



**HAL**  
open science

## Editorial -Crop health in agroforestry systems: An introduction to the special issue

Jay-Ram Lamichhane

► **To cite this version:**

Jay-Ram Lamichhane. Editorial -Crop health in agroforestry systems: An introduction to the special issue. *Crop Protection*, 2020, 134, 10.1016/j.cropro.2020.105187 . hal-02912503

**HAL Id: hal-02912503**

**<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02912503>**

Submitted on 13 Aug 2020

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

## Editorial -Crop health in agroforestry systems: An introduction to the special issue

Jay-Ram Lamichhane, Jay Lamichhane

► **To cite this version:**

Jay-Ram Lamichhane, Jay Lamichhane. Editorial -Crop health in agroforestry systems: An introduction to the special issue. *Crop Protection*, Elsevier, 2020, 134, 10.1016/j.cropro.2020.105187. hal-02912503

**HAL Id: hal-02912503**

**<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02912503>**

Submitted on 13 Aug 2020

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1    **EDITORIAL - Crop health in agroforestry systems: an introduction to**  
2    **the special issue**

3    Jay Ram Lamichhane

4    INRAE, Université Fédérale de Toulouse, UMR AGIR, F-31326 Castanet-Tolosan, France

5    \*Corresponding author: [jay-ram.lamichhane@inrae.fr](mailto:jay-ram.lamichhane@inrae.fr)

6    Tel: +33 (0)5 61 28 52 50; Fax: +33 (0)5 61 28 55 37

7        **1. A three-fold challenge of the 21<sup>st</sup> century agriculture**

8    In this century, stakeholders involved in the food chain are concerned by a three-fold  
9    challenge of raising agricultural productivity, reducing the negative environmental  
10   impact of agriculture, and adapting agriculture to ongoing climate change. These  
11   challenges are of concern worldwide, although to a different extent, depending on  
12   countries and regions. Consequently, also the possibility and initiatives to address these  
13   challenges may differ across regions. For example, the first two challenges – increasing  
14   agricultural productivity while promoting environmental sustainability at the same time  
15   – have become a priority for developed countries. This is because the intensive  
16   agricultural model is unsustainable not only from environmental but also from  
17   economic point of view, as yields of several staple crops have been stagnating across  
18   different regions of the world (Ray et al., 2012; Schauburger et al., 2018), despite the use  
19   of high input levels. This clearly highlights the need for alternative agricultural models  
20   to the productivist one that can be sustainable from environmental and socio-economic  
21   point of view. Developed countries have a better possibility to reduce environmental  
22   impact due to agricultural practices at the expense of agricultural productivity while this  
23   approach may be less readily applicable yet for developing countries, especially for

24 those facing the food security issues. In contrast to the first two challenges, both  
25 developed and developing countries are concerned to the same extent to cope with the  
26 third challenge of the 21<sup>st</sup> century agriculture, i.e. adapting agriculture to the changing  
27 climate, to ensure the viability of agriculture.

28 Many agricultural systems may have potential to address the above-mentioned three-  
29 fold challenge, although to a different extent. These systems include, and not limited to,  
30 organic agriculture, integrated agriculture, conservation agriculture, double cropping,  
31 relay cropping, agroforestry etc. More specifically to the agroforestry system (AFS), this  
32 is generally referred to systems where perennial plants managed by growers are  
33 associated with annual or perennial crops. Behind this single definition, a wide range of  
34 complexity lies within these systems, spanning from relatively simple agroforestry  
35 systems, characterized by only two associated species, to very complex ones, close to  
36 natural systems, with several species and vegetation strata. Therefore, also the  
37 management of AFSs is complex as many factors interact in these systems and the  
38 benefits generated by AFSs may markedly differ based on the factors involved and their  
39 interactions.

## 40 **2. Agroforestry systems to address the three-fold challenge of the 21<sup>st</sup> century** 41 **agriculture?**

42 AFSs are a telling example of integrated systems that bridge the gap separating  
43 agriculture and forestry thereby addressing both environmental and socio-economic  
44 objectives. Overall, AFSs have the capacity to enhance delivery of all four ecosystem  
45 services (MEA, 2005): provisioning (food, fresh water tec.), regulating (climate  
46 regulation, pollination, pest, weed and disease regulation etc), cultural (recreation,  
47 biodiversity etc.) and supporting (nutrient cycling, soil formation and retention etc.)

