SUSTAINABILITY • FUTURE

EDITOR

Dr. Otniel Vázquez Peralta

CROP HEALTH AND AGROECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT IN SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE-2026

ISBN: 978-625-92209-3-2

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20027527

May / 2026

Ankara / Türkiye

(The Licence Number of Publicator: 2014/31220)

E mail: info@ispecbooks.com

www.ispecbooks.com

It is responsibility of the author to abide by the publishing ethics rules.

ISPEC Publishing House – 2026©

ISBN: 978-625-92209-3-2

May / 2026

Ankara / Türkiye

CROP HEALTH AND AGROECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT IN SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE

EDITOR

Dr. Otniel Vázquez Peralta

AUTHORS

Asma ASHRAF

Momina BAKHTAWAR

Ume Amara BUKHARI

Muhammad ASAD

Saima QADEER

V. Sathiya ARAVINDAN

K. SUBA

Bui Thi THO

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

This volume brings together a collection of scholarly contributions that explore important developments in plant health, agroecosystem management, and sustainable agriculture. As global food systems continue to face challenges related to climate change, pest pressures, and environmental degradation, resilient and science-based agricultural strategies have become increasingly essential.

The chapters in this book address key themes related to crop protection, disease management, and ecological production systems. The examination of citrus agroecosystems highlights the complex interactions between pests, pathogens, and management practices within fruit production systems. The discussion on cotton diseases provides valuable insights into etiology, epidemiology, and integrated management strategies for one of the world's most important industrial crops. In addition, the exploration of syntropic agroforestry systems emphasizes ecological principles and innovative design approaches that support biodiversity, soil health, and long-term agricultural sustainability.

By adopting an interdisciplinary perspective, this volume integrates insights from plant pathology, agroecology, crop science, and sustainable land management. It contributes to academic discourse while also offering practical implications for farmers, researchers, and policymakers seeking adaptive and environmentally responsible agricultural solutions.

It is hoped that this book will serve as a valuable resource for scholars and practitioners interested in plant health and sustainable farming systems, while encouraging further research on productive, resilient, and ecological approaches to agriculture.

Editorial Team
May, 2026
Türkiye

CHAPTER 1
CITRUS AGROECOSYSTEMS: PEST, PATHOGEN, AND MANAGEMENT INTERACTION

[1]Asma ASHRAF
[2]Momina BAKHTAWAR
[3]Ume Amara BUKHARI
[4]Muhammad ASAD
[5]Saima QADEER

[1]University of Education, Lahore, Pakistan, asma.ashraf@ue.edu.pk, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9420-1262
[2]University of Education, Lahore, Pakistan
[3]University of Education, Lahore, Pakistan
[4]University of Education, Lahore, Pakistan
[5]University of Education, Lahore, Pakistan

INTRODUCTION

Psyllids an Agriculture Pathogens

Psyllids known as agricultural pathogens are recognized as vectors for transmitting significant plant pathogenic bacteria (*Candidatus* Liberibacter spp.). These bacterial species are recognized as causative agents of citrus greening disease also termed yellow shoot disease in various literatures and universally known as HLB (Huanglongbing). HLB being an infectious and pathogenic disease has been known to cause havoc to citrus-producing and trading regions worldwide, especially in America and Brazil (Zheng et al., 2018). This citrus greening disease is prevalent in the Asian region, the US, and Africa and is known to be first documented in 1951 in Taiwan. The fruits belonging to citrus, being known for their wholesome therapeutic benefits alongside their economic value are known to have been cultivated since 4000 B.C. in a region of Mesopotamia called Nippur (Iftikhar et al., 2024).

Psyllids commonly known as jumping plant lice are a superfamily of 38000 species. This superfamily (Psylloidea) of pests significantly affecting Rutaceae, Moraceae, and Leguminosae plants is further categorized into 11 families including 3 extinct families: Liviidae, Malmopsyllidae, Phacopteronidae, Calophyidae, Neopsylloididae, Aphalaridae, Liadopsyllidae, Triozidae, Psyllidae, Homotomidae, and Carsidaridae. Among the above-mentioned families, only a few (Psyllidae, Triozidae, Homotomidae, and Liviidae) are significantly known as agricultural pests. Psyllids are related morphologically to aphids except that psyllids lack cornicles and can jump (Moreno et al., 2021).

1. ASIAN CITRUS PSYLLID (ACP)

Diaphorina citri; an insect declared as pest belonging to the Liviidae family of Psylloids. ACP is known to have an Asian origin more specifically belonging to India. However, it is known to be first described in Taiwan (1908); a region of Southern China. This psyllid species is documented to spread HLB disease in regions of the Philippines, India, and China and it has also been proved by an experiment (insecticide spraying) performed by Lin (F. Wu et al., 2017).

Citrus Psyllid (*Diaphorina citri)* being known as a significant pest of Rutaceae plants affects its host directly by feeding on leaves and indirectly by transmitting a causative agent(bacteria) of citrus disease that is economically detrimental. (Qasim et al., 2018). It has also been observed that not just adult feeding is detrimental but ACP at the nymphal stage can also be damaging to citrus as nymphs excrete a white caste material that aggregates as a white sheath on plant tissue thus affecting the rate of photosynthesis (R. Wang et al., 2020). The agency known as the European and Mediterranian Plant Protection Organization has designated Asian citrus Psyllid as an insect belonging to the A1 quarantine category of pests (Fordjour et al., 2021). The presence of Asian Citrus Psyllid has been documented globally from Asian to African countries and even in Australian and American countries thus inferring that climatic conditions of these states are compatible with surviving and reproductive conditions of Psyllid. There is also evidence of ACP presence in the Mediterranian zone (Narouei-Khandan et al., 2016).

Taxonomic evolution of ACP

ACP termed commonly as Asian citrus psyllid is an agricultural pest belonging to the order Hemiptera was firstly named *Euphalerus citri* by Kuwayama but this name was renamed in 1975 as *Diaphorina citri* by Loginova and was placed in the family Psyllidae. However, *D. citri* is currently categorized under the Liviidae family after the work of Urckhardt and Ouvrard who revised the classification of ACP in 2012. ACP is known by different local names in different regions; for example, In China, it is called ganju musi, in French it is known as psylle de l'oranger, and in Asia categorically in Pakistan, it is recognized locally as Citrus Psylla. A complete latest taxonomic classification of *D. citri* is shown below in Table 1. In the latest publication by Burckhardt and fellows in 2021, the taxonomic classification of ACP is revised and it is recommended to place it again in Psyllidae family (EPPO, 2025b), though it is not applied yet.

Table 1.1: Taxonomic Classification of Diaphorina citri.

Domain	Eukaryota
Kingdom	Metazoa
Phylum	Arthropoda
Subphylum	Uniramia
Class	Insecta
Order	Hemiptera
Suborder	Sternorrhyncha
Family	Liviidae
Genus	*Diaphorina*
Species	*Diaphorina citri*

Physical Appearance and Bioecological aspects of ACP

Asian Citrus Psyllid is a small insect of brownish shade having a blotchy appearance. The average length of an adult Psyllid is recorded to be around 3-4mm. The wings on the body of an adult Psyllid appears like a shield protecting it. The margins of forewings and antennae are streaked with brown color whereas the tips of the antennae give the blackish appearance. These tiny creatures having size equivalence to aphids are usually found in congregations on stems of leaves. ACP adults feed on leaves and their feeding behavior is found to be strikingly interesting in a way that the angle of their body while feeding through the sap of a leaf is 45°. The life cycle of Psyllids encompasses five nymphal stages and takes 12-25 days to become an adult. The average life span of an adult Psyllid has been recorded to be 30-60 days. The nymphs of Psyllids appear to be circular and flattened in shape forecasting a color combination of yellow to orange. The egg count of an adult female psyllid during its lifetime is recorded to be a minimum of 500-800 almond-shaped eggs and can reach a maximum count of 1900 eggs. Psyllids usually lay eggs on fresh and newly emerged leaves scientifically called flush. These yellow to orange-colored eggs can be found on the foliage of leaves either in the form of groups or as a single egg at a position. These eggs remain in their position on tissue with the aid of an embedded stalk. The average temperature requirement for psyllids growth and reproduction falls in the range of 77 to 84°F (Chandrasekaran et al., 2021).

The 74 recognized species have been reported to be included in the genus *Diaphorina* and alongside *citri,* six further species of *Diaphorina (D. punctulate* Pettey*, D. amoena* Capener*, D. auberti* Hollis*, D. communis* Mather*, D. murrayi* Kandasamy*, and D. zebrana* Capener*)* are documented on citrus. *D. citri* exhibits a unique maculation arrangement on its forewings, allowing for straightforward differentiation from the majority of other citrus-associated species. The six other species are not recognized as vectors for any pathogens and hence exert significantly less influence on yield or quality compared to *D. citri*, rendering them of minimal practical significance (Health et al., 2021b). EPPO (a global database) has provided a list of host plants of *D. citri* and according to that list, 61 plants are known to host ACP while 8 plants are categorized under the major host plants. The EPPO has designated ACP a code of 6 letters (DIAACI) through which seekers can browse information about this pest. The names of eight major plants and their EPPO code are provided in Table 2 (EPPO, 2025a) (Health et al., 2021a).

Table 1.2: Major Plant hosts of Diaphorina citri.

EPPO Code	Host Plant	Common name
CJCWE	*Citroncirus webberi*	Citrange
CIDGR	*Citrus maxima*	Pomelo
CIDRE	*Citrus reticulate*	Mandarin
CIDMA	*Citrus x aurantiifolia var. macrophylla*	Lime
CIDAU	*Citrus aurantium*	Bitter Orange
CIDPA	*Citrus x aurantium var. paradise*	Grape Fruit
CIDLI	*Citrus x limon*	Lemons
MUYPA	*Murraya paniculata*	Orange Jasmine

The world is witnessing adverse climate changes and studies have shown that distribution of pests and disease transmission is closely related to climatic variabilities. Among various studied environmental factors, temperature has a significant role in the distribution of ACP population. Other than environmental factors; biology of pest, host plant genomics also serve a pivotal role in spread of pests. As the temperature of Earth is increasing globally, it has been observed that population of *D.citri* is spreading to unassessed areas as well (R. Wang et al., 2020).

A study was conducted to corelate environmental factors and population dynamics of ACP across various regions of Sargodha and it revealed that for ACP population to flourish; the months of March, April and significantly August were observed as the peak time and these are the days when fresh leaves bloom. The main insight of this study was that cooler temperature usually after rainfall is the ideal time for Asian citrus psyllid to reproduce and bloom while humidity had no significant effects on ACP population. One of the prime reason that rainfall exhibit a significant correlation(positive) with population bloom is the growth of new leaves after rainfall which provide feeding space to adults and to hatching nymphs (Yasir Iftikhar et al., 2017). The biotic as well as abiotic factors other than temperature that can contribute majorly to the distribution and survival rate of Asian citrus Psyllid are humidity, anthropogenic activities, and ecology of host plant. It has been observed that Citrus Psyllid has an advantage of producing high progeny and a short life span that can be beneficial in adapting to a new environment thus jeoparadizing the unassesed citrus orchards as well (Luo et al., 2018).

A study was designed to investigate gut microbes of *D. citri* through next generation sequencing and it revealed that Proteobacteria is a significant phylum in bacterial communities and the dominant genera found were Wolbachia, Escherichia-Shigella, and Candidatus Profftella. However, the host plat biology significantly impacts their abundance (Meng et al., 2022). *Candidatus* Profftella armatura, *Candidatus* Liberibacter asiaticus, *Candidatus* Carsonella rudii and *Wolbachia* alongwith *Tamarixia radiata* are recognized as significant endosymbionts of *D. citri*. The knowledge about endosymbionts is useful as their presence has a vital role in enhancing biology of their host thus helpful in management of host such as *T. radiata* is considered as an important parasitoid of Asian Citrus Psyllid thus acting as an effective managing tool for ACP population (Ashraf et al., 2021).

ACP as a Vector of Pathogenic Bacteria

The citrus psylla itself is simply a sap-feeding insect but what makes it a notorious pest is basically a gram-negative bacterium known as *Candidatus* Liberibacter asiaticus (*C*Las) (Leong et al., 2022) which basically belongs to alphaproteobacterial category (Merfa et al., 2019).

In 1994, Murray and Schleifer characterized this bacterium as *Candidatus* Liberibacter, where the term *Candidatus* refers to bacteria that are uncultured. The morphometric analysis reveals length and diameter of this bacterium to be 2µm and 0.2µm respectively (Yaqub, 2017).Liberibacter is a genus of bacteria which are phloem-limited and include three pathogenic species named as *Candidatus* Liberibacterasiaticus (*C*Las), *Candidatus* Liberibacter africanus (*C*Laf), and *Candidatus* Liberibacter americanus (*C*Lam) with CLas being the most pervasive one (C. Yang & Ancona, 2022). These fastidious bacteria are liable to insect-mediated transmission and the known insects are *Trioza erytreae* and the *Diaphorina citri* Kuwayama (ACP), the former being associated with the spread of (CLaf) while ACP being regarded as a known vector of CLas and CLam (the American specie) (Sétamou et al., 2023).

T. erytreae feeds on leaf while *Diaphorina citri* feeds on stem and the later has vast host range. These species are known to transmit disease by feeding on phloem of diseased plant; thus, taking pathogen to a fresh plant. The control of ACP population is one of the key solutions in managing HLB outbreak as these vectors have ability to transfer bacteria to their progeny as well. *Diaphorina citri* takes almost 15-30 minutes in acquiring a pathogen and it takes 10 days of incubation for a pathogen until the symptoms appear i-e the latent period (Iftikhar et al., 2024).

2. CITRUS

Citrus, a term generally associated with oranges, limes, and lemons is a genus containing incalculable species (G. A. Wu et al., 2018) And these fruits are reported to be extensively cultivated in about 140 nations worldwide .Citrus fruits belonging to the Mediterranean region are significant cash crops of the Rutaceae family. The cultivars that can be categorized as citrus include lemons, limes, oranges, grapefruits, mandarins, and pummelos (Volk et al., 2023). These vitamin C rich fruits having refreshing aromas and bright colors are known for various health benefits such as cardiovascular sustenance, providing anticancer and anti-inflammatory effects. These nutritive and healthy benefits are associated with polyphenols which contain antioxidant properties thus providing protection from many diseases.

Different analytical techniques have quantified flavonoids as the major polyphenols present in citrus (Mare et al., 2023). Among the nutrients and vitamins that citrus can possess are carbs, fiber, Ascorbic acid, pyridoxine, retinol, potassium, folate, calcium, copper, magnesium, thiamine, niacin, riboflavin, phosphorous, and pantothenic acid (Salik et al., 2023). With a production of almost 121 million tons per year, Citrus cultivars are grown throughout the globe in tropical and subtropical zones. Among other commercial cultivars, the mandarin *Citrus reticulata* Blanco has a significant place in horticulture (Umair Raza et al., 2023b). The Mediterranean region and countries like China, Brazil, USA, and India are known to contribute more than 70% in total citrus production of the World. The chromosomal count has shown that citrus species are diploid in nature comprising of variable number of chromosomes including 18,27, and 36 (Vijayakumari et al., 2022).

Citrus reticulata locally known as Kinnow in Pakistan is basically a hybrid breed of Willow *(Citrus deliciosa Tenora)a and* King (*Citrus nobilis).* This cultivar inherited its origin from California and was hailed in the sub-continent in 1942 as a present to Queen Victoria (Nawaz et al., 2021).

Pakistan and Citrus Industry

The agriculture sector of Pakistan despite facing many challenges still remains the driving force behind economic development. A growth rate of 6.25 % has been observed for year 2024 which is quite impressive comparing to 2023 and 2022 which were 2.27% and 4.21% respectively. In terms of sustainability, the agriculture is a promising sector alongside IT, tourism, and exports thus contributing 24.04 % to gross domestic production (GDP) for the fiscal year 2024 (GOP, 2024)\.

The fruit industry of Pakistan is known to produce around more than 30 fruits being influenced majorly by citrus production which contributes to 30% of total fruit production of the country. Though citrus is cultivated throughout in all Provinces of Pakistan, however Punjab region is renowned globally for citrus production especially Kinnow (Mandarin) (Siddique & Garnevska, 2018). A statistical report for the year 2021-2022 published by Ministry of National Food Security and Research showed citrus fruit production to be 2.4 million tons, highest among all fruits thus labeling it as a major export revenue generator. The total citrus production of year 2021-2022 has been estimated to be 2321802 tonnes which comprises 25.18 % of total fruit production (9220323 tonnes) (Security, 2023). According to report, the total area under fruit cultivation in year 2021-2022 was 714702 hectares while total area under citrus cultivation has been observed to be 152716 hectares constituting 21.36% of total area.