48 services. For example, AFSs maintain food supplies and at the same time increase  
49 climate resilience, raise carbon stocks in agricultural systems, maintain or even improve  
50 soil fertility and control soil erosion, regulate soil moisture content, enhance pollination,  
51 provide fuelwood, fodder, medicines and promote food supply and many other products  
52 (Cerda et al., 2014; Kuyah et al., 2019; Mbow et al., 2014). More specifically to regulating  
53 services, AFSs may affect pests' (*sensu lato*, that include pathogens, animal pests and  
54 weeds) incidence and abundance both through increased top-down regulation by  
55 natural enemies or via bottom-up factors such as moderation of microclimate, soil  
56 nutrients and water content, that may affect both the pests and the host plants.  
57 Nevertheless, there is no consensus in the literature and evidence is still inconclusive  
58 concerning the overall potential of AFSs on crop health. Although the term crop health  
59 is not a well-defined yet (Döring et al., 2012), here, it is used to indicate the capacity of a  
60 given crop to provide ecosystem services in general and regulating services in  
61 particular. This is because the effect of AFSs on pests maybe context-specific and can  
62 depend on the environmental conditions, tree and crop species concerned and  
63 management practices. Therefore, there is an increasing research need in order to  
64 understand how several key factors and their interactions affect the delivery of  
65 regulating services and how this finally affect provisioning services. A better research  
66 focus in this regard not only provides insights for their own improvement but also  
67 contributes with general theoretical and practical lessons on how to take advantage of  
68 vegetation. In particular, more research is needed to better elucidate the role of crop  
69 management practices, and in particular shade management, which represents a key  
70 agronomic lever affecting crop health in AFSs (Andres et al., 2018; Babin et al., 2010;  
71 Loguercio et al., 2009).

### 72 **3. Introduction to the special issue: crop health in agroforestry systems**

73 Pests can threaten crop health in AFSs, either by affecting the crop *per se* or perturbing  
74 associated tree species, thereby altering the delivery of ecosystem services. However,  
75 crop health in AFSs is a result of very complex interactions, as reported by works  
76 presented in this special issue. The articles published in this issue are selected from  
77 works presented at the 4<sup>th</sup> World Congress of Agroforestry, which was held in France  
78 from 20<sup>th</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2019 (<https://agroforestry2019.cirad.fr/>). Of 12 original articles,  
79 most papers in this special issue deal with pests affecting coffee- and cocoa-based AFSs  
80 although other AFSs such as mixed crop tree-vegetable systems are also studied. Based  
81 on the key findings, the papers in this issue are classified into five sections with those  
82 highlighting: i) shade level and distribution as a key driver affecting crop health in AFSs,  
83 ii) mechanisms and interactions unraveling the role of shade in crop health in AFSs, iii)  
84 role of tree species composing the landscape in natural pest regulation, iv) management  
85 practices and decision support systems promoting crop health in AFSs, and v) socio-  
86 economic factors as a driver affecting crop health in AFSs. The following are  
87 representative short summaries of the articles that appear in this issue.

### 88 3.1. Shade level and distribution as a key driver affecting crop health in AFSs

89 In complex coffee-based AFSs, quantifying the impact of associated trees on pest  
90 regulation and coffee yield is of paramount importance to improve the existing systems  
91 and to design more sustainable ones. Durand-Bessart et al. (2020) by taking into account  
92 a wide range of pedo-climatic conditions and management practices, analyze the  
93 interaction between tree species being part of AFSs as well as the complex of coffee  
94 airborne-diseases. In particular, they characterize soil, coffee trees status, coffee growth  
95 and coffee yield, using structural equation modeling. The authors report that associated  
96 tree species, and in particular the percentage of shade, was positively correlated with

97 air-borne diseases and soil quality with consequent negative impact on coffee growth  
98 and yield. The authors conclude that shade management at an optimal level may be an  
99 important solution to reduce the airborne diseases and to improve the coffee yield.

100 Under natural conditions, crop health is affected by a complex interaction between  
101 abiotic and biotic factors as well as cropping practices. This is also the case for citrus  
102 grown in cocoa-based AFSs, which suffer by a phenomenon called citrus tree decline,  
103 caused by several fungal diseases (Pseudocercospora leaf and fruit spot disease, citrus  
104 scab disease, Phytophthora foot rot disease) and insect pests (mites, whiteflies and  
105 aphids). Mvondo et al. (2019) demonstrate that the health of citrus trees located under  
106 dense shade and with regular distribution in the cocoa-based AFSs are much improved  
107 compared with citrus trees in full sun or with irregular shade distribution pattern.

### 108 3.2. Mechanisms and interactions unraveling the role of shade in crop health in 109 AFSs

110 Shade either enhances or reduces the coffee leaf rust development in AFSs although  
111 little is known to date about the underlying mechanism. Avelino et al. (2019) attempt to  
112 unravel this mechanism by studying three stages of the disease cycle separately: viz.  
113 sporulation, uredospore wash-off by rain, and uredospore deposition on leaves. The  
114 authors highlight that, compared with coffee plants in full sun, the number of  
115 uredospore was higher for coffee trees under shade, the uredospore wash-off by rain  
116 was less efficient under shade, and the deposition of uredospores on healthy leaves was  
117 higher under shade. All this leads to an increased coffee leaf rust severity under shade  
118 compared with that in full sun.

119 Shade levels plays a key role in coffee health in a number of ways, including  
120 enhancement or reduction of the coffee rust disease, caused by the obligate fungal

121 pathogen *Hemileia vastatrix*, through microclimate modifications of the canopy. Wind is  
122 one of the key weather variable affecting the dispersal of *H. vastatrix* uredospores  
123 during the dry season, which is affected by the presence and level of shade tree,  
124 especially at the edge of AFSs. Despite this potential role of wind, little is known to date  
125 on how shade tree leaf functional and canopy-level architectural traits impact wind  
126 dynamics and subsequent air-borne uredospore dispersal and deposition in this  
127 transition zone. Gagliardi et al. (2020) determine the contribution of shade tree leaf  
128 functional and canopy traits to changes in throughflow wind speeds and *H. vastatrix*  
129 uredospore dispersal under three shade levels (sparse, medium, and dense) of the shade  
130 tree *Erythrina poeppigiana* at the edge of farms. The authors show that the dense level of  
131 shade trees reduces throughflow wind speeds into the farm more frequently than do  
132 other shade levels and that leaf functional traits of shade trees significantly predicted  
133 these speeds. This explains the importance of shade tree canopy and leaf functional  
134 traits in reducing wind speeds and subsequent uredospore deposition.

### 135 3.3. Role of tree species composing the landscape in natural pest regulation

136 Plant species abundance and diversity in a landscape play an important role in providing  
137 suitable habitats for living organisms, including pests and their natural enemies. A better  
138 understanding of landscape factors promoting natural pest regulation may provide  
139 important insights into designing sustainable cropping systems. Sow et al. (2020) assess  
140 the association among landscape vegetation types in traditional AFSs and their impact  
141 on richness as well as on abundance of bird and bats and their contribution to natural  
142 regulation of millet head miner. The authors show that grain losses due to millet head  
143 borer are reduced when panicles were accessible to these predators. They however  
144 conclude that the contribution of trees for natural pest regulation is species-dependent



145 as some tree species provide habitats for crop pests while other provide refuges for  
146 their predators. This highlights the importance of a better landscape management based  
147 on the appropriate choice of tree species.

#### 148 3.4. Management practices and decision support systems to promote crop health 149 in AFSs

150 Cacao-based AFSs, compared with sole crops, can provide pest regulating services but  
151 they can also enhance crop damage due to pests, depending on the production system  
152 (conventional or organic) and management practices applied. For example, several  
153 studies in the literature report that organic farming is much more sustainable than  
154 conventional farming although these studies did not take into account heterogeneity of  
155 crop management practices or crop diversity applied to these systems. Armengot et al.  
156 (2019) investigate the effect of different cacao production systems (organic vs.  
157 conventional) under sole and mixed cropping and the consequent impact on pest  
158 incidence and cacao yield, without any external inputs. The authors show that, when  
159 best cropping practices are applied (e.g. regular tree pruning and fortnightly removal of  
160 infested pods as preventive phytosanitary measures), cacao productivity increases with  
161 no significant differences in terms of pest incidence between sole and mixed cropping,  
162 both in organic and conventional systems. The authors however highlight the need for  
163 extra labor related to the adoption of good management practices, and thus higher  
164 production costs, which should be compensated by incentives for farmers.