A study targeting the Sargodha district revealed that citrus aphids, mealybug, termites, fruit flies, and psylla constitute the major insects responsible for citrus damage and loss, while root rot, citrus canker, and citrus greening were reported as the prevalent diseases responsible for the heavy loss of citrus yield ("Assessing Knowledge Gap and Adoption Level of Citrus Growers Regarding IPM Practices in the Punjab, Pakistan," 2024).

Citrus Greening Disease

A vector-transmitted disease, that causes detrimental effects on Citrus production resulting in the economic defacement of citrus trade worldwide (N. Wang et al., 2017). Although there are many bacterial and fungal diseases of citrus reported so far; HLB still holds a significant importance at the global level. It is an infectious disease that results in the death of whole tree starting from the gradual death of branch tips thus affecting fruit production and nutritional value as well (Ibrahim et al., 2022). If unraveled, other symptoms associated with this infamous disease include pitted leaves that eventually fall from branches thus causing the dwindling of the canopy. Moreover, fruit obtained from such diseased trees has no commercial importance due to constrained size, irregular growth, and faded color and is thus categorized as low- graded fruit (Ferrarezi et al., 2020).

Almost all significant citrus-producing regions of Asia, America, Africa, and Oceania are reported to be influenced by greening disease. In 2005, Florida (USA) published its first report on HLB and from 2005 to 2018, almost 75% mitigation in citrus production has been recorded. Sao Paulo in Brazil was the first area reported to be affected by HLB in 2004. Chaoshan in Guangdong Province is known to be the firstly reported region of China to have the greening disease (Hu et al., 2021).

One of the prime reasons that greening disease is categorized as devastating is its non- curative nature. Though plant pathologists and researchers are in constant effort to provide an effective solution for its management understanding dynamics of this disease is an ominous challenge. The underlying reason that causes hindrance towards disease control is that all commercial cultivars of citrus are prone to HLB. Moreover, Liberibacter species associated with disease are phloem-limited thus limiting antimicrobial control of disease as well. Furthermore, there is a lack of viable strategy to control the ACP population so that bacterial transmission through vectors can be managed. (N. Wang, 2019). A survey was carried out to find the incidence rate of HLB in newly grown citrus orchards of District Layyah, Pakistan and it reported that the HLB incidence rate was 18% and Kinnow was found to be more suspected cultivar among Mosambi and Feutrall's early (Bashir et al., 2023).

Huanglongbing is a lethal disease as symptoms appear gradually which makes management a difficult task. It almost takes 3-12 months for a healthy tree to display symptoms after being exposed to CLas-acquired nymphs or adults (Tu et al., 2019). It has been cited in literature that the symptoms caused by HLB can be traced back to 1927 when Hussain and Nath elucidated CLas as a harmful agent being infused by Citrus Psyllid causing low-quality fruit and gradually the loss of a whole orchard (Leong et al., 2022a).

3. HLB MANAGEMENT AND ACP CONTROL

As HLB or blotchy-mottle disease is categorized as one of the crucial infectious diseases of citrus being spread by a pest vector, thus the control of ACP population through insecticides is considered as a significant path towards the management of HLB because no cultivar of citrus is known to be naturally resistant to a HLB infection so far. However, rigorous use of insecticides has led psyllids to develop resistance against insecticides (Taning et al., 2016). Moreover, combating HLB using conventional chemical products has negative effects on environmental health and are hazardous for human health as well. However, there are some families of biorational insecticides as compared to conventional ones and among them, the commonly cited insecticides used to kill psyllid are spirotetrama, thiamethoxam, clothianidin, and imidacloprid.

The effectiveness of these specified insecticides using bioassay method was determined which shows mortality response of 85.10 % against citrus psyllid (Majeed et al., 2021). The frequently cited insecticide sprays recommended to exterminate psyllids from field are fenpropathrin, chlorpyrifos, bifenthrin, dimethoate, and zeta-cypermethrin, (Eduardo Serrao et al., 2023). However, the use and effects of insecticides have not been proven to be that much ever-lasting (Nage et al., 2023). In conjunction with insecticides, plant based remedies to control pest population have also been employed and among them extracts of neem is found to be used extensively (Khan et al., 2024).

To prevent orchards from non-targeted effects of pesticides, early identification of pests in fields is generally advised for proper and limited use of insecticides. However, confirming psyllid presence in citrus fields is somewhat struggling because of its size which is nearly 2.5mm but the knowledge of their niche is helpful in early detection as their survival host is generally a shoot that can blend with its gray color (Dai et al., 2022). In literature, there are several ways suggested to predict the population of pest so that early control of ACP population can be implemented and among them Machine learning techniques are found to be effective in hypothesizing future population explosion trends. The machine learning techniques such as random forest regressor (RFR), Deep neural network (DNN), and multiple linear regression model (MLR) are found to be productive in predicting life stages of pest, yield of agriculture crops, measuring soil contents, and forecasting risks associated with pests such as oriental fruit fly and black planthopper respectively (Bibi et al., 2021). Among many recommended solutions for HLB management, the most devastating solution is uprooting the diseased trees from orchards. Though it can help to prevent spread of infectious pathogens to other trees yet it is difficult for orchard holders to see their fully grown trees perishing in this way and this is also not that much cost-effective solution. However, to bypass this harsh solution, studies have also been conducted to inject antibiotics to diseased trees so that the root cause of disease; “the bacteria” can be targeted. The commonly used combinations of antibiotics deployed belongs to Beta-Lactam, Cephalosporins, and Ansamycin class, and have been found effective in enhancing fruit quality(Hussain et al., 2019).

The agricultural pest management through chemicals has a traditional significance but currently the strategies to manage pests have also been revolutionized with the advent of scientific development and techniques. It is an interesting fact of world that almost for every problem there is a remedy to it and likewise for every noxious pest there is a natural enemy present in ecosystem that can help in controlling the population of pest and thus playing its part in balancing the natural ecosystem. The control of pests using their natural enemies is thus termed as biological control and this came out to be an efficient, convincing and nature friendly pest managing strategy. This productive strategy of controlling pests is based on exploiting natural relationships among organisms such as symbiotic, parasitic and predatory interactions and has been known to be a potent tool against a number of agricultural pests including mealybug, whitefly, and leaf beetles (Sethuraman et al., 2020).

The strategies to control pest in citrus orchards of Sargodha can be extended back to the historical period even before the partition of the sub-continent. The management of the ACP population through a biological control strategy has been recommended in many studies. A study was conducted in California to control *Diaphorina citri* using *Tamarixia radiata* and *Diaphorencyrtus aligarhensis* and a nearly 70% decrease in pest population was reported. This study revealed an interesting fact that *Linepithema humile,* an ant can sometimes hinder the rate of successful control of ACP through parasitoids by safeguarding Asian citrus psyllid, and this defensive aid is the result of give-and-take interaction between ACP and this ant (Hoddle et al., 2022).

REFERENCES

Ashraf, H. J., Akutse, K. S., Mukhtar, I., Ramos Aguila, L. C., Qasim, M., Wang, W., Bashir, S., Iftikhar, Y., Zeshan, M. A., Ghazanfar, M. U., & Mubeen, M. J. I. J. o. P. (2023).Mapping the Geospatial Distribution of Citrus Greening Disease in District Layyah, Pakistan. *12*(3), 327-333.

Beaurepaire, A. L., Webster, M. T., & Neumann, P. (2024). Population genetics for insect conservation and control. *6*(3), e13095. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/csp2.13095

Bibi, M., Hanif, M. K., Sarwar, M. U., Khan, M. I., Khan, S. Z., Shikali Shivachi, C., & Anees, A. (2021). Monitoring Population Phenology of Asian Citrus Psyllid**.** Chandrasekaran, M., Pirithiraj, U., & Soundararajan, R. J. B. R. T. (2021). Asian Citrus Psyllid: A Threat to Citriculture. *3*(1), 074-076**.**

Dai, F., Wang, F., Yang, D., Lin, S., Chen, X., Lan, Y., & Deng, X. (2022). Detection Method of Citrus Psyllids With Field High-Definition Camera Based on Improved Cascade Region-Based Convolution Neural Networks. *Volume 12 - 2021*. doi:10.3389/fpls.2021.816272doi:https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/4644213.

Dong, Z., Wang, Y., Li, C., Li, L., & Men, X. (2021). Mitochondrial DNA as a Molecular Marker in Insect Ecology: Current Status and Future Prospects.

Eduardo Serrao, J., Babar Shahzad Afzal, M., Banazeer, A., Rizwan, M., & Naeem, A. (2023). Ecology, Biology, Damage, and Management of Sucking and Chewing**.**

EPPO. (2025b). EPPO datasheets on pests recommended for regulation. Retrieved from https://gd.eppo.int/taxon/DIAACI/datasheet. EPPO Global Database Retrieved 13-4-2025.

Ferrarezi, R. S., Vincent, C. I., Urbaneja, A., & Machado, M. A. (2020). Editorial: Unravelling Citrus Huanglongbing Disease. *11*. doi:10.3389/fpls.2020.609655

Ferrer, C. M., & Vanaclocha, P. (2023). Diaphorina citri (Asian citrus psyllid).

Fordjour, O., Souza, P. G. C., da Silva, R. S., Santana Jr, P. A., Picanço, M. C., Kyerematen, R., Borgemeister, C. (2021). Response of Asian citrus psyllid Diaphorina citri Kuwayama (Hemiptera: Liviidae) to climate change.

GOP. (2024). *Economic Adviser's Wing, Finance Division Government of Pakistan, Islamabad*. Health, E. Panel o. P., Bragard, C., Dehnen-Schmutz, K., Di Serio, F., Gonthier, P., Jacques, M.-A., MacLeod, A. (2021b). Pest categorisation of Diaphorina citri. *EFSA Journal, 19*(1), e06357. doi:https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2021.6357

Hoddle, M. S., Hoddle, C. D., Morgan, D. J., Milosavljević, I. J. C. o. c. b. c. t. t. U. f. s., forestry,, & biodiversity. (2022). Successful biological control of Asian citrus psyllid, Diaphorina citri, in California. In (pp. 127-143): FHAAST-2019-05. USDA Forest Service Morgantown (WV).

Hu, B., Rao, M. J., Deng, X., Pandey, S. S., Hendrich, C., Ding, F., . . . Xu, Q. (2021). Molecular signatures between citrus and Candidatus Liberibacter asiaticus. *PLOS Pathogens, 17*(12), e1010071. doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1010071

Hussain, S., Rao, M. J., Anjum, M. A., Ejaz, S., Umar, U.-u.-D., Ali, M. A., Zia-Ul- Haq, M. J. A. E. (2019). Effect of different combinations of antibiotics on fruit quality antioxidant defense system in Huanglongbing infected Kinnow

Ibrahim, Y. E., Paredes-Montero, J. R., Al-Saleh, M. A., Widyawan, A., He, R., El Komy, M. H., . . . Brown, J. K. (2022). Characterization of the Asian Citrus Psyllid-'Candidatus Liberibacter Asiaticus' Pathosystem in Saudi Arabia Reveals Two Predominant CLas Lineages and One Asian Citrus Psyllid Vector Haplotype. *Microorganisms, 10*(10), 1991. Retrieved from https://www.mdpi.com/2076-2607/10/10/1991

Iftikhar, Y., Mubeen, M., Shakeel, Q., Lalarukh, I., Ali, A., Aasim, M., . . . Al-Shuraym, L. A. J. P. J. o. A. S. (2024). Spatial Distribution and Molecular Characterization of Huanglongbing and its Vector in Various Citrus Cultivars. *61*(2).

Khan, F., Yasmin, S., Pervez, M., Din, B. U., Manzoor, F., & Ullah, I. J. J. K. J. o. A. (2024). Comparison of Biopesticides and Synthetic Insecticides against Citrus Psylla (Diaphorina citri) in Citrus Orchad Rabbat District Dir Lower. *4*(2), 199- 205.

Kyerematen, R., . . . Borgemeister, C. (2021). Response of Asian citrus psyllid Diaphorina citri Kuwayama (Hemiptera: Liviidae) to climate change.

L. A. J. P. J. o. A. S. (2024). Spatial Distribution and Molecular Characterization of Huanglongbing and its Vector in Various Citrus Cultivars. *61*(2).

Leong, S. S., Leong, S. C. T., & Beattie, G. A. C. (2022a). Integrated Pest Management Strategies for Asian Citrus Psyllid Diaphorina citri Kuwayama (Hemiptera: Psyllidae) and Huanglongbing in Citrus for Sarawak, East Malaysia, Borneo. *Insects, 13*(10), 960. Retrieved from https://www.mdpi.com/2075- 4450/13/10/960

Luo, Y., Agnarsson, I. J. E., & Evolution. (2018). Global mt DNA genetic structure and hypothesized invasion history of a major pest of citrus, Diaphorina citri (Hemiptera: Liviidae). *8*(1), 257-265

Meng, L., Wang, Y., Wei, W.-H., & Zhang, H. (2018). Population genetic structure of Diaphorina citri Kuwayama (Hemiptera: Liviidae): host-driven genetic differentiation in China. *Scientific Reports, 8*(1), 1473. doi:10.1038/s41598- 018-19533-5

Majeed, M. Z., M.I. Ullah, D. Hussain, M. Luqman, M. Qasim, G. Yousaf, . . . Zeeshan., M. (2021). Laboratory evaluation of selected differential chemistry synthetic insecticides against some economically important insect pests. *Pakistan Journal of Agricultural Research, 34*(4), 878-888. doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.17582/journal.pjar/2021/34.4.878.888

Mare, R., Pujia, R., Maurotti, S., Greco, S., Cardamone, A., Coppoletta, A. R., . . . Pujia, A. (2023). Assessment of Mediterranean Citrus Peel Flavonoids and Their Antioxidant Capacity Using an Innovative UV-Vis Spectrophotometric Approach. *12*(23), 4046. Retrieved from https://www.mdpi.com/2223- 7747/12/23/4046

Merfa, M. V., Pérez-López, E., Naranjo, E., Jain, M., Gabriel, D. W., & De La Fuente, L. (2019). Progress and Obstacles in Culturing 'Candidatus Liberibacter asiaticus', the Bacterium Associated with Huanglongbing. *Phytopathology, 109*(7), 1092-1101. doi:10.1094/phyto-02-19-0051-rvw

Moreno, A., Miranda, M. P., & Fereres, A. J. E. G. (2021). Psyllids as major vectors of plant pathogens. *41*(5). Mukhopadhyay, T., & Bhattacharjee,

S. J. C. b. d. A. m. a. N. D., India: Research India Publications. (2016). Genetic diversity: Importance and measurements. 251- 295.

Nage, S. M., Kulkarni, U., Undirwade, D., & Sant, S. S. J. I. J. E. C. C. (2023). Relative Toxicity of Different Insecticides to Asian Citrus Psylla (Diaphorina citri Kuwayama). *13*(11), 3635-3641.

Naqvi, S. A. H., Atta, S., Liu, H., Rehman, A.-u., & Khan, A. A. J. P. J. o. A. S. (2017). Serological and molecular based detection of graft-transmissible pathogens associated with citrus from non-core areas of Pakistan. *54*(4).

Narouei-Khandan, H. A., Halbert, S. E., Worner, S. P., & van Bruggen, A. H. J. E. J. o. P. P. (2016). Global climate suitability of citrus huanglongbing and its vector, the Asian citrus psyllid, using two correlative species distribution modeling approaches, with emphasis on the USA. *144*, 655-670.

Nawaz, R., Khan, M. A., Hafiz, I. A., Khan, M. F., & Khalid, A. (2021). Climate variables effect on fruiting pattern of Kinnow mandarin (Citrus nobilis Lour × C. deliciosa Tenora) grown at different agro-climatic regions. *Scientific Reports, 11*(1), 18177. doi:10.1038/s41598-021-97653-1 orchards. *9*, 1-8.

Qasim, M., Baohua, W., Zou, H., Lin, Y., Dash, C. K., Bamisile, B. S., . . . Evolution. (2018). Phylogenetic relationship and genetic diversity of citrus psyllid populations from China and Pakistan and their associated Candidatus bacterium. *126*, 173-180.

Salgotra, R. K., & Chauhan, B. S. J. G. (2023). Genetic diversity, conservation, and utilization of plant genetic resources. *14*(1), 174.

Salik, M., Afzal, M., Komal, A., Khan, M., Ullah, M., Altaf, F., . . . Tariq, H. (2023). Effect of Different Plant Spacing on Growth, Yield and Fruit Quality of Kinnow Mandarin Citrus reticulata in Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Agricultural Research, 36*. doi:10.17582/journal.pjar/2023/36.3.230.238

Security, M. o. N. F. (2023). FRUIT, VEGETABLES AND CONDIMENTS STATISTICS OF PAKISTAN 2021-22.Serological and molecular based detection of graft-transmissible pathogens associated with citrus from non-core areas of Pakistan. *54*(4).

Sétamou, M., Soto, Y. L., Tachin, M., & Alabi, O. J. (2023). Report on the first detection of Asian citrus psyllid Diaphorina citri Kuwayama (Hemiptera: Liviidae) in the Republic of Benin, West Africa. *Scientific Reports, 13*(1), 801. doi:10.1038/s41598-023-28030-3

Sethuraman, A., Janzen, F. J., Weisrock, D. W., & Obrycki, J. J. (2020). Insights from Population Genomics to Enhance and Sustain Biological Control of Insect Pests. *11*(8), 462. Retrieved from https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4450/11/8/462

Siddique, M. I., & Garnevska, E. J. A. V. C. (2018). Citrus Value Chain (s): A Survey of Pakistan Citrus. 37.

Taning, C. N. T., Andrade, E. C., Hunter, W. B., Christiaens, O., & Smagghe, G. (2016). Asian Citrus Psyllid RNAi Pathway – RNAi evidence. *Scientific Reports, 6*(1), 38082. doi:10.1038/srep38082

Tu, Y., Gao, S., Samanta, S., Liu, Y., Chen, D., & Xu, Y. (2019). Transmission dynamics and optimal control of stage-structured HLB model. *Mathematical biosciences and engineering : MBE, 16*, 5180-5205. doi:10.3934/mbe.2019259

Umair Raza, M., Abasi, F., Shahbaz, M., Ehsan, M., Seerat, W., Akram, A., . . . Proćków,

Using Deep Learning. *2021*(1), 4644213. Vijayakumari, N., Lahane, Y., & Rekha, A. J. J. o. H. S. (2022). Ploidy analysis among Citrus mutants using leaf meristematic tissue. *17*(1), 34-40.

Volk, G. M., Gmitter, F. G., & Krueger, R. R. (2023). Conserving Citrus Diversity: From Vavilov's Early Explorations to Genebanks around the World. *12*(4), 814. Retrieved from https://www.mdpi.com/2223-7747/12/4/814

Wang, N., Stelinski, L. L., Pelz-Stelinski, K. S., Graham, J. H., & Zhang, Y. (2017). Tale of the Huanglongbing Disease Pyramid in the Context of the Citrus Microbiome. *Phytopathology, 107*(4), 380-387. doi:10.1094/phyto-12-16- 0426-rvw

Wang, R., Yang, H., Wang, M., Zhang, Z., Huang, T., Wen, G., & Li, Q. (2020). Predictions of potential geographical distribution of Diaphorina citri (Kuwayama) in China under climate change scenarios. *Scientific Reports, 10*(1), 9202. doi:10.1038/s41598-020-66274-5

Wu, F., Kumagai, L., Cen, Y., Chen, J., Wallis, C. M., Polek, M., . . . Deng, X. (2017). Analyses of Mitogenome Sequences Revealed that Asian Citrus Psyllids (Diaphorina citri) from California Were Related to Those from Florida. *Scientific Reports, 7*(1), 10154. doi:10.1038/s41598-017-10713-3

Wu, G. A., Terol, J., Ibanez, V., López-García, A., Pérez-Román, E., Borredá, C., . . . Talon, M. (2018). Genomics of the origin and evolution of Citrus. *Nature, 554*(7692), 311-316. doi:10.1038/nature25447

Yang, C., & Ancona, V. (2022). An Overview of the Mechanisms Against “Candidatus Liberibacter asiaticus”: Virulence Targets, Citrus Defenses, and Microbiome.

Yaqub, M. S. (2017). Molecular Detection of Candidatus Liberibacter Asiaticus, the Causal Organism of Huanglongbing (Citrus Greening) in Faisalabad, Pakistan for Huanglongbing Management. *Pakistan Journal of Agricultural Sciences, 54*(01), 21-26. doi:10.21162/pakjas/17.4455

Yasir Iftikhar, Y. I., Haq, I., Waqas Raza, W. R., Ullah, M., Sajjad Ali, S. A., Khoso, F., & Mubeen, M. (2017). Seasonal fluctuation of Asian citrus psylla populations in the citrus orchards infected with Huanglongbing in Sargodha, Pakistan

Zheng, Z., Chen, J., & Deng, X. (2018). Historical Perspectives, Management, and Current Research of Citrus HLB in Guangdong Province of China, Where the Disease has been Endemic for Over a Hundred Years. *108*(11), 1224-1236. doi:10.1094/phyto-07-18-0255-i

CHAPTER 2
MAJOR DISEASES OF COTTON: ETIOLOGY, EPIDEMIOLOGY AND INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

[1]V. Sathiya ARAVINDAN
[2]K. SUBA

[1]Department of Plant Pathology, Faculty of Agriculture, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar, Chidambaram, Tamil Nadu, India, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8556-7801
[2]Department of Plant Pathology, Faculty of Agriculture, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar, Chidambaram, Tamil Nadu, India, subakumar2310@gmail.com, ORCID ID: 0009-0002-9670-0919

INTRODUCTION

Cotton is an important cash crop with major economic and social significance worldwide, especially in countries like India and Pakistan. In India, cotton plays a key role in the agricultural economy by supplying raw material for the textile industry and supporting the livelihoods of more than 60 million people (Easwari et al., 2020). It contributes about 29.8% to the agricultural GDP and is essential for meeting the demands of the textile sector (Easwari et al., 2020). Similarly, in Pakistan, cotton contributes 0.6% to the national GDP and accounts for nearly 70% of export earnings, highlighting its economic importance (Baig et al., 2023).

However, cotton production is severely affected by various diseases that reduce both yield and fibre quality. Major diseases include cotton leaf curl disease caused by Begomoviruses and Ramularia leaf spot, which is particularly serious in Brazil. These diseases can cause yield losses ranging from 14.8% to 31.7% due to defoliation and reduced photosynthesis (Varma & Singh, 2024; Tormen & Blum, 2019). In addition to yield loss, farmers face increased costs for fungicides and crop management practices such as crop rotation to control disease outbreaks (Overstreet & Woodward, 2023). Therefore, this chapter examines major cotton diseases, their life cycles, impacts on yield and quality and effective management strategies.

1. FUNGAL DISEASES

1.1 Fusarium wilt of cotton

Fusarium oxysporum f. sp. *vasinfectum* (Fov) is a soil-borne pathogen that causes *Fusarium* wilt in cotton and several other crops. Its pathogenicity is primarily attributed to its ability to produce mycelium and spores that facilitate infection and survival. The mycelium colonizes host tissues, leading to vascular discoloration and characteristic wilting symptoms. The spores, particularly microconidia, play an important role in disease spread and infection. Studies have shown that microconidia applied near the root zone are more effective in causing infection than stem injection, highlighting the importance of soil-based spore dispersal (Keinath et al., 2022). In addition to its infection strategy, the pathogen persists for extended periods by switching between pathogenic and saprophytic forms.

Soil composition and organic matter influence spore movement and survival. Certain virulence factors, such as the FovSIX16 protein, are essential for full pathogenicity in specific races like race 7 (Yang et al., 2024). The distribution of the pathogen in soil is often uneven and depends on factors such as organic matter, which affects fungal growth and inoculum levels (Isakeit & Chappell, 2023). The disease is characterized by yellowing, wilting and eventual death of leaves (Mueller & Morgham, 1996). In cotton, the pathogen infects the vascular tissues, causing vascular discoloration, which is a key diagnostic symptom (Schachtner & Isensee, 2023). This is often accompanied by leaf wilting and necrosis, leading to reduced plant vigour and yield (Bell et al., 2017). The presence of root-knot nematodes, such as *Meloidogyne incognita*, can further increase disease severity (Garber et al., 1979). The pathogen blocks the vascular system by producing toxins and enzymes, resulting in wilting and stunted growth (P.K. & Kumar, 2014). Infected plants also show physiological stress, including reduced photosynthesis and increased transpiration (Marques et al., 2023). Disease severity varies with environmental conditions such as temperature and humidity (P.K. & Kumar, 2014), as well as genetic resistance among cotton varieties (Abdelraheem et al., 2021; Zhu et al., 2022). Fusarium wilt development is strongly influenced by environmental conditions. The optimal soil temperature for disease development is 25–30°C, while temperatures above 30°C reduce pathogen activity (Fangzhi, 2010; El-Abyad & Saleh, 1971). High relative humidity and soil moisture levels also favour disease development (El-Abyad & Saleh, 1971). The disease is more severe during the budding stage, especially under well-distributed rainfall (Fangzhi, 2010). Organic nitrogen sources and medium-textured soils further enhance fungal growth (El-Abyad & Saleh, 1971; Rao & Rao, 1966). Recent studies indicate that mild and wet weather conditions can increase disease incidence (Le et al., 2022). Management of *Fusarium* wilt involves an integrated approach, including the use of resistant cultivars, biological control agents and appropriate agronomic practices. In addition to conventional management approaches, recent research has increasingly focused on biological interventions as sustainable alternatives for controlling Fusarium wilt. Recent studies highlight the effectiveness of biocontrol agents and the importance of resistance breeding for sustainable disease management.

Biological Control Agents

Table 1. Comparative Efficacy of Biocontrol Agents Against Fusarium oxysporum

Biocontrol Agent	**Key Findings**	**Source**
Trichoderma harzianum	Improved cotton growth, inhibited *Fusarium oxysporum* mycelium, enhanced antioxidant defenses in plants	Javed et al., 2024
Bacillus subtilis subsp. *inaquosorum* RLS76	85.39% pathogen inhibition; produced antimicrobial compounds; strong biocontrol potential	Raut et al., 2024
Saccharothrix algeriensis	74% reduction in disease incidence in pot experiments; strong anti-*Fusarium* activity	Asif et al., 2023

Resistance Breeding

Developing and utilizing *Fusarium* wilt resistant cotton cultivars is a cost-effective strategy. Screening techniques for resistance have evolved, focusing on inoculation and evaluation protocols (Sanogo & Zhang, 2016).

Integrated Management Approaches

Combining biocontrol agents with resistant cultivars and entomopathogenic fungi can enhance disease management. Studies indicate that multiple applications of microbial treatments can effectively control *F. oxysporum* (Dara et al., 2020). Besides *Fusarium* wilt, *Verticillium* wilt represents another major soil-borne disease that significantly affects cotton production under diverse agro-climatic conditions.

Verticillium wilt of cotton

Verticillium dahliae is a soil-borne fungal pathogen that causes *Verticillium* wilt in cotton and many other crops. It produces microsclerotia, which are dark, thick-walled survival structures which enable long-term survival under field conditions. These structures develop from hyaline hyphae and play a key role in infection across different host plants, including cotton and tomato (Sheu et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2022). The pathogen also produces large numbers of single-celled, elliptical conidia on verticillate conidiophores, which help in rapid spread and infection (Sheu et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2024).

Once inside the plant, the fungus colonizes the vascular tissues, leading to typical wilt symptoms (Zhu et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2024). *Verticillium* wilt is characterized by reduced plant growth, leaf chlorosis and a distinct "tiger stripe" pattern on leaves. In infected plants, symptoms include interveinal yellowing, necrotic lesions, wilting and eventually plant death (Sheu et al., 2023). The pathogen multiplies within the vascular system, causing blockage and toxin production, which lead to these symptoms (Zhang et al., 2022). Early infection can severely reduce plant growth and yield, as observed in crops like sunflower (Dong et al., 2021). In fibre flax, symptoms progress from lower to upper parts of the plant, indicating movement of the pathogen through the vascular system (Blum et al., 2018). Disease development is further shaped by agronomic practices such as nitrogen application and irrigation management. High nitrogen levels can increase disease severity, with susceptible cultivars showing up to twice the disease incidence compared to partially resistant ones (Albers & Woodward, 2014). Poor drainage also increases soil moisture, creating favourable conditions for pathogen growth and increasing inoculum levels (López et al., 1989; Bejarano-Alcázar et al., 1996). In regions such as the Guadalquivir Valley, intensive cotton cultivation under irrigated conditions has led to severe disease outbreaks, highlighting the combined effect of nitrogen, soil conditions and irrigation practices on disease dynamics (López et al., 1989; Bejarano-Alcázar et al., 1996).

Crop Rotation as a Management Strategy

Table 2. Crop Rotation and Soil Management Strategies for Verticillium Wilt Control

Practice	**Effectiveness / Key Findings**	**Source**
Crop Rotation	Long rotations with non-host crops reduced microsclerotia density (6.7 MS/cm³ vs. 26.1 MS/cm³ in continuous cotton)	Wheeler et al., 2014
Host Specificity	Tomato & sesame reduced pathogen populations; barley & wheat increased them	Ghagarii, 2013
Inoculum Dynamics	Rotation crops can harbour inoculum, affecting subsequent cotton crops	Wheeler & Johnson, 2016
Intercropping (Garlic/Onion)	Reduced *Verticillium* wilt incidence; increased beneficial fungi (*Chaetomium*, *Penicillium*)	Zhang et al., 2023

Cotton–Wheat Rotation	Improved soil health, reduced disease; enhanced SOC and nitrate-N	Hulugalle et al., 2006
Maize Rotation	Improved lint yields, reduced GHG emissions; less impact on wilt compared to wheat/legumes	Hulugalle et al., 2020
Green Manure Crops	Field peas/faba beans improved soil health, suppressed pathogens	Hulugalle et al., 2006; López-Escudero & Mercado-Blanco, 2011
Long-Fallow Cotton	Reduced disease incidence by lowering pathogen load	Hulugalle et al., 2006
Soil Solarization	6–10 weeks reduced disease incidence to 13% vs. 55–90% in controls	Melero-Vara et al., 1995
Organic Amendments	Compost/green manure enhanced microbial diversity; *Trichoderma* & non-pathogenic *Fusarium* reduced microsclerotia	Kowalska, 2021; Gao et al., 2021
Biofumigation	Brassica residues released toxic compounds, suppressing *V. dahliae*	Kowalska, 2021
Rigolen Plowing	Soil inversion buried infested soil, reduced pathogen concentration	Wilhelm et al., 1967
Soil pH & Nutrients	Higher Ca & Mg linked to reduced black root rot incidence	Hulugalle et al., 2020

Apart from soil-borne vascular wilts, foliar diseases also play a critical role in limiting cotton productivity, particularly under favourable environmental conditions.

Grey Mildew of Cotton

Ramularia areola is an important fungal pathogen that causes Ramularia leaf blight in cotton, especially in Brazil. Infection starts with the germination of conidia, which occurs without the formation of appressoria. The germ tubes grow towards the stomata, penetrate the leaf tissues and colonize the mesophyll cells. The pathogen then produces spores through the stomata, leading to further spread of the disease (Curvêlo et al., 2010). The fungus can survive in infected plant debris during the cotton-free period. Its teleomorph, *Mycosphaerella areola*, plays a key role in survival and helps the pathogen persist between growing seasons, leading to new disease outbreaks (Mehta et al., 2016). Sporulation is influenced by temperature, with optimal conditions reported at 17 °C and 23 °C for different isolates (Galbieri et al., 2015).

Management of the disease is challenging and often requires repeated fungicide applications, indicating the aggressive nature of the pathogen (Galbieri et al., 2015). However, some cotton cultivars show resistance, which offers opportunities for breeding resistant varieties and improving disease management strategies (Ramanagouda & Ashtaputre, 2019). Grey mildew development is closely associated with specific weather conditions, particularly temperature, humidity and rainfall patterns.