165 Several studies investigated the impact of different environmental factors and farm  
166 management systems on coffee pests and predators separately. However, only few  
167 studies have been conducted to understand the complex regulating network that result  
168 from interactions between cropping practices, farming systems and their interactions

169 both on coffee pests and their predators. Beilhe et al. (2019) assess the potential effects  
170 of environmental conditions (e.g. percentage of shade cover, tree area surface, coffee  
171 density) and farm management (i.e. conventional, integrated, and, organic) on the  
172 abundance and related damage from coffee berry borer *Hypothenemus hampei*, as well  
173 as the ant predatory groups, and their interactions. The authors show how crop  
174 management practices (e.g. shade management, plant diversity, preventive  
175 phytosanitary measures) can reduce the coffee berry borer population without  
176 considerable side effects on the ant predatory group.

177 Coffee-based AFSs can differ in their complexity, ranging from simple systems including  
178 a few tree species to very complex systems comprising many tree species across a range  
179 of pedo-climatic and cropping practice gradients. Consequently, the ecosystem services  
180 provided by these systems in general and pest regulating services in particular may  
181 widely vary from one system to another. Identification of the most promising coffee  
182 agroecosystems, by comparing all these different levels of complexity that foster  
183 ecosystem services represents a key point to obtain information that can be used for  
184 designing sustainable AFSs. Cerda et al. (2020), by taking into account a wide range of  
185 shade and management conditions, quantify indicators of ecosystem services and  
186 disservices provided by these AFSs. In such a way, the authors identify six most  
187 promising coffee-based AFSs that allow to reduce crop losses while providing other  
188 ecosystem services.

189 Many research works have been conducted to understand the role of AFSs combining  
190 perennial crops on pest populations and their natural enemies. In contrast, little is  
191 known to date as to whether AFSs including annual and perennial crops may play a  
192 positive, negative or neutral role on insect pests. Imbert et al. (2020) estimate

193 population dynamic parameters of three major vegetable pests (the green peach aphid  
194 *Myzus persicae*, the gray cabbage aphid *Brevicoryne brassicae*, and other pests of the  
195 “caterpillars” group) in mixed fruit tree-vegetable plots, combining apple and cabbage,  
196 compared with sole crops. The authors report that mixed fruit tree-vegetable systems,  
197 compared with sole crop: can enhance reproduction or survival of some pests; pest  
198 predation level in this mixed cropping system may be similar or even lower than in sole  
199 crops; and trees do not necessarily constitute a barrier to pest immigration. This  
200 demonstrate that mixed cropping systems are not always favorable for crop health,  
201 especially if crop species are not carefully chosen.

202 The use of decision support systems play an important role to reduce crop losses due to  
203 pests. Although a large number of decision support tools, including weather forecasting  
204 models, have been developed to predict risks related to pests, these tools are not always  
205 used by growers. The reasons behind a low uptake of these tools are several including  
206 cost, reliability in terms of their prediction and user-friendliness. More specifically to  
207 coffee rust disease, to date, almost two dozen predictive models have been developed to  
208 predict different indicators of the disease development and management. One of the  
209 drawback of these models is that they determine *a priori* standardized periods of  
210 influence of the meteorological predictors. However, symptom appearance can be  
211 affected by complex combinations of meteorological variables acting at different times  
212 and duration. Merle et al. (2019) by using a statistical approach, identify the complex  
213 interactions of weather variables responsible for changes in lesion status. Based on this,  
214 the authors develops three models predicting lesion emergence probability, lesion  
215 sporulation probability and growth of its infectious area, which take into account  
216 temperatures and rainfall values for specific stages of the disease cycle. These models

217 are useful to predict risks of infection, sporulation and infectious area growth, which are  
218 helpful to optimizing phytosanitary treatment recommendations.