Table 3. Weather Factors Influencing Grey Mildew Development in Cotton

Factor	Key Findings	Source
Temperature	Optimal range: 20–30°C; conducive spread at max 28.6°C and min 16.5°C	Johnson et al., 2013; Jadhav et al., 2001
Humidity	High RH (>80%) crucial; morning & evening RH strongly correlated with disease intensity; 1% rise in evening RH → 0.38% increase in disease index (Bt cotton) & 1.87% (non-Bt cotton)	Johnson et al., 2013; Daunde, 2021; Ashwini et al., 2024
Rainfall	Frequent rains & prolonged dew enhance spread; negative correlation between rainfall and disease; ~105.1 mm rainfall prior to occurrence critical	Jadhav et al., 2001

Management strategies for grey mildew of cotton

Table 4. Fungicide Application and Resistant Genotypes against Grey Mildew in Cotton

Category	Key Findings	Source
Effective Fungicides	Sulpen 80 WP (0.25%) controlled disease by 67.7%; followed by Dithane Z-78 and Calixin 80 EC	Shivankar & Wangikar, 1993
Alternative Treatments	‘Calda Vicosa’ + Mancozeb/Tebuconazole improved yield by 88% compared to untreated plots	Aquino et al., 2008
Resistant Genotypes	Cotton genotypes GSHV-159 and GISV-272 showed strong resistance; useful for breeding programs	Senapati, 2023
Diversity in Resistance	Out of 89 cultivars tested, 22 consistently exhibited strong resistance; aids farmer selection	Senapati, 2023

2. BACTERIAL DISEASES

2.1 Bacterial Blight (Angular Leaf Spot)

Black arm of cotton, also known as bacterial blight, is an important disease affecting cotton crops worldwide. It is caused by the gram-negative bacterium *Xanthomonas axonopodis* pv. *malvacearum*. The disease produces a range of symptoms that reduce both yield and fibre quality. The initial symptoms appear as small, water-soaked spots on the leaves. These spots gradually enlarge into angular or irregular lesions. Infected leaves often turn yellow and may fall off, reducing the plant's photosynthetic capacity and causing stunted growth. As the disease progresses, it spreads to the stem, leading to blackening of the vascular tissues, which can be seen when the stem is cut open. This disruption impairs the translocation of water and nutrients, resulting in wilting of leaves. In severe cases, the infection can cause dieback of branches, further reducing plant productivity. Black arm causes significant yield losses by damaging leaves and stems, which are essential for plant growth and boll development. Susceptible varieties are particularly affected and can suffer heavy yield reduction. In addition, the disease lowers fibre quality, making it less suitable for textile production (Elassbli et al., 2021).

Environmental and Host Factors Influencing Symptoms

Weather parameters such as temperature, relative humidity and rainfall can influence the severity of black arm symptoms. High humidity and rainfall can facilitate the spread of the bacterium, exacerbating the disease (Singh et al., 2009). The severity of symptoms can vary depending on the cotton variety. Some cultivars exhibit resistance to the bacterium, reducing the extent of leaf and stem damage (Elassbli et al., 2021).

Economic Implications

The economic impact of black arm is significant, with yield losses directly affecting farmers' incomes. In regions where the disease is prevalent, farmers may experience reduced profitability and increased production costs (Xu, 2014). Managing black arm often requires integrated disease management strategies, including the use of resistant varieties, crop rotation and chemical controls, which can increase production costs (Pereg, 2013).

Table 5. Management Strategies for Black Arm in Cotton

Approach	Key Findings	Source
Cultural Practices	Crop rotation, sanitation, resistant cultivars; destroying leftover crop material and avoiding continuous cotton reduces inoculum load	Egan & Stiller, 2022
Biological Control	Parasitic fungi and bacteria suppress pathogen; *Trichogramma* species parasitize bollworm eggs, indirectly aiding disease management	Sarwar, 2017; Kumari et al., 2024
Chemical Control	Judicious pesticide use can control spread; overuse leads to resistance and pollution; rotation of selective pesticides recommended	Sarwar, 2017

3. VIRAL DISEASES

3.1 Cotton Leaf Curl Virus (CLCuV)

Cotton leaf curl virus (CLCuV) belongs to a complex group of Begomoviruses that includes Cotton leaf curl Burewala virus (CLCuBuV), Cotton leaf curl Kokhran virus (CLCuKoV) and Cotton leaf curl Multan virus (CLCuMV). These viruses are often associated with satellite molecules such as Cotton leaf curl Multan beta satellite (CLCuMB) and Cotton leaf curl Multan alpha satellite (CLCuMA), which play a role in disease development (Kumar et al., 2015; Mao et al., 2008; Zaffalon et al., 2012). Different strains of CLCuBuV show variation in symptom severity. For example, CLCuBuV-1, which has an intact TrAP gene, causes more severe symptoms such as leaf curling and plant stunting. In contrast, CLCuBuV-2, which contains a mutated TrAP gene, produces milder symptoms (Kumar et al., 2015). Some isolates of CLCuMV can infect other plant species, such as *Hibiscus rosa-sinensis*, thereby expanding the host range of the virus (Mao et al., 2008).

Symptoms and Impact

Table 6. Symptoms and Impact of Cotton Leaf Curl Virus (CLCuV)

Aspect	Key Findings	Source
Leaf Curling & Vein Thickening	Infected plants show curled leaves with thickened veins, reducing photosynthetic efficiency	Kumar et al., 2015; Mao et al., 2008
Stunted Growth	Virus impairs plant development, leading to shorter stature and reduced yield	Kumar et al., 2015; Mao et al., 2008
Economic Impact	CLCuV reduces fiber yield and quality, especially in Pakistan and northwestern India	Zaffalon et al., 2012

Transmission and Vector Dynamics

The primary vector of CLCuV is the whitefly *Bemisia tabaci*, a complex of cryptic species.

Vector Efficiency: Only specific whitefly biotypes, such as Asia II 1, efficiently transmit CLCuV, explaining its limited spread in certain regions (Masood & Briddon, 2018)

Seasonal Dynamics: Virus and beta satellite levels in whiteflies vary throughout the growing season, with betasatellite levels increasing steadily (Iqbal et al., 2024).

3.2 Management Strategies

Chemical and Nanoparticle Applications

Pesticides: Traditional management involves controlling the whitefly vector using pesticides, which has been effective in reducing disease incidence by up to 79.3% (Shafqat et al., 2024).

Nanoparticles: Biogenic nanoparticles such as zinc oxide and silver nanoparticles have been tested as eco-friendly alternatives to pesticides, showing moderate efficacy in reducing infection rates (Shafqat et al., 2024).

Cultural and Biological Control

Cultural Practices: Implementing crop rotation, using resistant varieties and managing planting dates can help reduce the spread of CLCuV (Atiq et al., 2023).

Biological Control: Utilizing natural predators of the whitefly vector and employing pathogen-derived resistance strategies are part of integrated pest management approaches (Atiq et al., 2023).

Integrated Disease Management (IDM) Framework for Cotton Diseases

Integrated Disease Management (IDM) is a sustainable and holistic approach that combines multiple strategies to effectively manage cotton diseases while minimizing environmental impact. It emphasizes the integration of cultural, biological, genetic and chemical methods based on disease epidemiology and agro-climatic conditions.

Cultural practices such as crop rotation, field sanitation, optimum sowing time and proper irrigation management play a crucial role in reducing pathogen inoculum and disease spread. The use of resistant or tolerant cultivars is one of the most effective and economical strategies for managing diseases like *Fusarium* wilt, *Verticillium* wilt and bacterial blight. Biological control agents, including *Trichoderma* spp. and *Bacillus* spp., help suppress soil-borne pathogens and enhance plant defense responses. Chemical control, including the judicious use of fungicides and bactericides, should be applied based on disease severity and economic threshold levels to avoid resistance development and environmental hazards. In the case of viral diseases such as cotton leaf curl virus (CLCuV), management primarily focuses on controlling insect vectors like *Bemisia tabaci* through integrated pest management strategies. Recent advancements such as the use of biogenic nanoparticles, molecular breeding and precision agriculture tools further strengthen IDM approaches. Overall, IDM provides a balanced, eco-friendly and effective strategy for sustaining cotton productivity and managing complex disease problems under changing climatic conditions.

Table 7. Comparative Overview of Major Cotton Diseases, Pathogens, Symptoms and Management Strategies

Disease	Pathogen	Key Symptoms	Management Strategies
Fusarium wilt	*Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *vasinfectum*	Yellowing, wilting, vascular discoloration, stunted growth	Resistant cultivars, crop rotation, biocontrol agents (*Trichoderma*, *Bacillus*), soil management
Verticillium wilt	*Verticillium dahliae*	Chlorosis, wilting, “tiger stripe” leaves, vascular browning	Crop rotation, soil solarization, balanced fertilization, resistant varieties
Grey mildew (*Ramularia* leaf blight)	*Ramularia areola*	White/grey powdery growth, leaf spots, defoliation	Fungicide sprays, resistant genotypes, humidity management
Bacterial blight (Black arm)	*Xanthomonas axonopodis* pv. *malvacearum*	Water-soaked lesions, angular leaf spots, stem blackening, defoliation	Resistant varieties, seed treatment, sanitation, chemical control
Cotton leaf curl virus (CLCuV)	Begomovirus complex (CLCuBuV, CLCuKoV, CLCuMV)	Leaf curling, vein thickening, stunted growth	Vector control (*Bemisia tabaci*), resistant varieties, cultural practices, IPM

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE PROSPECTS

Cotton production worldwide is significantly constrained by a wide range of diseases caused by fungal, bacterial and viral pathogens. Major diseases such as *Fusarium* wilt, *Verticillium* wilt, grey mildew, bacterial blight and cotton leaf curl virus (CLCuV) not only reduce yield but also adversely affect fibre quality and market value. These diseases are complex, driven by interactions among pathogen biology, host susceptibility and cropping practices. Soil-borne pathogens such as *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *vasinfectum* and *Verticillium dahliae* persist in soil for long periods, making their management particularly challenging. Similarly, foliar and vector-borne diseases like grey mildew and CLCuV can spread rapidly under favourable climatic conditions, leading to severe epidemics. Effective management of cotton diseases requires an integrated approach that combines resistant cultivars, cultural practices, biological control agents and the judicious use of chemicals. The adoption of Integrated Disease Management (IDM) strategies plays a critical role in reducing disease incidence while ensuring environmental sustainability. In particular, host plant resistance and biological control have emerged as cost-effective and eco-friendly approaches for long-term disease suppression.

Future research should focus on the development of durable disease resistant cotton varieties using advanced breeding techniques, including marker-assisted selection and genomic approaches. The exploration of novel biocontrol agents, plant-derived compounds and microbial consortia offers promising alternatives to chemical pesticides. Emerging technologies such as nanotechnology, RNA interference (RNAi) and genome editing tools like CRISPR/Cas systems have the potential to revolutionize plant disease management. In addition, climate-resilient disease management strategies must be developed to address the increasing impact of climate change on pathogen dynamics and disease outbreaks. Furthermore, the integration of digital agriculture tools, such as remote sensing, disease forecasting models and precision farming, can enhance early detection and timely management of diseases. Strengthening farmer awareness and promoting sustainable agricultural practices will also be crucial for effective disease control.

Overall, a multidisciplinary and integrated approach will be essential to ensure sustainable cotton production and long-term agricultural resilience. Thus, integrating advanced biotechnological tools with traditional disease management strategies will be key to ensuring sustainable cotton production in the future.

REFERENCES

Abdelraheem, A., Zhu, Y., Dever, J. K., Wheeler, T. A., Wedegaertner, T., Hake, K., & Zhang, J. (2021). Identification of resistance sources to Fusarium wilt race 4 in *Gossypium barbadense* and cultivated Asiatic diploid species. *Euphytica, 217*(7), Article 128. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10681-021-02882-0

Albers, C. R., & Woodward, J. E. (2014). Impact of nitrogen on cotton growth, lint yield, fiber quality and Verticillium wilt. *American Journal of Experimental Agriculture, 4*(8), 922–938. https://doi.org/10.9734/AJEA/2014/8919

Aquino, L. A. de, Berger, P. G., Rodrigues, F. Á., Zambolim, L., Ogoshi, F., Miranda, L. M., & Lélis, M. M. (2008). Controle alternativo da mancha de Ramularia do algodoeiro. *Summa Phytopathologica, 34*(2), 131–136. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0100-54052008000200004

Arabsalmani, M., Ghagarii, A., & Yousefii, M. (2014). The effect of crop rotation on Verticillium wilt and agronomical and non-agronomical characters of cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum*). *Field Crops Research, 103*, 190–198.

Ashwini, D., Ram Prasad, B., Prashanth, Y., Madavi, B., & Uma Reddy, R. (2024). Influence of weather parameters on the development of grey mildew disease in cotton. *International Journal of Environment and Climate Change, 14*(1). https://doi.org/10.9734/ijecc/2024/v14i13896

Asif, R., Siddique, M. H., Hayat, S., Rasul, I., Nadeem, H., Faisal, M., Waseem, M., Zakki, S. A., Zitouni, A., & Muzammil, S. (2023). Efficacy of *Saccharothrix algeriensis* NRRL B-24137 to suppress *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *vasinfectum*-induced wilt disease in cotton. *PeerJ, 11*, e14754. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.14754

Atiq, M., Talib, M. Z., Rajput, N., Sahi, S. T., Khan, M. A., Usman, M., Jabar, A. K., Arif, M. J., Gogi, M. D., Khan, M. A., & Akram, A. S. (2023). New-fangled tactics towards cotton leaf curl virus disease: A review. *Journal of Natural Fibers, 20*(2). https://doi.org/10.1080/15440478.2023.2217364

Baig, I. A., Ullah, S., & Nasir, S. (2023). Policy impacts on comparative advantage and production protection to cotton and its competing crops in

Pakistan. *Pakistan Development Review, 62*(4), 539–551. https://doi.org/10.30541/v62i4pp.539-551

Bejarano-Alcázar, J., Blanco-López, M. A., Melero-Vara, J. M., & Jiménez-Díaz, R. M. (1996). Etiology, importance, and distribution of Verticillium wilt of cotton in southern Spain. *Plant Disease, 80*(11), 1233–1238. https://doi.org/10.1094/PD-80-1233

Bell, A. A., Kemerait, R. C., Ortiz, C. S., Prom, S., Quintana, J., Nichols, R. L., & Liu, J. (2017). Genetic diversity, virulence, and *Meloidogyne incognita* interactions of *Fusarium oxysporum* isolates causing cotton wilt in Georgia. *Plant Disease, 101*(6), 948–956. https://doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-09-16-1382-RE

Blanco-López, M. A., Bejarano-Alcázar, J., Melero-Vara, J. M., & Jiménez-Díaz, R. M. (1989). Current status of Verticillium wilt of cotton in southern Spain: Pathogen variation and population in soil. In *Proceedings* (pp. 123–132). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-73166-2_8

Blum, A., Bressan, M., Zahid, A., Trinsoutrot-Gattin, I., Driouich, A., & Laval, K. (2018). Verticillium wilt on fiber flax: Symptoms and pathogen development in planta. *Plant Disease, 102*(12), 2421–2429. https://doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-01-18-0139-RE

Chen, A., Morrison, S., Gregson, A., Le, D. P., Urquhart, A. S., Smith, L. J., Aitken, E. A. B., & Gardiner, D. M. (2024). Fluorescently tagged *Verticillium dahliae* to understand the infection process on cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum*) and weed plant species. *Pathogens, 13*(6), Article 442. https://doi.org/10.3390/pathogens13060442

Curvêlo, C. R. da S., Rodrigues, F. Á., Berger, P. G., & Rezende, D. C. (2010). Scanning electron microscopy of the infection process of *Ramularia areola* in cotton leaves. *Tropical Plant Pathology, 35*(2), 108–113. https://doi.org/10.1590/S1982-56762010000200006

Dara, S. K., Dara, S. S., & Dara, S. R. (2020). Managing *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *vasinfectum* race 4 with beneficial microorganisms including entomopathogenic fungi. *Acta Horticulturae, 1270*, 111–116. https://doi.org/10.17660/ACTAHORTIC.2020.1270.11

Daunde, A. T. (2021). Correlation of weather parameters with the development of grey mildew disease of cotton caused by *Ramularia areola*. *International Journal of Plant Protection, 9*(1), 489–494. https://doi.org/10.18782/2582-2845.8553

Easwari, S., Natesan, R., & Malarvizhi, P. (2020). Assessment of biostimulants on availability and uptake of nutrients by irrigated transgenic cotton. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences, 9*(11), 2591–2605. https://doi.org/10.20546/IJCMAS.2020.911.314

El-Abyad, M. S., & Saleh, Y. E. (1971). Studies with *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *vasinfectum*, the cause of cotton wilt in Egypt: Germination, sporulation and growth. *Transactions of the British Mycological Society, 57*(3), 427–437. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0007-1536(71)80058-X

Elassbli, H., Abdelraheem, A., Zhu, Y., Teng, Z., Sanogo, S., Wheeler, T. A., Wedegaertner, T., & Zhang, J. (2021). Evaluation and analysis of commercial cultivars and elite breeding lines for resistance to bacterial blight pathogen race 18 in cotton. *Euphytica, 217*(2), Article 25. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10681-020-02753-0

Galbieri, R., Cia, E., Morello, C. de L., Fanan, S., Andrade Junior, E. R., & Kobayasti, L. (2015). *Ramularia areola* sporulation potential in Brazilian cotton. *Summa Phytopathologica, 41*(3), 233–235. https://doi.org/10.1590/0100-5405/2008

Gao, C., Wang, B., Ma, G., & Zeng, H. (2021). Green fluorescent protein-tagged *Bacillus axarquiensis* reduced cotton Verticillium wilt incidence. *Current Microbiology, 78*(9), 3562–3576. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00284-021-02618-2

Garber, R. H., Jorgenson, E. C., Smith, S., & Hyer, A. H. (1979). Interaction of population levels of *Fusarium oxysporum* and *Meloidogyne incognita* on cotton. *Journal of Nematology, 11*(2), 133–137.

Hulugalle, N., Nachimuthu, G., Kirkby, K., Lonergan, P., Watkins, M. D., & Finlay, L. A. (2020). Effects of maize rotation in cotton systems. *Soil Research, 58*(2), 137–150. https://doi.org/10.1071/SR19242

Hulugalle, N., Weaver, T. B., & Finlay, L. A. (2006). Residual effects of cotton-based crop rotations. *Soil Research, 44*(5), 467–477. https://doi.org/10.1071/SR05141

Iqbal, Z., Masood, M., Shafiq, M., & Briddon, R. W. (2024). Temporal changes in virus levels in whitefly feeding. *Frontiers in Microbiology*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2024.1410568

Isakeit, T., & Chappell, T. M. (2023). Growth rates of *Fusarium oxysporum* and infection risk. *Phytopathology*. https://doi.org/10.1094/PHYTO-11-22-0407-R

Jadhav, A. C., Nimbalkar, R. D., & Pawar, N. B. (2001). Incidence of grey mildew on cotton. *Journal of the Maharashtra Agricultural Universities, 26*(1), 32–34.

Javed, I., Khan, M. A., Riaz, H., Saeed, S., Ali, H., Bashair, M., & Haider, I. (2024). Sustainable management of Fusarium wilt in cotton through biological applications. *Research Square* **[Preprint]**. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-5191412/v1

Johnson, I., Ramjegathesh, R., Karthikeyan, M., & Chidambaram, P. (2013). Epidemiology of grey mildew and *Alternaria* blight. *Archives of Phytopathology and Plant Protection, 46*(18), 2216–2223. https://doi.org/10.1080/03235408.2013.789183

Keinath, A. P., Rennberger, G., DuBose, V. B., Zardus, S. H., & Rollins, P. A. (2022). *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *vasinfectum* identified on okra in South Carolina, United States. *Plant Health Progress, 24*(1), 110–111. https://doi.org/10.1094/php-05-22-0048-br

Kowalska, B. (2021). Management of the soil-borne fungal pathogen *Verticillium dahliae* Kleb. causing vascular wilt diseases. *Journal of Plant Pathology, 103*(4), 1185–1194. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42161-021-00937-8

Kumar, J., Gunapati, S., Alok, A., Lalit, A., Gadre, R., Sharma, N. C., Roy, J., & Singh, S. P. (2015). Cotton leaf curl Burewala virus with intact or mutant transcriptional activator proteins: Complexity of cotton leaf curl disease. *Archives of Virology, 160*(5), 1219–1228. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00705-015-2384-4

Le, D. P., Nguyen, C. P., Kafle, D., Scheikowski, L., Montgomery, J., Lambeth, E., Thomas, A. L., O'Keeffe, K., Shakeshaft, B., Young, A. M., McKay, A. R., Twine, A., Hudson, E., Jackson, R. M., & Smith, L. J. (2022). Surveillance, diversity, and vegetative compatibility groups of *Fusarium* *oxysporum* f. sp. *vasinfectum* collected in cotton fields in Australia (2017–2022). *Pathogens, 11*(12), 1537. https://doi.org/10.3390/pathogens11121537

Liu, F. (2010). A brief analysis on impact factors of cotton Fusarium wilt occurring. *Journal of Anhui Agricultural Sciences, 38*(24), 13234–13235.

López-Escudero, F. J., & Mercado-Blanco, J. (2011). Verticillium wilt of olive: A case study to implement an integrated strategy to control a soil-borne pathogen. *Plant and Soil, 344*(1–2), 1–50. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-010-0629-2

Mao, M.-J., He, Z.-F., Yu, H., & Li, H.-P. (2008). Molecular characterization of cotton leaf curl Multan virus and its satellite DNA that infects *Hibiscus rosa-sinensis*. *Chinese Journal of Virology, 24*(1), 64–68.

Marques, M. M. de S., Vitorino, L. C., Rosa, M., Dário, B. M. M., Silva, F. G., & Bessa, L. A. (2023). Leaf physiology and histopathology of the interaction between *Fusarium equiseti* and *Gossypium hirsutum*. *European Journal of Plant Pathology*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10658-023-02759-z

Masood, M., & Briddon, R. W. (2018). Transmission of cotton leaf curl disease: Answer to a long-standing question. *Virus Genes, 54*(6), 743–745. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11262-018-1605-9

Mehta, Y. R., Galbieri, R., Marangoni, M. S., Borsato, L. C., Rodrigues, H. P., Pereira, J., & Mehta, A. (2016). *Mycosphaerella areola*—The teleomorph of *Ramularia areola* of cotton in Brazil and its epidemiological significance. *American Journal of Plant Sciences, 7*(10), 1415–1422. https://doi.org/10.4236/ajps.2016.710135

Melero-Vara, J. M., Blanco-López, M. A., Bejarano-Alcázar, J., & Jiménez-Díaz, R. M. (1995). Control of Verticillium wilt of cotton by soil solarization and tolerant cultivars in southern Spain. *Plant Pathology, 44*(2), 250–260. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3059.1995.tb02776.x

Mueller, W. C., & Morgham, A. T. (1996). Ultrastructure of vascular responses of tobacco to *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *nicotianae*. *Botany, 74*(8), 1273–1278. https://doi.org/10.1139/b96-154

Mushtaq, R., Shahzad, K., Mansoor, S., Shah, Z. H., Alsamadany, H., Mujtaba, T., Alzahrani, Y., Alzahrani, H. A. S., Ahmed, Z., & Bashir, A. (2018). Exploration of cotton leaf curl virus resistance genes in *Gossypium arboreum*. *AoB Plants, 10*(6). https://doi.org/10.1093/aobpla/ply067

Overstreet, C. M., & Woodward, J. E. (2023). Diseases of cotton. In T. A. Wheeler & J. E. Woodward (Eds.), *Compendium of cotton diseases* (pp. 95–106). American Phytopathological Society. https://doi.org/10.1094/9780890546758.007

Pereg, L. (2013). Black root rot of cotton in Australia: The host, the pathogen and disease management. *Crop & Pasture Science, 64*(12), 1112–1126. https://doi.org/10.1071/CP13231

Ramanagouda, G., & Ashtaputre, S. A. (2019). Collection and characterization of grey mildew (*Ramularia areola*) pathogen of cotton. *Indian Phytopathology, 72*(2), 301–307. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42360-019-00123-y

Rao, M. V., & Rao, A. S. (1966). Fusarium wilt of cotton in relation to inoculum potential. *Transactions of the British Mycological Society, 49*(3), 403–409. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0007-1536(66)80084-0

Raut, L. S., Dalvi, S. M., & Rakh, R. R. (2024). Antifungal potential of *Bacillus subtilis* subsp. *inaquosorum* RLS76 for management of Fusarium wilt disease of Bt cotton. *Current Agriculture Research Journal*. https://doi.org/10.12944/carj.12.1.21

Sanogo, S., & Zhang, J. (2016). Resistance sources, resistance screening techniques and disease management for Fusarium wilt in cotton. *Euphytica, 207*(2), 255–271. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10681-015-1532-y

Sarwar, M. (2017). Cotton bollworm (*Helicoverpa armigera*) and development of integrated pest management platform. *Journal of Agriculture and Allied Sciences, 2*(1), 63–70.

Schachtner, D., & Isensee, J. (2023). Targeted development of diagnostic SNP markers for resistance to Fusarium wilt race 4 in upland cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum*). *bioRxiv* **[Preprint]**. https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.03.06.531315

Senapati, A. K. (2023). Evaluation of *Gossypium hirsutum* genotypes for resistance to grey mildew disease caused by *Ramularia areola*. *Ecology, Environment and Conservation, 29*, 281–288. https://doi.org/10.53550/eec.2023.v29i03s.051

Shafqat, U., Yasin, M. U., Shahid, M., Hussain, S., Shahzad, T., Mahmood, F., & Zeid, A. (2024). Impact of biogenic nanoparticles and pesticide application in controlling cotton leaf curl virus disease. *Chemical and Biological Technologies in Agriculture, 11*(1), 149. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-4416740/v1

Sheu, Z.-M., Chiu, M.-H., Chang, J.-H., & Oliva, R. (2023). First report of *Verticillium dahliae* causing wilt in grafted tomato in Taiwan. *Plant Disease*. https://doi.org/10.1094/PDIS-09-22-2083-PDN

Shivankar, S. K., & Wangikar, P. D. (1993). Effect of different fungicides on control of grey mildew disease of cotton. *Indian Phytopathology, 46*(3), 230–235.

Singh, D., Singh, P., Gill, J. S., Brar, J. S., & Sekhon, P. S. (2009). Impact of weather parameters on cotton leaf curl disease in upland cotton. *Plant Disease Research, 24*(1), 92–93.

Singh, P. (2014). Fusarium wilt of chrysanthemum: Problems and prospects. *Plant Pathology & Quarantine, 4*(1), 33–42. https://doi.org/10.5943/ppq/4/1/5

Tormen, N. R., & Blum, L. E. B. (2019). Ramularia leaf spot effect on yield and fibre quality of cotton under fungicide application. *Revista Caatinga, 32*(3), 634–646. https://doi.org/10.1590/1983-21252019v32n308rc

Varma, A., & Singh, M. (2024). Cotton. In *Advances in agronomy* (pp. 223–232). Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-323-90899-3.00088-4

Wang, D., Su, Z., Ning, D., Zhao, Y., Meng, H., Dong, B., Zhao, J., & Zhou, H. (2021). Different appearance period of Verticillium wilt symptoms affects sunflower growth and production. *Journal of Plant Pathology, 103*(2), 513–517. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42161-021-00772-x

Wheeler, T. A., Bordovsky, J. P., Keeling, J. W., & Woodward, J. E. (2014). Effect of cropping systems on densities of *Verticillium dahliae*. *Plant Pathology & Nematology Journal*. http://cotton.org/journal/2014-18/2/upload/jcs18-355.pdf

Wilhelm, S., Sagen, J. E., Tietz, H., & George, A. (1967). Vertical distribution of fungus suggests rigolen plowing for control of Verticillium wilt in cotton. *California Agriculture, 21*(5), 2–4.

Xu, F. (2014). Analysis of economic loss from pest insects and plant disease in cotton of China during 1991–2000. *Chinese Bulletin of Entomology*.

Yang, D., Zhang, X., Ming, Y., Liu, C., Zhang, X., Liu, S., & Zhu, L. (2024). Characterization of the high-quality genome sequence and virulence factors of *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *vasinfectum* race 7. *Journal of Fungi*. https://doi.org/10.3390/jof10040242

Zaffalon, V., Mukherjee, S. K., Reddy, V. S., Thompson, J. R., & Tepfer, M. (2012). A survey of geminiviruses and associated satellite DNAs in cotton-growing areas of northwestern India. *Archives of Virology, 157*(3), 483–495. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00705-011-1201-y

Zhang, D.-D., Dai, X., Klosterman, S. J., Subbarao, K. V., & Chen, J. (2022). The secretome of *Verticillium dahliae* in collusion with plant defence responses modulates Verticillium wilt symptoms. *Biological Reviews, 97*(5), 1810–1822. https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12863

Zhang, Y., Yang, Y., Lu, X., Wang, A., Xue, C., Zhao, M., & Zhang, J. (2023). Effects and interrelationships of intercropping on cotton Verticillium wilt and soil microbial communities. *BMC Microbiology, 23*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12866-023-02780-6

Zhang, Y., Zhou, J., Zhao, P., Feng, Z., Wei, F., Bai, H., & Fang, H. (2022). A review of the pathogenicity mechanism of *Verticillium dahliae* in cotton. *Journal of Cotton Research, 5*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s42397-021-00111-6

Zhu, H., Li, Y., Ji, X. B., Zhang, D. D., Chen, J. Y., Dai, X. F., & Wang, D. (2024). Disease quantification analysis of cotton Verticillium wilt using disease index and fungal biomass methods. *Plant Protection Science, 60*(2). https://doi.org/10.17221/109/2023-pps

Zhu, Y., Thyssen, G. N., Abdelraheem, A., Teng, Z., Fang, D. D., Jenkins, J. N., McCarty, J. C., Wedegaertner, T., Hake, K., & Zhang, J. (2022). A GWAS identified a major QTL for resistance to Fusarium wilt race 4 in upland cotton and a meta-analysis of QTLs. *Theoretical and Applied Genetics, 135*(7), 2297–2312. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00122-022-04113-z

CHAPTER 3
SYNTROPIC AGROFORESTRY SYSTEMS: ECOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES, DESIGN STRATEGIES, AND SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURAL APPLICATIONS

[1]Bui Thi THO

[1]Bttho@ued.udn.vn, ORCID ID: 0000-0002-5707-4698

INTRODUCTION

Agricultural systems worldwide are facing increasing pressures from climate change, land degradation, biodiversity loss, and rising food demand. Global assessments show that a large proportion of agricultural land has been degraded due to unsustainable practices, particularly intensive monoculture systems that depend heavily on chemical inputs. Although these systems can increase yields in the short term, they often reduce soil health, ecosystem stability, and resilience to environmental change (FAO, 2021; IPCC, 2022; Lal, 2020).

Agroforestry has emerged as a promising approach to address these challenges by integrating trees, crops, and sometimes livestock within the same system. This integration enhances biodiversity, improves nutrient cycling, and strengthens ecosystem resilience while maintaining productivity. Many studies highlight the ecological and economic benefits of agroforestry, especially in tropical and subtropical regions (Altieri, 2018; Nair, 1993; Montagnini, 2017).

Within this context, syntropic agriculture—also known as syntropic agroforestry—has gained attention as a regenerative approach that mimics natural forest dynamics. It is based on the idea that agricultural systems can be designed according to ecological principles such as succession, diversity, and energy flow. By aligning farming practices with natural processes, syntropic systems aim to restore degraded land while sustaining high productivity (Götsch, 1996; Young, 1997).

The concept of "syntropy" refers to the tendency of living systems to develop toward greater complexity, organization, and productivity. Unlike entropy, which leads to disorder, syntropy emphasizes regeneration and the accumulation of biological structures. This shifts agriculture from an extractive activity to a regenerative one, where soil fertility, biodiversity, and biomass are continuously improved (Schrödinger, 1944; Götsch, 1996).

A key feature of syntropic systems is the use of ecological succession as a design principle. Species are selected based on their roles in different successional stages—pioneer, secondary, and climax—allowing efficient use of light, water, and nutrients. Spatial stratification, where plants occupy different vertical layers, further enhances resource use and productivity (Odum, 1969; Nair, 1993; Altieri, 2018).

In addition, syntropic agriculture emphasizes active biomass management through pruning and mulching. These practices accelerate organic matter accumulation, improve soil structure, and stimulate microbial activity. Unlike conventional systems that remove biomass, syntropic systems recycle it to build long-term soil fertility and resilience (Young, 1997; Lal, 2020).

Despite its potential, syntropic agriculture remains underrepresented in scientific literature. Much existing knowledge is based on practitioner experience rather than systematic research, limiting its wider adoption (Altieri, 2018; FAO, 2021).

This chapter aims to synthesize current knowledge on syntropic agroforestry by examining its theoretical foundations, core principles, and practical applications, as well as its benefits and limitations. By linking ecological theory with agricultural practice, it highlights syntropic agriculture as a viable pathway toward regenerative and climate-resilient food systems (IPCC, 2022; Montagnini, 2017).