219 Coffee orchard floor management, based on tree species as cover crops, can offer the  
220 potential for greater labor and herbicide efficiency as well as positive contributions to  
221 coffee productivity and a better weed management. However, the choice of tree species  
222 as cover crops needs a particular attention to improve coffee productivity and reduce  
223 risks related to weed development. Staver et al. (2020) perform a long-term trial  
224 including two dry season cover crop species combination of deciduous and non-  
225 deciduous leguminous and non-leguminous species (*Inga laurina* and *Tabebuia rosea*)  
226 with two intensities of organic and conventional coffee management. The authors show  
227 that, despite several potential for a better weed management and increased coffee  
228 productivity through a better coffee orchard floor management, numerous challenges  
229 remain for the selection of tree species. These challenges include water use efficiency,  
230 nutrient cycling and soil biology, tree growth habit and canopy form as well as ease of  
231 management.

### 232 3.5. Socio-economic factors as drivers affecting crop health in AFSs

233 There have been several cases of disease epidemics in the modern history of agriculture  
234 leading to devastating crop losses with consequent impact on food security. These  
235 disease epidemics have been most often associated to crop pests or, at best, pests x  
236 weather interactions without taking into account other drivers, which may have  
237 triggered disease epidemics. This has been also the case for coffee rust epidemics,  
238 caused by the obligate fungal pathogen *H. vastatrix*, that hit Central America since 2012.  
239 While several studies have been conducted on the biology and epidemiology of the  
240 causal agent, little is known to date about socio-economic drivers affecting the disease

241 epidemic. Villarreyana et al. (2020) identify how socio-economic factors, in particular  
242 economic constraints, affected the decision making process of farmers, in terms of  
243 access to best cropping practices and how all this has triggered the development of  
244 coffee rust epidemic in Nicaragua.

#### 245 **4. Conclusions and future perspectives**

246 This special issue sheds light on how pests affect different kind of host plants of AFSs --  
247 by focusing on the multiple interacting mechanisms that take place at different scales  
248 (plot, farm, and landscape) as a result of the vegetation biodiversity such as  
249 microclimate modifications, soil quality improvement, host plant physiology changes,  
250 permanent shelter for invertebrates (both beneficials and pests), alternate sources of  
251 disease inocula etc. These mechanisms either can lead to natural regulation of pests or  
252 conversely increase their populations, depending on their specific requirements or  
253 specific phases of the host/pest interaction. Structuring and managing biodiversity in  
254 AFSs are thus essential to improve pest regulation, by promoting desirable mechanisms  
255 while discouraging undesirable ones. However, papers presented in this issue also show  
256 that pest regulation services can also compete with other ecosystem services, which  
257 suggests the need of several trade-offs to improve the functioning of the whole system.

258 Results of some works in this special issue are complementary to others as they  
259 corroborate on key factors affecting crop health in AFSs. For example, Armengot et al.  
260 (2019) show that, when external input is excluded and when best cropping practices are  
261 adopted, no difference in pest incidence occur between cacao grown in monocropping  
262 and classical AFSs managed under organic and conventional farming. This confirms  
263 what Villarreyana et al. (2020) demonstrate, meaning that socio-economic constraints  
264 that do not allow farmers to bear labor costs related to best cropping practices, trigger

265 crop health problems as was the case for coffee rust epidemics in Nicaragua. AFSs, with  
266 the integration of trees into cropland, can be beneficial for smallholder family survival  
267 only when properly managed, as tree species compete with crops for light, nutrients,  
268 and water. Labor demand in AFSs are higher compared with the monocropping system  
269 due to its complexity in terms of crop management needs. Policy initiatives are,  
270 therefore, needed to provide economic incentives to those farmers who cannot afford  
271 labor costs required for a better crop management. This will ensure farmers' access to  
272 best management practices and thus finally improve the sustainability and durability of  
273 AFSs. Finally, future studies focusing on crop health in AFSs should aim at better  
274 elucidating some key points not necessarily addressed by papers presented in this issue  
275 **(Box 1).**