1. THEORETICAL AND ECOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS

Understanding syntropic agroforestry systems requires a solid foundation in ecological theory, particularly concepts related to ecosystem dynamics, biodiversity, and nutrient cycling. Natural ecosystems are complex adaptive systems characterized by self-organization, nonlinear interactions, and resilience. These properties enable them to maintain functional stability and recover from disturbances. In contrast, simplified agricultural systems such as monocultures often lack resilience due to reduced biodiversity and disrupted ecological processes (Tilman et al., 2001; Folke et al., 2004).

A central principle of syntropic agriculture is ecological succession, which describes the temporal development of species composition and ecosystem structure following disturbance. Succession typically progresses from fast-growing pioneer species with high resource-use efficiency to more complex communities dominated by late-successional species. This process enhances biomass accumulation, soil formation, and ecosystem stability. In syntropic systems, succession is actively managed, with species deliberately arranged to accelerate natural successional pathways (Connell & Slatyer, 1977; Chazdon, 2014).

Closely linked to succession is the concept of functional diversity, which refers to the variety of functional traits within a biological community. High functional diversity enhances productivity, nutrient cycling, and resistance to environmental stress. In agroforestry systems, combining species with complementary traits—such as nitrogen fixation, deep rooting, and rapid biomass production—can significantly improve system performance compared to monocultures. This principle is fundamental to syntropic agriculture, where species are selected based on both their ecological roles and economic value (Hooper et al., 2005; Díaz et al., 2007).

Vertical stratification is another key ecological foundation, reflecting the spatial organization of plant species across different canopy layers. Natural forests exhibit complex stratification, allowing efficient capture of solar radiation and optimal use of vertical space. By mimicking this structure, syntropic systems can enhance photosynthetic efficiency and overall productivity, particularly in tropical environments where light is a limiting factor (Jose et al., 2004; Cardinale et al., 2012).

Nutrient cycling is also central to ecosystem functioning and a core principle of syntropic agriculture. In natural ecosystems, nutrients are continuously recycled through litterfall, decomposition, and microbial activity, resulting in minimal losses. Conventional agricultural systems, however, often rely on external inputs due to disrupted nutrient cycles. Syntropic systems restore these cycles by retaining biomass within the system through practices such as pruning and mulching, thereby improving soil organic matter and microbial processes (Lal, 2004; Drinkwater & Snapp, 2007).

Soil microbial communities play a crucial role in mediating these processes, influencing nutrient availability, soil structure, and plant health. Diverse plant communities support diverse microbial populations, which enhance nutrient cycling and suppress diseases. This interaction between aboveground and belowground biodiversity is a key mechanism underlying the regenerative capacity of syntropic systems (van der Heijden et al., 2008; Bardgett & van der Putten, 2014).

In addition, energy flow and thermodynamic efficiency are fundamental to ecosystem organization. Ecological systems tend to evolve toward configurations that maximize energy capture and minimize dissipation.

This aligns with the concept of syntropy, which emphasizes increasing biological complexity and organization. By enhancing photosynthesis and biomass production, syntropic systems improve energy use efficiency and support ecosystem development (Odum & Pinkerton, 1955; Jørgensen & Svirezhev, 2004).

Finally, ecosystem resilience is critical for sustainable agriculture. Resilience refers to the capacity of a system to absorb disturbances and reorganize while maintaining its core functions. Structurally complex and diverse systems, such as syntropic agroforestry, are generally more resilient to environmental stressors, including climate variability, pests, and diseases. This highlights the importance of ecologically informed agricultural design in the context of global environmental change (Folke et al., 2004; Walker et al., 2004).

2. CORE PRINCIPLES OF SYNTROPIC AGRICULTURE

Syntropic agriculture is grounded in a set of ecological principles that guide the design and management of productive and regenerative agroecosystems. These principles are derived from observations of natural ecosystems, particularly tropical forests, where productivity, biodiversity, and resilience are maintained without external inputs. By translating these ecological dynamics into agricultural practices, syntropic systems aim to maximize both productivity and ecosystem regeneration.

The Concept of Syntropy

The concept of "syntropy" originates from thermodynamics and systems theory and refers to the tendency of living systems to evolve toward greater order, complexity, and organization. In contrast to entropy—which describes the natural progression toward disorder—syntropy emphasizes the accumulation of structure, energy, and biological organization over time (Schrödinger, 1944).

In the context of agriculture, syntropy represents a paradigm shift from extractive production systems to regenerative systems that enhance life-supporting processes. Rather than depleting soil nutrients and ecosystem functions, syntropic agriculture seeks to increase biomass, biodiversity, and soil fertility through continuous ecological development.

This perspective aligns with ecological intensification, where ecosystem processes are harnessed to sustain agricultural productivity (Tittonell, 2014).

Syntropic systems therefore function as dynamic, evolving ecosystems in which human management accelerates natural processes such as succession, nutrient cycling, and energy flow.

Biomass Maximization

Biomass maximization is a core principle of syntropic agriculture, as biomass drives key ecosystem processes such as nutrient cycling, soil formation, and energy flow. In syntropic systems, plant species are carefully selected to ensure continuous and abundant biomass production. Fast-growing pioneer species are strategically integrated to generate large amounts of organic material, which is regularly pruned and returned to the soil as mulch.

This continuous input of biomass enhances soil organic carbon, improves soil structure, and stimulates microbial activity. Increased biomass has been shown to directly improve soil fertility and overall ecosystem productivity (Lal, 2004). In addition, high biomass production supports carbon sequestration, contributing to climate change mitigation (Nair et al., 2009).

Therefore, biomass is not simply a byproduct but a fundamental resource that drives regeneration, resilience, and productivity in syntropic systems.

Continuous Soil Cover

Maintaining continuous soil cover is a key principle of syntropic agriculture. In natural ecosystems, soil is rarely left bare, as it is protected by vegetation or organic litter, which helps prevent erosion, conserve moisture, and regulate temperature.

Syntropic systems replicate this condition by keeping the soil constantly covered with living plants or organic mulch. Pruned biomass is reused as ground cover, protecting the soil while enhancing nutrient cycling through decomposition.

Continuous cover also supports soil biodiversity, including microorganisms and invertebrates that play essential roles in nutrient transformation and soil structure formation.

These organisms are critical for sustaining long-term soil fertility and resilience (Bardgett & van der Putten, 2014).

Unlike conventional systems, syntropic agriculture minimizes soil exposure and disturbance, maintaining a stable environment that supports ecological processes.

Temporal Dynamics and Ecological Succession

Temporal dynamics, particularly ecological succession, are central to syntropic systems. Succession describes the natural progression of plant communities from pioneer species to more complex and stable ecosystems.

In syntropic agriculture, this process is actively managed through careful species selection and the timing of planting and pruning. Pioneer species are used to rapidly build biomass and improve soil conditions, followed by secondary and climax species that support long-term productivity and stability.

This temporal organization allows efficient resource use, as species occupy different ecological niches over time. It also ensures continuous production through staggered harvesting.

By accelerating natural succession, syntropic systems reduce the time needed to develop mature ecosystems, improving both ecological and economic outcomes (Chazdon, 2014).

2.1 Comparison with Other Agricultural Systems

Conventional Agriculture

Conventional agriculture is typically characterized by monoculture systems, heavy reliance on synthetic inputs, and simplified ecosystem structures. While these systems can achieve high short-term yields, they often lead to soil degradation, biodiversity loss, and reduced resilience to environmental stress.

In contrast, syntropic agriculture emphasizes diversity, ecological processes, and internal resource cycling. Instead of relying on external inputs, syntropic systems build fertility through biomass accumulation and nutrient recycling. This results in more sustainable and resilient production systems over the long term (Tilman et al., 2002; Lal, 2020).

Organic Farming

Organic farming seeks to reduce environmental impacts by eliminating synthetic inputs and promoting soil health. While it shares some principles with syntropic agriculture, such as the use of organic matter and ecological pest management, it often retains simplified cropping systems and may rely on external organic inputs.

Syntropic agriculture goes further by designing systems that mimic natural ecosystems, with a strong emphasis on succession, stratification, and biomass-driven fertility. It aims for self-sufficiency and continuous regeneration rather than simply substituting synthetic inputs with organic ones (Pretty, 2018).

Permaculture

Permaculture is a design philosophy that integrates ecological principles into human systems, including agriculture. Like syntropic agriculture, it emphasizes diversity, sustainability, and ecosystem-based design.

However, syntropic agriculture is more specifically focused on ecological succession and biomass management as core drivers of system development. It places greater emphasis on active management practices such as pruning to accelerate ecosystem processes.

While permaculture often focuses on system stability and low intervention, syntropic agriculture embraces dynamic intervention to guide systems toward higher productivity and complexity (Ferguson & Lovell, 2014).

Synthesis of Core Principles

The core principles of syntropic agriculture-syntropy, biomass maximization, continuous soil cover, and temporal dynamics-are deeply interconnected. Together, they form a holistic framework for designing and managing regenerative agroecosystems.

By integrating these principles, syntropic systems are able to enhance productivity while restoring ecological functions. This approach represents a shift from input-dependent agriculture to knowledge-intensive systems that leverage natural processes for sustainable development.

As global challenges such as climate change and land degradation intensify, the adoption of such principles becomes increasingly important for building resilient and sustainable agricultural systems.

2.2 Case Studies of Syntropic Agriculture Systems

The theoretical principles of syntropic agriculture are best understood through real-world applications that demonstrate their ecological and productive potential. The following case studies illustrate how syntropic systems have been implemented across different environmental and socio-economic contexts, highlighting their capacity to restore degraded land, enhance productivity, and support sustainable livelihoods.

Syntropic Agroforestry in Brazil (Ernst Götsch System): Practical Implementation by Plant Functional Groups

In the syntropic agroforestry system developed by Ernst Götsch in Bahia, Brazil, system design is based on the integration of multiple plant functional groups, each selected according to ecological roles and managed through precise practices. At the initial stage, pioneer and soil-improving species play a crucial role in restoring ecosystem functions and generating biomass. Common species include *Gliricidia sepium*, *Inga edulis*, *Inga vera*, *Leucaena leucocephala*, *Cajanus cajan*, and *Tithonia diversifolia*. These species are planted at high densities (0.5–1.5 m spacing) to rapidly establish ground cover and maximize biomass production. After 2–3 months, intensive pruning begins, typically at heights of 0.5–1.5 m and repeated every 1–3 months depending on growth. All pruned biomass is retained in situ as mulch, forming a continuous organic layer that enhances soil structure, nutrient cycling, and microbial activity. Leguminous species such as *Inga* and *Gliricidia* also contribute to biological nitrogen fixation, reducing the need for external fertilizers (Jose, 2009; Mbow et al., 2014).

Alongside pioneer species, short- and medium-term crops are introduced from the first year to provide early economic returns and support microclimate regulation. These include banana (*Musa spp.*), papaya (*Carica papaya*), pineapple (*Ananas comosus*), cassava (*Manihot esculenta*), and occasionally maize (*Zea mays*). Banana plays a key role, typically planted at 3 × 2 m or 3 ×

3 m spacing to rapidly develop canopy cover and produce substantial biomass. Management involves maintaining 2–3 productive stems per clump and cutting harvested pseudostems for mulch. Papaya and other short-cycle crops are planted at approximately 2 × 2 m and gradually phased out after 1–2 years as upper canopy layers develop. These species not only provide income but also regulate light, humidity, and temperature, creating favorable conditions for the main crop (Schroth et al., 2004).

Cacao (*Theobroma cacao*) is the primary production species and is established simultaneously with other plant groups rather than being introduced later, as in conventional systems. It is planted at spacings of approximately 3 × 3 m or 3 × 2.5 m and grows under the shade provided by pioneer species and bananas. Light management is critical, with direct sunlight exposure maintained below 50% through regular pruning of upper canopy species such as *Gliricidia* and *Inga*. This ensures optimal growth conditions similar to natural forest environments, reducing stress and improving yield quality. Nutrient supply is maintained entirely through internal cycling, mainly from decomposed biomass, eliminating the need for chemical inputs (Nair, 2011).

At higher canopy levels, long-lived perennial and native timber species are incorporated to ensure long-term ecological stability and economic value. Common species include *Swietenia macrophylla*, *Cedrela odorata*, *Tabebuia spp.*, *Hymenaea courbaril*, and *Euterpe oleracea*, along with fruit trees such as mango (*Mangifera indica*), avocado (*Persea americana*), and citrus (*Citrus spp.*). These species are planted at lower densities (6 × 6 m to 8 × 8 m) and require minimal management, mainly selective pruning when necessary. As the system matures over 4–5 years, these species gradually dominate the upper canopy, forming a structure similar to secondary forest (Götsch, 1995; Young, 1997).

The system operates along a temporal gradient reflecting accelerated ecological succession. In the first year, all plant groups are established to initiate system dynamics. During years 1–3, pioneer species are intensively pruned to generate biomass, while intermediate species provide early yields and cacao establishes under shade. From year 3 onwards, short-cycle crops are gradually removed, allowing perennial species to dominate. After approximately five years, the system reaches a stable, multilayered structure.

Thus, Götsch's syntropic system represents a dynamic management process where dense planting, pruning, biomass recycling, and density regulation are continuously applied to enhance regeneration and optimize both ecological and economic productivity (Mbow et al., 2014; Nair, 2011).

Agroforestry Systems in the Amazon Basin: Practical Implementation and Ecological Functions

Agroforestry systems in the Amazon basin are among the most well-studied and empirically validated models of complex, multistrata agricultural systems, particularly in cacao-based production. Unlike syntropic systems that intentionally accelerate ecological succession, Amazonian agroforestry is shaped by a combination of traditional ecological knowledge and scientific management. Despite these differences, both systems share core principles, including biodiversity enhancement, biomass cycling, and stratified canopy organization (Jose, 2009; Mbow et al., 2014).

At the initial stage, system establishment focuses on soil restoration and biomass accumulation through fast-growing species, especially legumes and high-biomass plants such as *Erythrina poeppigiana*, *Inga spp.*, and *Cecropia spp.*. These species are planted or naturally regenerated at relatively high densities to rapidly create canopy cover and supply organic matter. Regular pruning stimulates biomass production and nutrient cycling, while pruned material is retained as mulch to improve soil fertility, increase nitrogen availability, and enhance microbial activity. Studies have shown that such systems significantly improve soil properties compared to degraded lands, highlighting their role in ecological restoration (Cardona et al., 2021).

Simultaneously, intermediate and economically valuable crops are introduced to ensure short- and medium-term income while supporting system functionality. These include banana (*Musa spp.*), cassava (*Manihot esculenta*), maize (*Zea mays*), and peach palm (*Bactris gasipaes*). Banana often acts as a nurse crop, providing shade and regulating microclimate for cacao. Annual crops such as maize and cassava are cultivated during early stages and gradually phased out as canopy closure increases. This dynamic integration ensures continuous production and efficient land use during system development (Tinoco-Jaramillo et al., 2024).

Cacao (*Theobroma cacao*) serves as the central productive species in most Amazonian agroforestry systems. It is cultivated under shaded conditions that mimic natural forest environments, with moderate planting densities and diverse shade tree associations. Light management is essential and achieved through periodic pruning or thinning of overstory trees. Research indicates that cacao agroforestry systems can achieve yields comparable to monocultures while providing additional ecosystem services such as soil fertility improvement, biodiversity conservation, and carbon sequestration (Araujo et al., 2021; Solarte-Soto et al., 2025). These systems also support habitat connectivity and reduce pressure on primary forests.

At higher canopy levels, long-lived timber and native tree species are incorporated to enhance structural complexity and long-term economic value. Typical species include *Cedrela odorata*, *Swietenia macrophylla*, and *Cedrelinga cateniformis*, along with fruit trees such as citrus, avocado, and mango. These species are planted at lower densities and require minimal management beyond occasional thinning. Their presence increases aboveground biomass and contributes to long-term carbon storage, as confirmed by studies in the Colombian Amazon (Díaz-Cháux et al., 2025).

From a temporal perspective, Amazonian agroforestry systems follow a gradual successional trajectory. During the first 1–2 years, pioneer species and annual crops dominate, providing immediate yields and improving soil conditions. Between years 3 and 5, cacao becomes the primary crop, while short-cycle species are progressively removed. Over time, the system transitions into a mature multistrata structure dominated by perennial and timber species. This temporal organization ensures continuous productivity while enhancing ecological resilience and sustainability (Garcia et al., 2016; Mbow et al., 2014).

Overall, Amazonian agroforestry demonstrates that highly diverse, multistrata systems can simultaneously achieve economic viability and ecological sustainability. Its strong empirical foundation and functional similarities to syntropic systems make it a valuable reference model for developing regenerative agriculture in tropical regions.

3. SYSTEM DESIGN AND SPECIES ORGANIZATION IN SYNTROPIC AGROFORESTRY

The design of syntropic agroforestry systems is fundamentally rooted in the deliberate organization of plant species across spatial and temporal dimensions to optimize ecological processes and agricultural productivity. Unlike conventional systems that prioritize uniformity and simplification, syntropic design embraces complexity, diversity, and dynamic interactions among species. This approach aligns with ecological design principles that emphasize multifunctionality, resilience, and efficient resource use in agroecosystems.

(Jose, 2009; Mbow et al., 2014).

Spatial Design and Multi-Strata Organization

A key feature of syntropic systems is multi-strata spatial organization, where plant species are arranged vertically according to ecological roles and light requirements. This structure includes ground cover, understory, mid-canopy, and upper canopy layers, mimicking natural forests and improving light use efficiency while reducing competition.

Studies show that multi-strata agroforestry systems can increase overall productivity compared to monocultures by optimizing radiation use and resource complementarity. Combining shade-tolerant crops with taller trees enables continuous use of solar energy, leading to higher biomass production (Ong et al., 2015; Cardinale et al., 2012).

Belowground interactions are also enhanced, as deep-rooted trees access subsoil nutrients and redistribute them through litterfall, benefiting shallow-rooted crops. This vertical complementarity supports efficient nutrient cycling and long-term sustainability (Schroth & Sinclair, 2003; Jose et al., 2004).

Temporal Design and Successional Planning

Syntropic agroforestry emphasizes temporal design by integrating ecological succession into system planning. Species are selected based on their roles in different stages, including pioneer, intermediate, and climax species. Pioneer species are fast-growing and light-demanding, quickly establishing canopy cover, producing biomass, protecting soil, and improving microclimate.

Over time, these species are gradually replaced or complemented by shade-tolerant species that enhance long-term stability and productivity (Chazdon, 2014; Finegan, 1996). This successional approach enables continuous production, as different species peak at different times, while reducing reliance on external inputs.

By actively managing succession through planting and pruning, syntropic systems accelerate ecosystem development, shorten the time to reach mature states, and improve both ecological efficiency and productivity (Mbow et al., 2014; Nair, 2011).

Functional Grouping of Species

A core principle of syntropic design is the classification of species based on their functional roles rather than solely their economic value. Functional groups may include nitrogen-fixing species, biomass accumulators, deep-rooted nutrient recyclers, and commercially valuable crops.

Nitrogen-fixing species, such as legumes, contribute to soil fertility by converting atmospheric nitrogen into forms available to plants. Biomass-producing species, often fast-growing trees or shrubs, are regularly pruned to generate organic matter that is returned to the soil. Deep-rooted species enhance nutrient cycling by accessing nutrients from deeper soil layers and redistributing them through litterfall.

Research has demonstrated that combining species with complementary functional traits can enhance ecosystem functioning and productivity. Functional diversity increases system efficiency by promoting resource partitioning and reducing competition, thereby improving overall system performance *(Hooper et al., 2005; Díaz et al., 2007).*

Species Interactions and Facilitation Mechanisms

Interactions among plant species are central to the performance of syntropic agroforestry systems. These interactions may include competition, facilitation, and mutualism, with facilitative interactions playing a particularly important role in system design.

Facilitation occurs when one species improves the growth conditions for another, for example by providing shade, enhancing soil fertility, or reducing pest pressure. In syntropic systems, pioneer species often facilitate the establishment of later-successional species by creating favorable microclimatic conditions and improving soil properties.

Such positive interactions are increasingly recognized as critical drivers of ecosystem functioning, particularly in stressful environments. Designing systems that maximize facilitation while minimizing competition is a key objective of syntropic agroforestry *(Brooker et al., 2008; Callaway, 2007).*

Integration of Design Principles for System Optimization

Effective syntropic system design requires the integration of spatial, temporal, and functional principles into a coherent framework. This involves selecting appropriate species combinations, determining planting densities, and planning management interventions such as pruning and thinning.

Recent advances in agroecological research emphasize the importance of designing for complexity, where system performance emerges from the interactions among components rather than from individual species alone. Such systems are inherently adaptive and capable of responding to environmental variability, making them particularly suitable for sustainable agriculture in the context of climate change *(Kremen & Miles, 2012; Tittonell, 2014).*

Moreover, the integration of ecological knowledge into agricultural design supports the transition from input-intensive systems to knowledge-intensive systems. While syntropic agroforestry requires a high level of ecological understanding and management skills, it offers the potential for long-term sustainability, reduced external inputs, and enhanced ecosystem services *(Pretty, 2018; Mbow et al., 2014).*

4. IMPLEMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN SYNTROPIC AGROFORESTRY

The successful implementation of syntropic agroforestry systems depends not only on sound ecological design but also on adaptive and knowledge-intensive management practices.

Unlike conventional agricultural systems that rely heavily on external inputs, syntropic systems emphasize internal resource cycling, continuous biomass production, and active system regulation. Management interventions are designed to accelerate ecological processes such as succession, nutrient cycling, and soil regeneration, thereby enhancing both productivity and sustainability *(Tittonell, 2014; Pretty, 2018).*

System Establishment and High-Density Planting

The establishment phase is critical in determining the long-term performance of syntropic systems. A key strategy is high-density planting, where multiple species are introduced simultaneously at relatively close spacing. This approach contrasts with conventional systems that often prioritize wide spacing to reduce competition.

High-density planting enhances early canopy closure, which reduces soil erosion, suppresses weeds, and improves microclimatic conditions such as soil moisture and temperature. Rapid canopy development also increases photosynthetic capacity, leading to higher biomass accumulation during the initial stages of system development. Studies have shown that increased plant density can improve resource-use efficiency and promote positive interactions among species, particularly in diverse systems *(Forrester et al., 2006; Vandermeer, 2011).*

Pruning as a Central Management Strategy

Pruning is one of the most distinctive and critical management practices in syntropic agroforestry. It serves multiple ecological functions, including regulating light availability, stimulating plant growth, and generating organic matter for soil improvement.

Regular pruning of fast-growing species, particularly biomass-producing trees, creates pulses of organic material that are deposited on the soil surface as mulch. This process mimics natural litterfall but occurs at an accelerated rate, enhancing soil organic matter, improving nutrient availability, and stimulating microbial activity. Additionally, pruning helps maintain an optimal balance between different strata, preventing excessive shading and ensuring that light-demanding species can thrive *(Jose et al., 2004; Lal, 2020).*

From a physiological perspective, pruning can also stimulate plant regrowth by altering hormonal balances and promoting the allocation of resources to new shoots. This regenerative response contributes to sustained biomass production and system productivity over time *(Forrester et al., 2013).*

Biomass Management and Soil Fertility Enhancement

A central principle of syntropic agriculture is the retention and recycling of biomass within the system. Unlike conventional systems where crop residues are often removed or burned, syntropic systems utilize all available organic material to build soil fertility.

Mulching with pruned biomass provides multiple benefits, including moisture retention, temperature regulation, and suppression of competing vegetation. More importantly, it serves as a substrate for microbial decomposition, which drives nutrient cycling and the formation of stable soil organic matter.

Soil organic matter plays a critical role in improving soil structure, water-holding capacity, and nutrient availability. Increased organic matter content is also associated with enhanced carbon sequestration, making syntropic systems a potential tool for climate change mitigation *(Lal, 2004; Drinkwater & Snapp, 2007).*

Soil Biological Processes and Microbial Interactions

The effectiveness of biomass management is closely linked to soil biological activity. Diverse plant communities in syntropic systems support diverse microbial populations, including bacteria, fungi, and mycorrhizal associations. These organisms are essential for decomposing organic matter, mobilizing nutrients, and improving soil structure.

Recent research highlights the importance of plant–soil feedback mechanisms, where plant diversity influences microbial communities, which in turn affect plant growth and ecosystem functioning. In syntropic systems, this feedback loop is reinforced by continuous inputs of organic matter and the presence of functionally diverse plant species *(Bardgett & van der Putten, 2014; van der Heijden et al., 2008).*

Water Management and Microclimate Regulation

Water management in syntropic agroforestry is largely achieved through ecological processes rather than engineered infrastructure. The combination of dense vegetation, mulching, and multi-layered canopies enhances water infiltration, reduces evaporation, and stabilizes soil moisture levels.

Tree canopies play a significant role in moderating microclimatic conditions by reducing temperature extremes, increasing humidity, and protecting the soil from direct solar radiation. These effects are particularly important in tropical and semi-arid regions, where water availability is a limiting factor for agricultural productivity.

Agroforestry systems have been shown to improve hydrological functions, including increased infiltration rates and reduced runoff, thereby contributing to more sustainable water use *(Ilstedt et al., 2016; Ong et al., 2015).*

Ecological Pest and Disease Management

Syntropic agroforestry systems rely on ecological pest management strategies rather than chemical inputs. High levels of biodiversity create habitats for natural enemies of pests, such as predators and parasitoids, thereby enhancing biological control.

In addition, diverse plant communities reduce the likelihood of pest outbreaks by disrupting host plant continuity and limiting the spread of specialized pests. This “associational resistance” is a well-documented phenomenon in ecological research and is a key advantage of diversified systems over monocultures *(Letourneau et al., 2011; Ratnadass et al., 2012).*

Furthermore, healthy soils and balanced nutrient cycling contribute to plant health, making crops more resistant to diseases. This holistic approach to pest management aligns with the principles of agroecology and reduces dependence on synthetic pesticides *(Altieri & Nicholls, 2004).*

Adaptive Management and Knowledge Intensity

A defining feature of syntropic agroforestry is its reliance on adaptive management, where decisions are continuously adjusted based on system feedback and environmental conditions.

Unlike standardized agricultural systems, syntropic systems require site-specific knowledge and ongoing observation.

This knowledge-intensive nature can be both a strength and a limitation. On one hand, it allows for highly optimized and context-specific solutions. On the other hand, it may pose challenges for large-scale adoption, particularly in regions with limited access to technical knowledge and training.

Recent studies emphasize the importance of integrating local knowledge with scientific research to support the successful implementation of agroecological systems. Capacity building, farmer training, and participatory approaches are essential for scaling up syntropic practices *(Tittonell, 2014; Kremen & Miles, 2012).*

5. BENEFITS AND LIMITATIONS OF SYNTROPIC AGROFORESTRY SYSTEMS

Syntropic agroforestry systems have gained increasing attention as a regenerative agricultural approach capable of simultaneously enhancing productivity, ecosystem services, and resilience. However, despite their ecological and agronomic advantages, these systems also face several technical, socio-economic, and scalability challenges. A balanced evaluation of both benefits and limitations is essential to assess their broader applicability in modern agricultural landscapes.

Ecological Benefits

One of the most significant advantages of syntropic agroforestry is its capacity to restore ecological functions while maintaining agricultural productivity. By integrating diverse plant species across multiple strata, these systems mimic natural forest structures and processes, leading to enhanced biodiversity and ecosystem stability.

High plant diversity promotes niche complementarity and functional redundancy, which improve resilience against environmental disturbances such as drought, pests, and climate variability. Empirical studies have demonstrated that agroforestry systems support higher levels of biodiversity compared to monocultures, including beneficial insects, soil microorganisms, and vertebrates *(Jose, 2009; Torralba et al., 2016).*

Furthermore, syntropic systems significantly enhance soil quality through continuous biomass input and organic matter accumulation. Improved soil structure, increased microbial activity, and enhanced nutrient cycling contribute to long-term soil fertility and sustainability *(Lal, 2004; Drinkwater & Snapp, 2007).*

Climate Change Mitigation and Carbon Sequestration

Syntropic agroforestry systems play an important role in climate change mitigation by increasing carbon sequestration in both biomass and soil. Trees and perennial plants act as carbon sinks, while the accumulation of soil organic matter contributes to long-term carbon storage.

Studies indicate that agroforestry systems can sequester significantly more carbon than conventional agricultural systems, particularly when managed intensively with continuous biomass inputs. This makes syntropic agriculture a promising strategy for achieving climate-smart agriculture goals *(Nair et al., 2009; Zomer et al., 2016).*

In addition to mitigation, these systems enhance climate adaptation by improving water retention, reducing temperature extremes, and stabilizing production under variable climatic conditions *(Mbow et al., 2014).*

Productivity and Resource Use Efficiency

Contrary to the assumption that diversification reduces productivity, syntropic agroforestry systems can achieve high levels of productivity through ecological intensification. By optimizing species interactions and resource partitioning, these systems improve the efficiency of light, water, and nutrient use.

Complementarity among species allows for better utilization of available resources across space and time, leading to increased total system yield compared to monoculture systems. This concept is supported by research on intercropping and mixed-species systems, which consistently show yield advantages under appropriate management conditions *(Tilman et al., 2002; Forrester & Bauhus, 2016).*

Moreover, the continuous production of biomass ensures a steady supply of organic inputs, reducing dependence on external fertilizers and enhancing system self-sufficiency *(Tittonell, 2014).*

Socio-Economic Benefits

Syntropic agroforestry systems can provide diversified income streams through the production of multiple crops, including fruits, timber, medicinal plants, and annual crops. This diversification reduces economic risk and increases livelihood resilience for farmers.

Additionally, reduced reliance on external inputs such as synthetic fertilizers and pesticides lowers production costs and improves economic sustainability over time. Agroecological systems, including syntropic approaches, have been shown to enhance food security and support rural development in various contexts. *(Kremen & Miles, 2012; Pretty et al., 2018).*

These systems also align with global sustainability agendas, including sustainable intensification and regenerative agriculture, making them attractive for policy support and international development programs.

Technical and Knowledge Constraints

Despite their benefits, syntropic agroforestry systems are knowledge-intensive and require a deep understanding of ecological processes, species interactions, and management techniques.

Farmers must make complex decisions regarding species selection, planting density, pruning schedules, and system dynamics. This level of complexity can be a barrier to adoption, particularly in regions where technical training and extension services are limited *(Tittonell, 2014).*

Moreover, the lack of standardized protocols and scientific guidelines for syntropic systems poses challenges for replication and scaling. Much of the existing knowledge is experiential and context-specific, which limits its transferability across different agroecological zones.

Labor Requirements and Management Intensity

Syntropic systems typically require higher labor inputs compared to conventional systems, especially during the establishment phase and for ongoing management practices such as pruning and biomass handling.

While these labor requirements can create employment opportunities, they may also limit adoption in areas with labor shortages or high labor costs. Mechanization of syntropic systems remains challenging due to their structural complexity and high plant density *(Mbow et al., 2014)*.

Economic and Market Barriers

Although syntropic systems can be economically beneficial in the long term, initial establishment costs and delayed returns from perennial crops may discourage adoption. Farmers may face financial risks during the transition period before the system becomes fully productive.

In addition, market access for diverse and non-standardized products can be limited, particularly in conventional supply chains that favor uniformity and large-scale production. Developing value chains for agroforestry products is therefore essential to support wider adoption *(Place et al., 2012)*.

Scalability and Policy Challenges

Scaling up syntropic agroforestry systems presents significant challenges at both institutional and policy levels. Current agricultural policies often favor monoculture systems through subsidies, research funding, and infrastructure support.

The integration of syntropic systems into mainstream agriculture requires supportive policies, including incentives for ecosystem services, investment in research and extension, and the development of appropriate market frameworks.

Furthermore, more empirical research is needed to quantify the long-term benefits and trade-offs of syntropic systems across different environments. This evidence is crucial for informing policy decisions and promoting large-scale adoption *(Zomer et al., 2016; Mbow et al., 2014)*.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

Syntropic agroforestry represents a transformative approach to agricultural production that integrates ecological principles with practical land management. By mimicking natural forest succession and emphasizing biodiversity, stratification, and continuous biomass generation, syntropic systems provide a viable pathway toward regenerative and sustainable agriculture.

Throughout this study, it is evident that syntropic agroforestry systems offer multiple co-benefits, including enhanced soil fertility, improved biodiversity, efficient resource use, and increased resilience to climate variability. These outcomes align with the broader concept of ecological intensification, where ecosystem functions are harnessed to sustain productivity while reducing reliance on external inputs (Tittonell, 2014).

Moreover, the capacity of agroforestry systems to sequester carbon and regulate microclimates highlights their importance in addressing global environmental challenges such as climate change and land degradation. Empirical evidence confirms that integrating trees into agricultural landscapes significantly enhances carbon storage and ecosystem services compared to conventional monoculture systems (Zomer et al., 2016).

However, despite these advantages, syntropic agroforestry remains a knowledge-intensive and management-demanding system. Its successful implementation requires a deep understanding of ecological interactions, adaptive management strategies, and site-specific conditions. These requirements can limit widespread adoption, particularly in regions lacking technical support and institutional frameworks.

Future Perspectives

To fully realize the potential of syntropic agroforestry, future research and development efforts should focus on several key areas.

(1) Strengthening Scientific Evidence

Although syntropic agriculture is increasingly recognized, there is still a need for quantitative, long-term scientific studies evaluating its performance across different agroecological zones. Future research should aim to:

- Quantify productivity, carbon sequestration, and ecosystem services

- Compare syntropic systems with conventional and other agroecological models
- Develop standardized indicators for system evaluation

Such efforts will provide robust evidence to support policy development and large-scale implementation. Agroforestry research has already demonstrated the importance of integrating ecological and agronomic data to evaluate system performance (Nair et al., 2009; Jose, 2009).

(2) Development of Context-Specific Models

Syntropic systems are inherently site-specific, requiring adaptation to local environmental conditions, socio-economic contexts, and cultural practices. Future work should focus on developing regionally adapted syntropic models, particularly in tropical and subtropical regions where agroforestry has the greatest potential.

Participatory approaches involving farmers, researchers, and local communities will be essential for co-developing practical and scalable solutions. This aligns with the broader agroecological framework, which emphasizes the integration of local knowledge with scientific innovation (Kremen & Miles, 2012).

(3) Technological Innovation and Mechanization

One of the major barriers to scaling syntropic systems is their high labor demand and management complexity. Future innovations should explore:

- Appropriate mechanization for pruning and biomass management
- Digital tools for system design and monitoring
- Decision-support systems based on ecological modeling

Advances in precision agriculture and ecological modeling could help reduce labor constraints and improve system efficiency without compromising ecological integrity.

(4) Policy Support and Institutional Integration

The expansion of syntropic agroforestry requires supportive policy frameworks that recognize and incentivize ecosystem services. Governments and institutions should consider:

- Payments for ecosystem services (PES)
- Agroforestry subsidies and financial incentives
- Integration into climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies

Agroforestry has already been identified as a key strategy in climate policy due to its multifunctional benefits, including carbon sequestration and resilience enhancement (Mbow et al., 2014).

(5) Market Development and Value Chains

For syntropic systems to be economically viable at scale, it is essential to develop diversified and resilient value chains. Future efforts should focus on:

- Market access for agroforestry products
- Certification schemes (e.g., organic, regenerative)
- Value addition and processing of diverse outputs

Strengthening market linkages will help ensure that farmers can capture the full economic benefits of diversified production systems.

Final Remarks

Syntropic agroforestry embodies a paradigm shift from input-intensive agriculture to knowledge-intensive, ecology-based production systems. While challenges remain in terms of scalability, labor requirements, and knowledge dissemination, its potential to address pressing global issues - such as food security, climate change, and ecosystem degradation - is substantial.

Future advancements will depend on the integration of scientific research, technological innovation, and supportive policy frameworks. With continued investment and interdisciplinary collaboration, syntropic agroforestry can play a pivotal role in shaping the future of sustainable agriculture.

REFERENCES

Altieri, M. A. (2018). *Agroecology: The science of sustainable agriculture*. CRC Press.

Altieri, M. A., & Nicholls, C. I. (2004). Biodiversity and pest management. *Food Products Press*.

Araujo, Q. R., et al. (2021). Cacao-based agroforestry systems in the Atlantic Forest and Amazon Biomes. *Agricultural Systems, 193*, 103270. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2021.103270

Bardgett, R. D., & van der Putten, W. H. (2014). Belowground biodiversity and ecosystem functioning. *Nature*, 515, 505–511. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature13855

Bardgett, R. D., & van der Putten, W. H. (2014). Belowground biodiversity. *Nature*, 515, 505–511. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature13855

Bardgett, R. D., & van der Putten, W. H. (2014). Belowground biodiversity. *Nature*, 515, 505–511. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature13855

Brooker, R. W., et al. (2008). Facilitation in plant communities. *Journal of Ecology*, 96(1), 18–34. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2745.2007.01295.x

Callaway, R. M. (2007). *Positive interactions and interdependence in plant communities*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-6224-7

Cardinale, B. J., et al. (2012). Biodiversity loss and its impact on humanity. *Nature*, 486, 59–67. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11148

Cardinale, B. J., et al. (2012). Biodiversity loss and its impact on humanity. *Nature*, 486, 59–67. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11148

Cardona, C. A., et al. (2021). Cacao agroforestry systems improve soil fertility in the Colombian Amazon. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment, 314*, 107349. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2021.107349

Chazdon, R. L. (2014). Second growth. *University of Chicago Press*. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226118109.001.0001

Chazdon, R. L. (2014). *Second growth: The promise of tropical forest regeneration*. University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226118109.001.0001

Chazdon, R. L. (2014). *Second growth: The promise of tropical forest regeneration*. University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226118109.001.0001

Connell, J. H., & Slatyer, R. O. (1977). Mechanisms of succession in natural communities. *The American Naturalist*, 111(982), 1119–1144. https://doi.org/10.1086/283241

Díaz, S., et al. (2007). Incorporating plant functional diversity effects in ecosystem service assessments. *PNAS*, 104(52), 20684–20689. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0704716104

Díaz, S., et al. (2007). Incorporating plant functional diversity effects in ecosystem services. *PNAS*, 104(52), 20684–20689. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0704716104

Díaz-Cháux, J. T., et al. (2025). Carbon storage in cacao agroforestry systems in the Colombian Amazon. *PLOS ONE, 20*(6), e0325477. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0325477

Drinkwater, L. E., & Snapp, S. S. (2007). Nutrients in agroecosystems. *Agronomy Monographs*, 50, 163–186. https://doi.org/10.2134/agronmonogr50.c6

Drinkwater, L. E., & Snapp, S. S. (2007). Nutrients in agroecosystems. https://doi.org/10.2134/agronmonogr50.c6

Drinkwater, L. E., & Snapp, S. S. (2007). Nutrients in agroecosystems. https://doi.org/10.2134/agronmonogr50.c6

FAO. (2021). *The state of the world's land and water resources for food and agriculture*. Food and Agriculture Organization.

Ferguson, R. S., & Lovell, S. T. (2014). Permaculture. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 31, 251–264. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10460-013-9450-0

Folke, C., et al. (2004). Regime shifts, resilience, and biodiversity. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, 35, 557–581. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.35.021103.105711

Forrester, D. I., & Bauhus, J. (2016). Mixed-species forests. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 374, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2016.04.028

Forrester, D. I., et al. (2006). Mixed-species plantations. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 233(2–3), 211–230. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2006.05.012

Forrester, D. I., et al. (2013). Tree growth responses. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 310, 136–145. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2013.08.010

Garcia, E., et al. (2016). Pasture re-agroforestation with cacao in the Brazilian Amazon. *Sustainability Science, 11*, 277–293. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-015-0330-8

Götsch, E. (1995). Break-through in agriculture.

Götsch, E. (1996). *Breakthrough in agriculture*. (Unpublished manuscript / widely cited in syntropic agriculture literature).

Hooper, D. U., et al. (2005). Effects of biodiversity on ecosystem functioning. *Ecological Monographs*, 75(1), 3–35. https://doi.org/10.1890/04-0922

Hooper, D. U., et al. (2005). Effects of biodiversity on ecosystem functioning. *Ecological Monographs*, 75(1), 3–35. https://doi.org/10.1890/04-0922

Ilstedt, U., et al. (2016). Trees increase water infiltration. *Global Change Biology*, 22(10), 3627–3637. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13214

IPCC. (2022). *Climate change 2022: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability*. Cambridge University Press.

Jørgensen, S. E., & Svirezhev, Y. M. (2004). *Towards a thermodynamic theory for ecological systems*. Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-008044015-2/50000-2

Jose, S. (2009). Agroforestry for ecosystem services and environmental benefits: An overview. *Agroforestry Systems, 76*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-009-9229-7

Jose, S. (2009). Agroforestry for ecosystem services and environmental benefits: an overview. *Agroforestry Systems*, 76, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-009-9229-7

Jose, S. (2009). Agroforestry for ecosystem services and environmental benefits: An overview. *Agroforestry Systems*, 76, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-009-9229-7

Jose, S. (2009). Agroforestry for ecosystem services. *Agroforestry Systems*, 76(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-009-9229-7

Jose, S., Gillespie, A. R., & Pallardy, S. G. (2004). Interspecific interactions in temperate agroforestry. *Agroforestry Systems*, 61, 237–255. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:AGFO.0000028991.00895.9b

Jose, S., Gillespie, A. R., & Pallardy, S. G. (2004). Interspecific interactions. *Agroforestry Systems*, 61, 237–255. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:AGFO.0000028991.00895.9b

Jose, S., Gillespie, A. R., & Pallardy, S. G. (2004). Interspecific interactions. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:AGFO.0000028991.00895.9b

Kremen, C., & Miles, A. (2012). Diversified farming systems. *Ecology and Society*, 17(4), 40. https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-05035-170440

Kremen, C., & Miles, A. (2012). Diversified farming systems. *Ecology and Society*, 17(4), 40. https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-05035-170440

Kremen, C., & Miles, A. (2012). Ecosystem services in biologically diversified farming systems. *Ecology and Society*, 17(4), 40. https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-05035-170440

Kremen, C., & Miles, A. (2012). Ecosystem services in biologically diversified versus conventional farming systems. *Ecology and Society*, 17(4), 40. https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-05035-170440

Lal, R. (2004). Soil carbon sequestration impacts on global climate change. *Science*, 304(5677), 1623–1627. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1097396

Lal, R. (2004). Soil carbon sequestration. *Geoderma*, 123(1–2), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2004.01.032

Lal, R. (2004). Soil carbon sequestration. *Geoderma*, 123, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2004.01.032

Lal, R. (2020). Soil organic matter and sustainability. *Agronomy Journal*, 112(5), 3265–3277. https://doi.org/10.1002/agj2.20282

Lal, R. (2020). Soil organic matter and water retention. *Agronomy Journal*, 112(5), 3265–3277. https://doi.org/10.1002/agj2.20282

Lal, R. (2020). Soil organic matter. *Agronomy Journal*, 112, 3265–3277. https://doi.org/10.1002/agj2.20282

Letourneau, D. K., et al. (2011). Biological control. *Ecology Letters*, 14(9), 922–932. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2011.01652.x

Mbow, C., et al. (2014). Agroforestry solutions to address food security and climate change challenges in Africa. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 6, 61–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2013.10.014

Mbow, C., et al. (2014). Agroforestry solutions to climate change. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 6, 61–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2013.10.014

Mbow, C., van Noordwijk, M., Luedeling, E., Neufeldt, H., Minang, P. A., & Kowero, G. (2014). Agroforestry solutions to address food security and climate change challenges in Africa. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 6*, 61–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2013.10.014

Mbow, C., van Noordwijk, M., Luedeling, E., Neufeldt, H., Minang, P. A., & Kowero, G. (2014). Agroforestry solutions to address food security and climate change challenges in Africa. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 6, 61–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2013.10.014

Montagnini, F. (2017). Integrating landscapes: Agroforestry for biodiversity conservation and food sovereignty. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-69371-2

Nair, P. K. R. (1993). *An introduction to agroforestry*. Springer.

Nair, P. K. R. (2011). Agroforestry systems and environmental quality. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 40(3), 784–790. https://doi.org/10.2134/jeq2011.0076

Nair, P. K. R. (2011). Carbon sequestration studies in agroforestry systems: A reality-check. *Agroforestry Systems, 86*(2), 243–253. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-011-9434-z

Nair, P. K. R., et al. (2009). Carbon sequestration in agroforestry systems. *Advances in Agronomy*, 108, 237–307. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2113(10)08005-3

Nair, P. K. R., et al. (2009). Carbon sequestration. *Advances in Agronomy*, 108, 237–307. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2113(10)08005-3

Nair, P. K. R., Kumar, B. M., & Nair, V. D. (2009). Agroforestry as a strategy for carbon sequestration. *Advances in Agronomy*, 108, 237–307. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2113(10)08005-3

Odum, E. P. (1969). The strategy of ecosystem development. *Science*, 164(3877), 262–270. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.164.3877.262

Ong, C. K., Black, C. R., & Wilson, J. (2015). Tree–crop interactions. *CAB Reviews*, 10(016), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1079/PAVSNNR201510016

Ong, C. K., Black, C. R., & Wilson, J. (2015). Tree–crop interactions. https://doi.org/10.1079/PAVSNNR201510016

Place, F., et al. (2012). Improved fallows, agroforestry, and land productivity in Africa: A review. *World Development*, 40(8), 1541–1555. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2012.04.023

Pretty, J. (2018). Sustainable intensification of agriculture. *Science*, 362(6417). https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aav0294

Pretty, J. (2018). Sustainable intensification. *Science*, 362(6417). https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aav0294

Pretty, J. (2018). Sustainable intensification. *Science*, 362. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aav0294

Pretty, J., et al. (2018). Global assessment of agricultural system redesign for sustainable intensification. *Science*, 362(6417). https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aav0294

Ratnadass, A., et al. (2012). Plant diversity and pest regulation. *Annual Review of Entomology*, 57, 81–100. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-ento-120710-100731

Schrödinger, E. (1944). What is life?

Schrödinger, E. (1944). *What is life?* Cambridge University Press.

Schroth, G., & Sinclair, F. L. (2003). *Trees, crops and soil fertility*. CABI Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1079/9780851995939.0000

Schroth, G., da Fonseca, G. A. B., Harvey, C. A., Gascon, C., Vasconcelos, H. L., & Izac, A. M. N. (2004). *Agroforestry and biodiversity conservation in tropical landscapes*. Island Press. https://doi.org/10.5822/978-1-61091-062-8

Solarte-Soto, J. A., et al. (2025). Biodiversity and ecosystem services of cacao agroforestry in the Colombian Amazon. *Agroforestry Systems, 99*, 235. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-025-01326-1

Tilman, D., et al. (2001). Diversity and productivity in a long-term grassland experiment. *Science*, 294(5543), 843–845. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1060391

Tilman, D., et al. (2002). Biodiversity and productivity. *Nature*, 418, 671–677. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature00886

Tilman, D., et al. (2002). Biodiversity and productivity. *Nature*, 418, 671–677. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature00886

Tinoco-Jaramillo, L., et al. (2024). Agroforestry systems of cocoa in the Ecuadorian Amazon. *Forests, 15*(1), 195. https://doi.org/10.3390/f15010195

Tittonell, P. (2014). Ecological intensification of agriculture. *Agricultural Systems*, 126, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2013.12.001

Tittonell, P. (2014). Ecological intensification. *Agricultural Systems*, 126, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2013.12.001

Tittonell, P. (2014). Ecological intensification. *Agricultural Systems*, 126, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2013.12.001

Tittonell, P. (2014). Ecological intensification. *Agricultural Systems*, 126, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2013.12.001

Tittonell, P. (2014). Ecological intensification. *Agricultural Systems*, 126, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2013.12.001

Torralba, M., et al. (2016). Agroforestry and biodiversity. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 231, 173–185. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2016.06.021

van der Heijden, M. G. A., et al. (2008). Soil microbes. *Ecology Letters*, 11(3), 296–310. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2007.01139.x

van der Heijden, M. G. A., et al. (2008). The unseen majority: Soil microbes. *Ecology Letters*, 11(3), 296–310. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2007.01139.x

Vandermeer, J. (2011). The ecology of agroecosystems. *Jones & Bartlett Learning*.

Walker, B., et al. (2004). Resilience, adaptability and transformability. *Ecology and Society*, 9(2), 5. https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-00650-090205

Young, A. (1997). *Agroforestry for soil management* (2nd ed.). CAB International. https://doi.org/10.1079/9780851991897.0000

Young, A. (1997). *Agroforestry for soil management*. CAB International.

Zomer, R. J., et al. (2016). Global tree cover. *Scientific Reports*, 6, 29987. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep29987

Zomer, R. J., Neufeldt, H., Xu, J., Ahrends, A., Bossio, D., Trabucco, A., Van Noordwijk, M., & Wang, M. (2016). Global tree cover and biomass carbon on agricultural land. *Scientific Reports*, 6, 29987. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep29987

ISBN: 978-625-92209-3-2