276 **Box 1.** Future research priorities to fill current knowledge gaps in AFSs

- Shade seems to be an important driver affecting pest incidence and severity in AFSs. Which species and which leaf functional traits and canopy architecture for crops grown in AFSs to maximize ecosystem services? How breeding programs for shade trees can contribute to this objective?
- Maximization of an ecosystem service may have negative impacts on other ecosystem services. How can we find a trade-off between non-commercial vs. commercial ecosystem services across contrasting pedo-climatic and socio-economic gradients?
- Which socio-economic and environmental indicators for model AFSs capable of improving farmers' livelihoods, collective well-being, socio-economic development, and equity across contrasting pedo-climatic and socio-economic gradients?
- A higher priority toward non-commercial ecosystem services may be needed to increase resilience of AFSs in the long term. However, this may affect the short-term productivity of AFSs. What possibility of public policy support to help farmers during this transition phase?
- AFSs, by definition, are integrated systems and thus should address both environmental and socio-economic objectives. What feasibility of interdisciplinary collaboration, combining socio-economic and bio-technical research to better understand crop health in AFSs?

277

278

279 **Acknowledgements**

280 I thank Stephen N. Wegulo and the reviewers of this special issue, who very efficiently  
281 collaborated with me to ensure timely publication of this issue. I am grateful to Jacques  
282 Avelino for his kind availability for interactions from the beginning until the completion  
283 of this special issue as well as his useful comments on an earlier version of this editorial.  
284 I am also thankful to Jean-Pierre Sarthou for his initial contribution to the special issue.

285 **References**

- 286 Andres, C., Blaser, W.J., Dzahini-Obiatey, H.K., Ameyaw, G.A., Domfeh, O.K., Awiagah, M.A.,  
287 Gattinger, A., Schneider, M., Offei, S.K., Six, J., 2018. Agroforestry systems can  
288 mitigate the severity of cocoa swollen shoot virus disease. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*  
289 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2017.09.031>
- 290 Armengot, L., Ferrari, L., Milz, J., Velásquez, F., Hohmann, P., Schneider, M., 2019. Cacao  
291 agroforestry systems do not increase pest and disease incidence compared with  
292 monocultures under good cultural management practices. *Crop Prot.* 105047.  
293 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2019.105047>
- 294 Avelino, J., Vílchez, S., Segura-Escobar, M.B., Brenes-Loaiza, M.A., de M. Virginio Filho, E.,  
295 Casanoves, F., 2019. Shade tree *Chloroleucon eurycyclum* promotes coffee leaf rust  
296 by reducing uredospore wash-off by rain. *Crop Prot.* 105038.  
297 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2019.105038>
- 298 Babin, R., Ten Hoopen, G.M., Cilas, C., Enjalric, F., Gendre, P., Lumaret, J.-P., 2010. Impact  
299 of shade on the spatial distribution of *Sahlbergella singularis* in traditional cocoa  
300 agroforests. *Agric. For. Entomol.* 12, 69–79. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-9563.2009.00453.x)  
301 [9563.2009.00453.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-9563.2009.00453.x)

302 Beilhe, L.B., Roudine, S., Perez, J.A.Q., Allinne, C., Daout, D., Mauxion, R., Carval, D., 2019.  
303 Pest-regulating networks of the coffee berry borer (*Hypothenemus hampei*) in  
304 agroforestry systems. Crop Prot. 105036.  
305 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2019.105036>

306 Cerda, R., Avelino, J., Harvey, C.A., Gary, C., Tixier, P., Allinne, C., 2020. Coffee agroforestry  
307 systems capable of reducing disease-induced yield and economic losses while  
308 providing multiple ecosystem services. Crop Prot. 105149.  
309 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2020.105149>

310 Cerda, R., Deheuvels, O., Calvache, D., Niehaus, L., Saenz, Y., Kent, J., Vilchez, S., Villota, A.,  
311 Martinez, C., Somarriba, E., 2014. Contribution of cocoa agroforestry systems to  
312 family income and domestic consumption: looking toward intensification. Agrofor.  
313 Syst. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-014-9691-8>

314 Döring, T.F., Pautasso, M., Finckh, M.R., Wolfe, M.S., 2012. Concepts of plant health –  
315 reviewing and challenging the foundations of plant protection. Plant Pathol. 61, 1–  
316 15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3059.2011.02501.x>

317 Durand-Bessart, C., Tixier, P., Quinteros, A., Andreotti, F., Rapidel, B., Tauvel, C., Allinne,  
318 C., 2020. Analysis of interactions amongst shade trees, coffee foliar diseases and  
319 coffee yield in multistrata agroforestry systems. Crop Prot. 105137.  
320 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2020.105137>

321 Gagliardi, S., Avelino, J., Beilhe, L.B., Isaac, M.E., 2020. Contribution of shade trees to wind  
322 dynamics and pathogen dispersal on the edge of coffee agroforestry systems: A  
323 functional traits approach. Crop Prot. 130, 105071.  
324 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2019.105071>



325 Imbert, C., Papaïx, J., Husson, L., Warlop, F., Lavigne, C., 2020. Estimating population  
326 dynamics parameters of cabbage pests in temperate mixed apple tree-cabbage plots  
327 compared to control vegetable plots. *Crop Prot.* 129, 105037.  
328 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2019.105037>

329 Kuyah, S., Whitney, C.W., Jonsson, M., Sileshi, G.W., Öborn, I., Muthuri, C.W., Luedeling, E.,  
330 2019. Agroforestry delivers a win-win solution for ecosystem services in sub-  
331 Saharan Africa. A meta-analysis. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* 39, 47.  
332 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-019-0589-8>

333 Loguercio, L.L., Santos, L.S., Niella, G.R., Miranda, R.A.C., De Souza, J.T., Collins, R.T.,  
334 Pomella, A.W. V, 2009. Canopy-microclimate effects on the antagonism between  
335 *Trichoderma stromaticum* and *Moniliophthora perniciosa* in shaded cacao. *Plant*  
336 *Pathol.* 58, 1104–1115. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1111/j.1365-3059.2009.02152.x>

337 Mbow, C., Smith, P., Skole, D., Duguma, L., Bustamante, M., 2014. Achieving mitigation  
338 and adaptation to climate change through sustainable agroforestry practices in  
339 africa. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2013.09.002>

340 MEA, 2005. Millennium EcosystemAssessment; Ecosystems and human wellbeing:  
341 synthesis. World Resources Institute, Washington, DC.

342 Merle, I., Tixier, P., de Melo Virginio Filho, E., Cilas, C., Avelino, J., 2019. Forecast models  
343 of coffee leaf rust symptoms and signs based on identified microclimatic  
344 combinations in coffee-based agroforestry systems in Costa Rica. *Crop Prot.*  
345 105046. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2019.105046>

346 Mvondo, E.A., Ndo, E.G.D., Manga, M.L.T., Aba'ane, C.L., Bitoumou, J.A., Manga, B., Nomo,  
347 L.B., Ambang, Z., Cilas, C., 2019. Effects of complex cocoa-based agroforests on citrus

348 tree decline. Crop Prot. 105051.  
349 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2019.105051>

350 Ray, D.K., Ramankutty, N., Mueller, N.D., West, P.C., Foley, J. a, 2012. Recent patterns of  
351 crop yield growth and stagnation. Nat. Commun. 3, 1293.

352 Schauberber, B., Ben-Ari, T., Makowski, D., Kato, T., Kato, H., Ciais, P., 2018. Yield trends,  
353 variability and stagnation analysis of major crops in France over more than a  
354 century. Sci. Rep. 8, 16865. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-35351-1>

355 Sow, A., Seye, D., Faye, E., Benoit, L., Galan, M., Haran, J., Brévault, T., 2020. Birds and bats  
356 contribute to natural regulation of the millet head miner in tree-crop agroforestry  
357 systems. Crop Prot. 105127.  
358 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2020.105127>

359 Staver, C., Juventia, S., Navarrete, E., Navarrete, L., Sepulveda, N., Barrios, M., 2020. Long-  
360 term response of groundcover components to organic and conventional weed  
361 control in shaded and open-sun coffee in Nicaragua. Crop Prot. 105150.  
362 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2020.105150>

363 Villarreyna, R., Barrios, M., Vílchez, S., Cerda, R., Vignola, R., Avelino, J., 2020. Economic  
364 constraints as drivers of coffee rust epidemics in Nicaragua. Crop Prot. 127, 104980.  
365 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2019.104980>

366

367

**Declaration of interests**

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests: