



HAL
open science

Design as a source of renewal in the production of scientific knowledge in crop science

Quentin Toffolini, Marie-Hélène Jeuffroy, Jean-Marc Meynard, Julie Borg, Jérôme Enjalbert, Arnaud Gauffreteau, Isabelle Goldringer, Amélie Lefèvre, Chantal Loyce, Philippe Martin, et al.

► To cite this version:

Quentin Toffolini, Marie-Hélène Jeuffroy, Jean-Marc Meynard, Julie Borg, Jérôme Enjalbert, et al.. Design as a source of renewal in the production of scientific knowledge in crop science. *Agricultural Systems*, 2020, 185, 10.1016/j.agsy.2020.102939 . hal-02936827

HAL Id: hal-02936827

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02936827>

Submitted on 11 May 2022

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.

Design as a source of renewal in the production of scientific knowledge in crop science

Quentin Toffolini^{a, b, c}

Marie-Hélène Jeuffroy^b

Jean-Marc Meynard^a

Julie Borg^d

Jérôme Enjalbert^d

Arnaud Gauffreteau^b

Isabelle Goldringer^d

Amélie Lefèvre^e

Chantal Loyce^b

Philippe Martin^a

Chloé Salembier^{a, e}

Véronique Souchère^a

Muriel Valantin-Morison^b

Gaëlle Van Frank^d

Lorène Prost^c

a Université Paris-Saclay, AgroParisTech, INRAE, UMR SADAPT, 78850 Thiverval-Grignon, France

b Université Paris-Saclay, AgroParisTech, INRAE, UMR Agronomie, 78850 Thiverval-Grignon, France

c Université Paris-Est Marne la Vallée, INRAE, CNRS, ESIEE, UMR LISIS, 77454 Marne-La-Vallée, France

d Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS, AgroParisTech, INRAE, UMR GQE-Le Moulon, 91190 Gif-sur-Yvette, France

e Université Montpellier, INRAE, UE Alénya-Roussillon, 66200 Alénya, France

Abstract

Innovation is central to the strategic orientations of many agronomic research institutes. Little attention has been paid, however, to the links between knowledge production and design processes, defined as processes resulting in the creation of new objects in pursuit of specific goals. Our aim was to analyze the conditions and specificities of the production of scientific knowledge on agro-ecosystems through design processes. Drawing on design theory, we carried out a cross-analysis of nine research projects that included design processes and produced innovative objects (for example blending rules for variety mixtures in low-input crop management routes). These projects were managed by researchers from a range of disciplines (agronomists, geneticists, crop physiologists, and ecologists), and varied in their duration (from three to 15 years) and scale (from plot to landscape). We combined semi-structured interviews with these researchers and the analysis of various documents (scientific papers, PhD theses, technical publications, and research projects or reports). Our findings show that in all case studies, original and general scientific knowledge on

37 agro-ecosystem functioning was produced at various stages throughout the design processes. The
38 originality of this knowledge lies with the new representations that emerged, either of the agro-ecosystem
39 processes at stake, or of farmers' practices. We show that these representations were formed gradually,
40 through successive iterations of both refined formulations of the design target and new knowledge
41 produced, required for its design. Finally, our results highlight the role of confrontation with real-life
42 situations (particularly through agronomic diagnosis or experiments) in the evolution of these
43 representations. Engaging in design processes can thus be seen as a research practice that leads to the
44 production of original knowledge, allowing for a greater diversity of actors' ways of knowing to be taken
45 into account.

46 **Keywords:**

47 innovation, design theory, diagnosis, farmers' practices, agroecology, research management

48 1 Introduction

49 In order to achieve the agronomic, economic, social and environmental performance expected of
50 agricultural production, a radical transformation of agricultural systems is required. This calls for
51 innovation, which has become central to the strategic orientations of agricultural research institutes (see for
52 example INRA, 2016; Wageningen University of Research, 2016). Agricultural researchers are being asked
53 to support the in-depth redesign of cultural practices and crop ideotypes (Hill, 2006; Hill and MacRae,
54 1995), to create agricultural systems that reduce the use of synthetic inputs, provide ecosystem services,
55 ensure the sustainability of agro-ecosystem production and health-related functions, and thus contribute to
56 innovation. Research supporting such redesign has been growing for several years (Bos et al., 2009;
57 Dogliotti et al., 2014; Le Gal et al., 2011; Meynard et al., 2012; Prost et al., 2018; Romera et al., 2020).
58 There has been little emphasis, however, on the design activities and methods used by agricultural
59 researchers as such. The focus is rather on the knowledge gaps that hinder the development of technical
60 alternatives (Duru, 2013; Tomich et al., 2011; Wezel et al., 2014), or the need for a greater diversity of
61 knowledge sources (Doré et al., 2011), including expert or traditional knowledge (Altieri and Toledo, 2005;
62 Francis et al., 2003). Such emphasis is consistent with the widespread idea that innovation ensues from the
63 accumulation of relevant scientific knowledge. This understanding of the relationship between knowledge
64 and innovation is exemplified by the linear scale of the Technology Readiness Levels originally developed
65 by NASA (Mankins, 1995), for instance, defined in INRAE strategic guidance documents as the scale
66 which “*assesses the level of maturity of a technology from research at the laboratory prior to its*
67 *commercialization or application*”. Innovation is thus seen as an *a posteriori* way of valorizing the scientific
68 knowledge produced. In this article, we support a contrary perspective: innovation can also be seen as a
69 way of generating scientific knowledge, specifically through the design stage of innovation. Here, design
70 is defined as the process whereby a new object is shaped in pursuit of new goals, that is, the process whereby
71 its identity is defined: what it will be, what it will do, or what it will make possible. A number of crop
72 science publications have studied the knowledge that supports these agronomic design processes from the

73 perspective of its nature, sources, general applicability and objects (Berthet et al., 2015; Duru et al., 2015;
74 Toffolini et al., 2017). Yet little consideration has been given to the scientific knowledge that is generated
75 during design, which is what we set out to study in this article. We thus analyze several design processes,
76 in which agricultural researchers were involved, to answer the following question: *to what extent, and in*
77 *what way, do design processes produce original scientific knowledge about agricultural systems?* To this
78 end, we first explain our theoretical framework, followed by a presentation of our methodological approach
79 to select and analyze nine case studies. We then present and discuss the results of our cross-analysis,
80 emphasizing the connections between the design process and the scientific knowledge produced, and
81 explaining the originality of that knowledge.

82

83 2 Theoretical framework

84 Largely studied within the Design Research community (see for instance Bayazit, 2004; Cross, 2007; Dorst,
85 2008; Papalambros, 2015; Vial, 2015), design is a process through which new objects are created to attain
86 goals (Simon, 1969). It is thus a finalized process which pursues an “intention for the future” (Béguin et
87 al., 2011). Design processes are specific insofar as the design problem to be solved is not clearly formulated
88 at the start of the process. This problem’s formulation will be gradually specified as design solutions are
89 imagined and tested (e.g. Dorst and Cross, 2001). Designers therefore build their own representations of
90 the design problem, which evolve as the problem is being solved and new objects are being designed. Based
91 on these principles, design processes can be described in terms of their *initial design target* - which includes
92 the initial intentions of the designers and the types of actions they target to implement - , a *cognitive*
93 *reasoning* making evolve the formulations of the design target through the processes, and their final
94 *outcomes*. Schön and Wiggins (1992) complete this analytical framework by conceptualizing design as a
95 “*reflective conversation with the materials of a design situation*”. According to these authors, the designer
96 cannot imagine all the properties of an object before putting it into action: implementing a prototype, for
97 instance, makes it possible to learn about some of its properties, and thus to manage the complexity of the
98 object during its emergence. As a consequence, the design of an object is fed in and through the action in
99 which the object takes place.

100 These different elements (initial design targets, outcomes, cognitive reasoning and actions featuring the
101 object) will constitute our framework to describe our design case studies.

102 Research on design has also shown the existence of close links between design and knowledge. During the
103 design process, designers use knowledge, particularly through analogies and abductions that are known
104 tools for them to transfer knowledge from past projects to new ones by revisiting past solutions or problem
105 formulations (see for example Bonnardel, 2000; Roozenburg, 1993). But design also involves the
106 production of new knowledge (Eekels and Roozenburg, 1991; Glanville, 1999; Hatchuel and Weil, 2009;
107 Owen, 1998). When designers imagine solutions to solve the problem they formulated, they often identify
108 missing knowledge, leading to a dedicated knowledge production phase, which will in turn transform their
109 representation of the design problem to solve. C-K (Concept-Knowledge) design theory thus represents

110 design reasoning as the coevolution, through constant dialogue, of a space of ‘concepts’ in which an object
111 that does not yet exist emerges through the gradual definition of its properties, and a space of ‘knowledge’,
112 including what we know and what we learn (Hatchuel and Weil, 2009). In this article, we will propose to
113 analyze the production of scientific knowledge regarding design processes by tracing the interactions
114 between three moving spaces over time: the representations that designers have of the problem to be solved,
115 the successive formulations of the design targets, and the outcomes of the design process.
116

117 3 Materials and methods

118 3.1 Choice of the case studies

119 The nine case studies were selected from design projects in the crop sciences (agronomy, population
120 genetics, applied ecology). The case selection was based on two criteria guided by the theoretical
121 framework: (i) all the projects were driven by an ambition to innovate exemplified by an explicit design
122 target, and all ultimately resulted in the design of new objects (for example crop management routes,
123 cropping systems, cultivar mixtures, decision support tools, and spatial organizations of agricultural
124 landscapes – see Table 1); and (ii) all the projects produced scientific knowledge, as evidenced by
125 *publications* in peer-review scientific journals or conference proceedings (Table 1). Publications provided
126 a starting point for the case study analysis, for an in-depth description of the diversity of scientific
127 knowledge produced. Moreover, in order to easily collect information about project management from one
128 or more of the main actors involved, we only selected case studies with a deep involvement of researchers
129 engaged in methodological reflection on design in agrifood systems as part of the IDEAS collective network
130 (INRAE-AgroParisTech). This paper is a product of the IDEAS network, and its content was elaborated
131 and debated within that network.

132 The case studies were not selected to be representative of current innovation projects. Rather, we aimed
133 to cover a wider diversity of design processes, in several respects. The nine case studies thus vary in terms
134 of (Table 1):

- 135 (i) the duration of the design process (ranging from three to 15 years), whether still in progress or
136 completed: the oldest cases offer retrospective insight into all the knowledge produced relating
137 to design, while the most recent ones and those still in progress provide a more detailed
138 understanding of the most decisive aspects of the design process);
- 139 (ii) the actions which the object designed is supposed to transform (mostly farmers’ practices, for
140 example fertilization, varietal choice, and crop management); and
- 141 (iii) their spatial scale, ranging between a field, a farm, a landscape mosaic, a watershed or a
142 breeding network. Some of the case studies involved researchers with a strong commitment to
143 studying the valorization of agro-ecosystem regulations within the field of agroecology (Altieri
144 and Toledo, 2005), for example looking at pollen beetle control with auxiliaries, vegetable
145 intercropping, or participatory breeding. Others aimed to optimize input applications, which
146 may be relevant for all types of agriculture, (such as “Double density strips”, “NNI

147 trajectories”, and “Miscanthus”, see section 3.3). All these case studies were carried out with
148 non-research partners: farmers, agricultural advisers, engineers from advisory services, or
149 applied research organizations.

150 3.2 Case study analysis methods

151 The case study approach was inductive and instrumental: “inductive” insofar as assumptions about the
152 links between scientific knowledge production and design emerged from the exploration of the cases, and
153 “instrumental” (Stake, 1994) in that the study was based on analyses moving back and forth between the
154 exploration of each case and a cross-analysis of all cases. Hence, in each case, we retraced the design
155 process from its outcomes back to the initial design target, and identified the scientific knowledge produced
156 throughout the process. Semi-structured interviews with the researchers carrying out the research in each
157 case study were held by the primary author of this article, who then combined or supplemented the
158 information collected with an analysis of articles published in refereed journals, conference proceedings,
159 research project reports, and PhD theses. All the researchers interviewed validated the accuracy of the
160 analysis of their case study.

161 The following questions guided the interviews: what design target did you have at the start of the
162 project, and how did it evolve? What knowledge was used during the design process? What scientific
163 knowledge has been produced? In what way is this knowledge original, specifically with regard to the
164 scientific disciplines in which it is embedded? At which stage of the design process was this knowledge
165 produced? In relation to which question, and which experimental configurations? The interviews were
166 transcribed and coded according to different categories:

- 167 1. the resources available and mobilized during the design process (stabilized knowledge, data,
168 existing experimental arrangements);
- 169 2. the successive formulations of the design target that guided the production of new knowledge;
- 170 3. the concrete research practices mobilized, that is, the tools applied to produce data, analyze it, or
171 test the knowledge produced (for example experimental or research frameworks, modelling, agronomic
172 diagnosis, or prototype testing);
- 173 4. the agricultural situations targeted by the design processes, in other words the agronomic and
174 ecological characteristics of farmers’ contexts, the decisions at stake, and the constraints (technical,
175 organizational) encountered in the implementation of solutions, as well as the representations that
176 farmers have of the effect of their actions (Cerf et al., 2012).

177

178 Table 1: Description of the case studies and selection criteria.

179

180 3.3 Description of the case studies

181 We here briefly introduce each case study, focusing on the knowledge produced and the resulting
182 innovations. These final outcomes of the design processes are summarized in Table 1, with each case
183 referred to, using a short name provided in the titles below in brackets.

184 3.3.1 *Case 1. A double density strip to maximize the Nitrogen Use Efficiency of wheat (Double*
185 *density strip)*

186 In the late 1990s, nitrogen fertilization of wheat required measuring soil inorganic N after winter, which
187 is impossible in stony soils. The initial design target, defined by the advisory services of the main regions
188 concerned, was a method to calculate N fertilization rate that did not require any measurement of soil
189 mineral nitrogen. Researchers proposed a new equation to calculate the fertilizer rate to apply, based on
190 nitrogen uptake in an unfertilized control case and the Nitrogen Use Efficiency (NUE) of the fertilizer
191 applied (Meynard et al., 1997). In order to better understand the sources of variation of NUE, a large
192 experimental network of farm plots was then set up by advisors and researchers: NUE appeared to be
193 strongly correlated with the wheat's growth rate at the time of N application. A ¹⁵N tracing of the fertilizer
194 explained NUE variations through gaseous losses. This new knowledge opened the door for innovation
195 surrounding the date of fertilizer application: to maximize fertilizer NUE, the recommendation was made
196 to fertilize plants during a stage of high growth, thus delaying the application dates. An indicator (the
197 yellowing of a more densely sown area, called a double density strip) was formulated to trigger fertilizer
198 application.

199 3.3.2 *Case 2. Wheat Nitrogen fertilization based on Nitrogen Nutrition Index trajectories (NNI*
200 *trajectories)*

201 The Balance Sheet method (Meynard et al., 1997; Rémy and Hébert, 1977), widely used in France for
202 40 years to manage N fertilization of wheat, does not prevent over-fertilization and pollution. The initial
203 design target was a method for managing N fertilization, to replace the Balance Sheet method while also
204 reducing N fertilization rates and maximizing NUE. A diagnosis of the Balance Sheet implementation,
205 carried out by agricultural researchers in 2015, revealed that the estimation of crop requirement based on a
206 target yield was a major source of error. Through design workshops involving scientists, experts and
207 advisors, the new design target was formulated: an alternative fertilization method, based on the monitoring
208 of the nitrogen nutrition status of the crop using the Nitrogen Nutrition Index (NNI). To explore this
209 strategy, an NNI minimum trajectory was identified by re-analyzing available datasets, distinguishing
210 between situations without yield loss despite N deficiency (above the trajectory), and those with yield loss
211 (below the trajectory). A new fertilization method was thus developed, based on the real-time monitoring
212 of NNI and a calculation of N inputs to avoid NNI values below the minimum trajectory.

213 3.3.3 *Case 3. Nitrogen fertilization of rapeseed, accounting for N loss through frozen leaves*
214 *(Frozen leaves)*

215 The initial design target of the project, which began in 1996, was a crop management route for winter
216 rapeseed, based on a sowing date realized one month earlier than in current management routes, in order to
217 take advantage of the plant's ability to uptake large N amounts at the start of the cycle, thus limiting N loss
218 through leaching, and highly competing with weeds. Trials, both in experimental stations and on farms,
219 confirmed a large N uptake in autumn, but also showed that in some situations, a very large part of this
220 nitrogen was lost during the winter due to leaves falling following frosts. This revealed a lack of knowledge

221 about what happens to the N contained in frozen leaves. An experiment at an experimental station,
222 combining incubations (to estimate the mineralization rate) and isotopic tracing of N in frozen leaves (partly
223 absorbed after the frozen leaves' mineralization), produced new knowledge on the dynamics of nitrogen
224 mineralization and reabsorption. It ultimately made it possible to account for the role played by frozen
225 leaves, thanks to a method to calculate spring N fertilization of rapeseed, applicable with any sowing date
226 and quantity of frozen leaves.

227 *3.3.4 Case 4. Rules for creating wheat variety mixtures in various agricultural contexts (Variety*
228 *mixtures)*

229 The project, launched in 2014, focused on variety mixtures, the genetic diversity of which supports
230 disease control and production stability. The initial design target was rules for creating variety mixtures.
231 During the design workshops, attended by agricultural advisors, farmers, and researchers from various
232 disciplines (agronomy, genetics, phytopathology), strategies were formulated for creating mixtures and
233 defining the associated blending rules. A new hypothesis emerged on the diversity of heights and disease
234 resistance among cultivars to combine in order to control the spread of airborne diseases in mixtures. This
235 hypothesis was tested in a crop physiology PhD thesis that highlighted mechanisms for mitigating the
236 spread of airborne diseases in cultivar mixtures with large height gradients. Moreover, a diagnosis of the
237 implementation of variety mixtures on farms showed that farmers used mixtures either to stabilize
238 production or to simplify their crop management. This led researchers to redefine their representation of
239 farmers' practices, and to shift the formulation of blending rules to objectives other than productivity. A
240 multi-criteria assessment tool for cultivar mixtures was then designed to provide support for choosing
241 cultivars to be mixed. It combined blending rules for disease control, for stabilizing production, and for
242 simplifying crop management.

243 *3.3.5 Case 5. A risk indicator of the potential damage to rapeseed by beetles, allowing for the*
244 *management of cropping system mosaics (Pollen beetles)*

245 As in Case 3, the initial design target of this project launched in 2007 was a low-input rapeseed
246 management route. An agronomic diagnosis performed by agricultural researchers revealed limiting
247 factors, including pollen beetles that lay eggs in flower buds. In this diagnosis, the abundance of pollen
248 beetles on a farm plot appeared to be linked more to the surrounding landscape than to the management of
249 the rapeseed on the plot. The design target thus moved from the scale of the plot to that of the landscape,
250 in which natural habitats, semi-natural elements and plot margins, as well as cropping systems, impact
251 pollen beetles and their natural enemies. A landscape indicator was produced to anticipate the pollen beetle
252 pressure that would not be regulated by natural enemies, also highlighting a critical need for knowledge
253 about the dispersal distance of pollen beetles. The agronomists proposed to use this indicator for the
254 landscape management of pollen beetle pressure.

255 3.3.6 *Case 6. Cropping systems involving miscanthus and reducing net greenhouse gas emissions*
256 *(Miscanthus)*

257 The initial design target of the project, which began in 2009 and involved agricultural scientists,
258 advisors and R&D organizations from the Burgundy region, was environmentally efficient cropping
259 systems involving energy crops. It started with an on-farm diagnosis, which identified a greater variability
260 of miscanthus yields than that observed at experimental stations. The year-to-year yield evolution of this
261 long-cycle crop (15 to 20 years) was not known, as the miscanthus in the study area was grown since
262 recently. The yield dynamics on a multi-year scale, as well as their sensitivity to local contexts, were then
263 modeled on the basis of yields measured on farm plots over the first two years of production, within the
264 study region, and on the basis of data from long-term trials in various locations across Europe. This new
265 knowledge on yield variability and its dynamics over the growing period were then mobilized in a series of
266 design workshops that brought together researchers, advisors, local experts and farmers. These workshops
267 made it possible to design innovative cropping systems involving energy crops. They also identified the
268 need for better knowledge on nitrogen loss under a miscanthus crop.

269 3.3.7 *Case 7. Watershed-wide practice layouts to reduce erosive runoff (Erosive runoff)*

270 In the project, launched in 1988, the initial design target was cropping systems and their organization
271 to limit erosive runoff in silty watersheds in the Haute-Normandie region. A first field diagnosis showed
272 the influence of tillage (tillage direction, dead furrows, dirt tracks, ditches) on the evolution of the soil
273 structure under the effect of rainfall and runoff. The research team developed a spatially explicit model
274 (STREAM) (Souchère et al., 2002) simulating the impacts, on each plot, of soil tillage on soil surface
275 structures and, at watershed level, the effect of land use and soil tillage on the quantities of runoff and soil
276 removed at the outlet of the watershed, after every rain. A first implementation of this model with farmers
277 and advisors showed the need to integrate leeway for farmers into proposals to change practices, so as to
278 accommodate their work organization constraints. Thus, at the end of the project, the research team
279 proposed guidelines to the farmers to avoid situations conducive to erosive runoff as well as an erosion risk
280 indicator, rather than rigid rules for the spatial arrangement and management of crops.

281 3.3.8 *Case 8. Intercropping vegetables in organic systems and for short value chains (Vegetable*
282 *intercropping)*

283 In 2013, a system experiment was set up at a research station to design, test and assess an organic
284 market gardening cropping system catering to short circuits, which made it possible to manage crop health
285 through natural regulations (initial design target). The desire to promote natural pest regulation with
286 intercropping raised the question of the choice of vegetable species, their spatial arrangement, and their
287 management (trellising, irrigation, duration of cultivation). During the first years of the experiment, strong
288 unforeseen interactions appeared between the techniques applied to different species within the tunnel, both
289 in space (for example between trellising, species shading and barrier effects on pests) and in time (between
290 the uprooting dates of the different species and pest flows, for instance). New knowledge was then produced
291 around these interactions. The experiment, combined with participatory workshops and an analysis of

292 farmers' practices, made it possible to gradually design an intercrop and management rules for pest and
293 disease regulation that optimized the use of space by the different species.

294 3.3.9 Case 9. A collective setting for participatory wheat breeding (*Participatory breeding*)

295 In the early 2000s, geneticists familiar with singular situations where farmers cultivate old varieties or
296 even crossbreed them wished to evaluate the contribution of these practices to the maintenance of genetic
297 diversity, and to co-design a participatory wheat breeding scheme with farmers (initial design target). A
298 diagnosis of practices raised the question of the consequences of multiple seed exchanges on genetic
299 diversity. A database was produced with farmers in order to monitor the seed exchanges. The project studied
300 the impact of these exchanges and of the mass selection, which made it possible to produce an indicator of
301 intra-varietal diversity. The knowledge produced on the adaptation of population varieties to different farms
302 supported the design and implementation of a method for participatory breeding that combined (i) a
303 database on seed exchanges and performance in various environments, (ii) a network of on-farm trials with
304 shared protocols, and (iii) a method to compare population varieties.

305 4 Results and discussion

306 4.1 The diversity of outcomes produced during the design processes

307 The design processes analyzed led to diverse outcomes (Table 1). In several cases, these outcomes
308 combined both a set of innovative practices (for example fertilization strategies in the “Double density
309 strip” and “NNI trajectories” cases; crop management routes, cropping systems and spatial arrangements
310 of crops in the “Frozen leaves”, “Miscanthus” and “Erosive runoff” cases respectively), and a tool focused
311 on one specific decision-making aspect (for instance, indicators that trigger fertilization in the “Double
312 density strip” and “NNI trajectories” cases). Some outcomes were decision-making rules focused on
313 adapting modalities of action to singular agricultural and ecological contexts. These included a calculation
314 method for spring fertilization of rapeseed, which accounted for autumn crop N uptake (“Frozen leaves”
315 case), rules for blending varieties according to the pressure of dominant diseases (“Variety mixtures” case),
316 rules for crop arrangement in space, and landscape management rules (“Pollen beetles” and “Vegetable
317 intercropping” cases). Other outcomes were however more removed from farmers' practices, for instance
318 new ways of describing agro-ecosystems (such as the indicator linking a quantity of water – runoff – to a
319 quantity of sediment – erosion – in the “Erosive runoff” case; and the indicator of cultivated genetic
320 diversity including intra-varietal diversity in the “Participatory breeding” case).

321 4.2 Knowledge on agro-ecosystems generated during design

322 Table 2 shows that none of the outcomes designed resulted exclusively from the application of pre-
323 existing knowledge: all the design processes studied provided an opportunity to generate scientific
324 knowledge regarding agro-ecosystems, and this knowledge was often necessary for further design. For
325 instance, the quantity of mineralized N from frozen rapeseed leaves that is reabsorbed in the spring allowed
326 to calculate N inputs in spring in the “Frozen leaves” case, or the dispersion distance of pollen beetles was
327 determined to develop the landscape indicator for natural regulation efficiency in the “Pollen beetles” case.

328 Three types of knowledge on agro-ecosystems were generated during the design processes, which are
329 identified in the third column of Table 2:

- 330 i) Biological or physical processes involved in the agro-ecosystem (in all case studies, for
331 example N gaseous losses explaining ¹⁵N Fertilizer Use Efficiency variations in the “Double
332 density strip” case; the dispersion distances of pollen beetles in the “Pollen beetles” case; and
333 the effect of height diversity across susceptible and resistant varieties on airborne diseases
334 spread in the “Variety mixtures” case);
- 335 ii) Effects of technical actions on the agro-ecosystem, particularly with regard to biophysical
336 processes that were not expected to be impacted (in six of the nine cases, for instance the
337 impact of mass selection on genetic diversity and the adaptation of population varieties in the
338 “Participatory breeding” case; the effects of miscanthus planting practices on the evolution of
339 yields over time in the “Miscanthus” case; and the effects of the arrangement of vegetable
340 species within a tunnel on pest insect populations in the “Vegetables intercropping” case);
- 341 iii) Systemic modeling of key physical or biological processes to steer action (in six of the nine
342 cases; for example modeling the direction of water flow at any point on a plot as a function of
343 tillage direction and field slope in the “Erosive runoff” case; modeling the relationship between
344 NNI trajectory and wheat yield in the “NNI trajectories” case; and modeling the amount of N
345 mineralized by rapeseed leaves that is reabsorbed by the rapeseed crop in the “Frozen leaves”
346 case).

347 The production of knowledge, observed throughout the design process in all case studies, echoes the
348 findings of the Design Sciences in various domains, as described in the Theoretical Framework section.
349 Whereas, in our case studies, the design targets often addressed a narrow, even local innovation niche (for
350 example stony soils in Case 1, low-input rapeseed in Cases 3 and 5, vegetables for short value chains in
351 Case 8, and a participatory breeding scheme for a few groups of farmers in Case 9), at least part of the
352 knowledge produced was reasonably general, as evidenced by its publication in international scientific
353 journals (Table 1). In other words, even if the outcomes of design processes themselves were not always
354 generalizable beyond the contexts in which they were produced, the way design processes led researchers
355 to explore the reality at stake could produce general knowledge about agro-ecosystem entities and
356 processes.

357 Far from just supporting design, the knowledge generated through design processes also contributed
358 to further research. In the older “Frozen leaves” case, the longer timespan since the publication of the
359 knowledge produced allows us to see that the knowledge produced during the design process was largely
360 reused in academic research. The article by Dejoux et al. (2000) on nitrogen mineralization of frozen leaves
361 has been cited 42 times (according to the Web Of Science databases) in articles also studying crop
362 management routes, including, for instance, the use of companion crops and new fertilization strategies
363 (N=10, in journals such as *Agronomy for Sustainable Development* and *Field Crops Research*), Nitrogen
364 Use Efficiency and associated mechanisms (N=13), plant biology (N=13, concerning proteomics, flows
365 and reserves, in journals such as *Journal of Experimental Botany* and *Plant Biology*), the mineralization of

366 organic waste material N in soils (N=4), and winter GHG emissions (N=2, in journals such as *Plant and*
367 *Soil and Plant Biology*). Similarly, the article by Rusch et al. (2013) describing the effect of landscape and
368 cultural practices on pollen beetle populations (“Pollen beetles” case) has been cited 30 times in studies of
369 the landscape impacts of pollen beetle populations (N=11, in *Agriculture Ecosystems Environment* and
370 *Biological conservation*) or other pest species (N=11), as well as more general articles on the
371 implementation of agroecological farming systems (N=5, in journals such as *Agronomy for Sustainable*
372 *Development*) and entomology articles (for instance in *Biocontrol* and *PLOS One*) discussing concepts of
373 spatial scale integration (N=3).

374 Moreover, some of the articles written by the agricultural researchers involved in our case studies
375 underscored how the design processes shed light on areas of knowledge that needed to be explored. For
376 example, Borg et al. (2017) pointed to the scarcity of work on varietal mixtures considering traits other than
377 yield, such as grain quality, and indicated that ecological mechanisms of interaction between varieties could
378 be explored in more detail by covering a range of varietal traits, partly discussed during the participatory
379 workshops (“Variety mixtures” case). In the “Double density strip” case, Limaux et al. (1999) proposed
380 research topics to explain the influence of wheat growth on Nitrogen Use Efficiency, and on the reduction
381 of gaseous losses: “*The increase in crop height (...) may significantly modify physical conditions at the soil*
382 *surface, for volatilisation particularly, by reducing wind speed just above the soil surface, reducing N*
383 *infiltration due to increased drying of the topsoil, and increasing leaf absorption of volatilised NH₃*”.

384

385 *Table 2: Knowledge generated during the design processes, and forms of originality of the representations on*
386 *which they are based.*

387

388 4.3 Originality of the knowledge generated during design

389 We analyzed the originality of the knowledge generated through design processes both by reviewing
390 the articles in which this knowledge was published, and by exploring the expertise of the agricultural
391 researchers interviewed. The nine case studies allowed us to identify two main forms of originality (Table
392 2), depending on whether the new knowledge *i*) relates to original agricultural objects, and thus offers new
393 ways of representing processes within the agro-ecosystem, or *ii*) pertains to forms of farmer action that
394 were not previously taken into consideration by agricultural researchers.

395 *A renewal in the way agricultural researchers represent certain processes within agro-ecosystems.* The
396 knowledge produced often relates to new objects (that is, objects not intentionally studied as such
397 previously), identified as determinants for the action targeted by the design (“Frozen leaves”, “Variety
398 mixtures”, “Erosive runoff”, “Vegetable intercropping” and “Participatory breeding” cases; Table 2). For
399 instance, frozen rapeseed leaves were not traditionally studied in connection with plant development or the
400 nitrogen cycle. In their review of literature, Dejoux et al. (2000) identify the objects more conventionally
401 taken into account in the estimation of soil nitrogen supply for rapeseed as being the residues from the
402 previous crop, and the burial of intermediate crops. In the “Vegetable intercropping” case, the intercrop

403 targeting crop health led to use new criteria beyond those usually studied (*“The intercrop is usually*
404 *described in terms of the choice of species and, in certain cases, by their spatial arrangement”* (Salembier
405 et al., 2015)), in order to also consider different techniques which determine the effect of the mixture on
406 pests and their natural enemies (for example trellising, planting and the uprooting dates of each species).

407 In several cases, the originality mainly pertained to the connections between objects conventionally
408 considered independently of one another (*“Double density strip”, “Pollen beetles”* and *“Miscanthus”* cases;
409 Table 2). Here, while the objects may not have been inherently original, the design processes led to them
410 being analyzed as part of a same system. For instance, in the *“Pollen beetles”* case, the landscape
411 representation that was adopted to qualify the abundance factors of pollen beetles integrated both practices
412 on the plot (not taken into account by landscape ecology, see Vasseur et al., 2013), and semi-natural
413 elements of the landscape (not traditionally considered in agronomy).

414 *A renewal in the farmer practices considered by agricultural researchers.* The knowledge generated
415 can pertain to new representations that agricultural researchers form of farmers’ actions (*“Erosive runoff”*
416 and *“Participatory breeding”* cases; Table 2). The direction of tillage in the *“Erosive runoff”* case is a typical
417 example. In studies of runoff as a function of surface structures, the physical parameters traditionally taken
418 into account in pedologists’ and hydrologists’ models (for example roughness, top-soil texture, etc.) do not
419 account for the link between these parameters, on the one hand, and temporary tillage effects (dead furrows,
420 dirt tracks and ditches, for instance) and direction on the other. By contrast, within the design process
421 targeting watershed crop management consistency, the direction of tillage became a key variable, both in
422 the STREAM model (Cerdan et al., 2002; Souchère et al., 2002) and in the analysis by Joannon et al. (2006)
423 of changes in surface conditions during a cropping campaign. In the *“Participatory breeding”* case, the early
424 identification of the amount of seed exchange (a new consideration for scientists as regards farmers’
425 practices) during farmers’ selection process led to changes in the scientists’ representation of population
426 varieties and to the modeling of cultivated genetic diversity dynamics. In other cases, although researchers
427 did not identify possible new farmer practices, they had to pay specific attention to the dynamics of
428 indicators supporting action (*“Double density strip”, “NNI trajectories”, “Erosive runoff”,* and *“Vegetables*
429 *intercropping”* cases; Table 2). In the *“NNI trajectories”* case, wheat tolerance to temporary nitrogen
430 deficiencies was modeled based on a minimum NNI trajectory: provided that NNI remains above this
431 trajectory from tillering to flowering, N deficiency has no detrimental impact on crop production. This
432 dynamic formalism was preferable, for understanding fertilizer inputs in real time, to that which previously
433 prevailed, proposed by Jeuffroy and Bouchard (1999), which was based on a static indicator (although
434 involving the same types of datasets) combining the intensity and duration of deficiency periods *a*
435 *posteriori*. Similarly, in the *“Vegetable intercropping”* case, the transfer of pests and natural enemies
436 between crops observed within the intercrop led to increased interest in the characteristics of the
437 intercropped species and of their management driving the dynamics of insect populations’ evolution and
438 movement, something that was not self-evident at the start of the project.

439 The design process thus contributes to renewing scientists’ approach to the agro-ecosystem and to
440 farmers’ capacities for action. The dynamics of expansion of the knowledge space, linked to the design

441 process (Hatchuel and Weil, 2002), here appears as a source for crop scientists to broaden their areas of
442 interest, and to shift their attention towards new objects or dynamics within the systems under study.
443 Tittonel (2014) makes the same point in a discussion on the paradigm change associated with the
444 development of technical solutions grounded in natural regulations, arguing that “*classical agronomy and*
445 *agroecology differ (...) in the way they deal with principles such as diversity, dynamics and scaling*”.

446 4.4 Interactions over time between knowledge production and the evolution of the design target

447 The analysis of the dynamics of design processes in the case studies shows that knowledge production
448 evolved hand in hand with the formulation of the design target, and with representations of agro-ecosystem
449 processes.

450 The “Pollen beetle” case (Figure 1) offers a good illustration. The initial design target was a low-input
451 crop management route for rapeseed (first formulation of the design target, noted T1). This target was
452 consistent with a representation of the agro-ecosystem limited to the plot (first representation, noted R1).
453 An agronomic diagnosis, conducted to identify factors limiting plot production, highlighted the
454 predominant role of insect pests and particularly pollen beetles (first knowledge produced, noted K1). The
455 agronomic diagnosis showed that the populations of these insects were not dependent on crop management,
456 but were particularly abundant in plots near forests. The diagnosis thus led to a change in the scale
457 considered (the landscape) and to a renewal of the representation of the agro-ecosystem (R2). This then led
458 to the formulation of a new design target: a landscape indicator to assess the probability that the pollen
459 beetle population would not be regulated by the parasitoids (T2). A spatially explicit model was produced
460 on the basis of the knowledge acquired, and identified the dispersion distance of pollen beetles and natural
461 enemies as a major variable impacting the model’s sensitivity. This resulted in a new formulation of the
462 knowledge needed: what are the precise dispersal distances based on the phases of the cycle, the spatialized
463 distributions and abundances, and the resources and habitats of pollen beetles (K3)? The design target,
464 which reflects the action targeted by the design, evolved to take into account the new spatial scale, and
465 included crop arrangement at landscape level (T3).

466

467 *Figure 1: An example of the co-evolution of the design target, knowledge needs and representations of processes*
468 *of interest in the agro-ecosystems at stake. Case 5: “Pollen beetles”.*

469

470 Similar evolutions were observed in all case studies (Figure 3). The initial formulations of design targets
471 consisted of crop management routes, cropping systems, and crop or variety arrangements. From these
472 generic formulations, the design targets were further specified over the course of the design process, mainly
473 in connection with more elementary actions (for example spring nitrogen fertilization for a rapeseed
474 management route based on early sowing in the “Frozen leaves” case; and crop arrangements and their
475 trellises in the “Vegetable intercropping” case) (Figure 3). As Béguin (2011) points out, “*the desirable, the*
476 *intention for the future, is not built once and for all at the beginning of the design process*”. Our case studies
477 therefore rather reflect the “non-transitive problematization” conceptualized by Matt et al. (2017), referring

478 to the complex paths of innovation: “*Innovation journeys are very often like Columbus’ discovery of*
479 *America that started with the objective of India*”.

480

481 *Figure 2: Comparison of the co-evolutions of design targets, knowledge production, and representations of*
482 *processes of interest in the agro-ecosystems at stake (the key in Figure 1 also applies here).*

483

484 In all cases, this evolution of the design target resulted from knowledge generated during the design
485 process. This knowledge was linked to the initial formulation of the design target, but also always led to a
486 transformation of that target. Moreover, the production of knowledge went hand-in-hand with the evolution,
487 over time, of researchers’ representations of agro-ecosystems processes or of the actions that may impact
488 them. In none of the case studies did the representation associated with the initial formulation of the design
489 target remain over time (Figure 2). Through the exploration necessary to specify the characteristics and
490 properties of the object being designed, knowledge was produced in fields that were not anticipated at the
491 start of the design process. In other words, for all case studies, the design process cannot be likened to an
492 accumulation and technological maturation of knowledge, driven by a definitive formulation of the design
493 target. The relations between scientific knowledge production and design cannot therefore be described
494 using a linear scale such as the Technology Readiness Levels “targeting identified goals” (Mankins, 1995).

495 Figure 2 shows that knowledge production can take place at any time during the design process, in
496 connection with both (i) the specification of the object being designed, and (ii) the evolution of the
497 representations of agro-ecosystems processes or actions. The literature mentioned in the ‘Theoretical
498 framework’ section describes specific operators (such as *disjunction* – a knowledge supports the
499 formulation of a concept – or *conjunction* – the explored concept becomes a new knowledge) for iterations
500 between knowledge and the progressive specification of the object being designed (Hatchuel and Weil,
501 2009). Our results help to clarify some aspects of the dynamics of these iterations. They show that design
502 is not only a matter of refining the properties of the object being designed: it may also lead to radical change
503 in the design target, as a result of the knowledge generated over the course of the design process. Moreover,
504 these disruptive reformulations of the design target also correspond to a change in the designers’
505 representations of the processes of interest or of the practices targeted by the design.

506 4.5 Knowledge production stemming from the conditions of action in a real environment

507 Since the knowledge produced plays a significant role in specifying the design target, it is important to
508 consider the drivers of this specification process. We have identified three types of drivers:

509 ***i) The identification of rare, “singular” situations that revealed a weakness in available***
510 ***practices or objects, and led to the reformulation of a design target, better suited to these situations.***

511 These situations were often brought to agricultural researchers’ attention through informal interactions with
512 farmers or advisors. In these singular situations, standard rules of action, reasonings, approaches and
513 indicators could no longer be considered valid. Examples of such singular situations include stony soils in
514 the “Double density strip” case, very early sowing of rapeseed in the “Frozen leaves” case, short supply
515 chains in the “Vegetables intercropping” case, and ancient variety cultivation in the “Participatory

516 breeding” case. Some occurred at the start of the design process (“Double density strip”, “Vegetables
517 intercropping” and “Participatory breeding” cases), and then provided a definition of what was to be
518 targeted, which set a constraint on the action but did not directly define the knowledge to be produced (for
519 example stony soils which made it impossible to measure inorganic N at the end of winter and therefore to
520 calculate a nitrogen fertilizer rate). Others arose in the middle of the design process timeline (for example
521 situations where many frozen leaves were observed after an initial implementation of rapeseed management
522 routes, applying very early sowing), and pointed more directly to new knowledge to be produced (for
523 example the kinetics of nitrogen mineralization in frozen leaves for rapeseed sowed very early).

524 **ii) Diagnoses of the diversity of situations, whether relating to practices, their impacts (“Double**
525 **density strip”, “Pollen beetles” and “Miscanthus” cases) or their contexts (“NNI trajectories”,**
526 **“Variety mixtures”, “Erosive runoff”, “Vegetables intercropping” and “Participatory breeding”**
527 **cases).**

528 In the “Pollen beetle” and “Miscanthus” cases, diagnoses surrounding the impacts of practices (for
529 example agronomic diagnosis, Doré et al., 1997) occurred at the start of the design process. In both cases,
530 they directly led to the production of knowledge about the agro-ecosystem (determinants of the presence
531 and non-regulation of pollen beetles; the plant density of miscanthus as a factor explaining yield). In the
532 “Double density strip” case, the analysis of the diversity of NUEs observed revealed the correlation between
533 NUE and wheat growth rate, and led to a new representation of the fate of nitrogen derived from fertilizer.

534 Diagnoses relating to the diversity of practice contexts (“NNI trajectories”, “Variety mixtures”,
535 “Erosive runoff”, “Vegetables intercropping” and “Participatory breeding” cases) can take several forms.
536 In the “NNI trajectory” case, a “diagnosis of uses” (Cerf et al., 2012) was carried out from the outset of the
537 design process, and revealed the problems surrounding the implementation of the Balance Sheet method,
538 thus helping to determine some desired characteristics of action (that is, managing fertilizer inputs without
539 setting a yield target) in a new formulation of the design target. In other cases, the diagnosis occurred later
540 on in the design process, for example during design workshops involving future users of the object being
541 designed, who highlighted new dimensions to take into account with regards to the practices at stakes (for
542 instance, in the “Variety mixtures” case, during the workshops, farmers and advisors based blending
543 strategies on variety traits different from those initially identified by the researchers; and in the “Vegetables
544 intercropping” case, the market gardeners participating in organized visits to the experimental station
545 stressed the importance of the type of trellising used for successful pest control). The functional aspects of
546 practices (in other words, why a technique is used and how its impact is assessed) were then addressed, and
547 the contribution of non-academic actors (advisors, groups of farmers) was often crucial to the reformulation
548 of the design targets.

549 **iii) Early experiments with initial prototypes of the object being designed (“Frozen leaves”,**
550 **“Erosive runoff” and “Vegetables intercropping” cases).** In the “Frozen leaves” case, the
551 implementation, within a network of farms, of crop management routes with very early sowing, resulting
552 in a high N uptake in autumn, highlighted the difficulty of envisaging spring fertilization, due to the fall of
553 N-rich leaves in winter. In the “Vegetables intercropping” case, the experiment showed that the uprooting

554 dates of short-cycle species could cause health problems to long-cycle species, due to the transfer of
555 parasites from the former to the latter. These experiments therefore served to test a prototype of the object
556 being designed, and shed light on dimensions not taken into account in an earlier representation of the agro-
557 ecosystems processes. Therefore these were not tests to validate “what works and what does not work”
558 (Thomke, 2003), but tests that offered an early and exploratory confrontation with the situations of actions
559 that might be taken into account in the continuing design process. We can see here the “*reflective*
560 *conversation with the materials of a design situation*” conceptualized by Schön and Wiggins (1992),
561 mentioned in the ‘Theoretical Framework’ section of this article: putting into action the object under design
562 enriches and even re-orientates the design process, as well as the associated knowledge generation.

563 These three types of drivers resulted from proactive approaches by the researchers involved in the case
564 studies. In most of the design approaches studied, the researchers applied research methods that allowed
565 the unexpected to emerge in the real-life situations of action. This unexpected often led to changes in the
566 representations of the processes of interest in the agro-ecosystem, as well as changes in the identification
567 of new knowledge needs. The diagnoses described above (for example agronomic diagnosis, the diagnosis
568 of uses, and experimentation in a large diversity of situations) played a decisive role in the emergence of
569 the unexpected, especially when they were intentionally managed to highlight and analyze the diversity of
570 situations and its perceptions by the farmers and advisors. As Louridas (1999) points out, “*Design is a*
571 *continual interplay between events and their handling by the designer; design is successful when it handles*
572 *contingent events well*”. These unexpected events, as well as dialogue between various actors around
573 prototypes (Cerf et al., 2012; McCown, 2001), therefore contributed to the production of scientific
574 knowledge. Thus, as Prost et al. (2018) have already evidenced, our results show that confronting prototypes
575 to the real-life situations of action is not an end for the design process (in other words, this does not just
576 serve to assess the outcome) but a step in the problematization process. For agricultural researchers, facing
577 the situations of action through a variety of practices can be a driving force in the evolution of their
578 representations of agro-ecosystems and of their knowledge needs, and therefore their representation of the
579 design process in which they are involved.

580
581 Our analysis of the production of scientific knowledge through design echoes debates on the orientation
582 and organization of agricultural research. In particular, the holistic and complex agroecology approach is
583 often argued to involve interdisciplinary research, combining, notably, ecology and agronomy (see for
584 example Hatt et al., 2016). We show that rather than being a necessity required from the outset,
585 interdisciplinarity can be built throughout the design process, in coherence with the evolution in the
586 representations of the ecosystemic processes of interest, and can thus sometimes be unpredictable. In fact,
587 during the design processes studied, the changes in the representations of ecosystemic processes mostly
588 caused the boundaries of the systems studied to be redrawn, and led to the production of knowledge on
589 objects given little attention in the researchers’ original disciplines: for instance, the major role of the plants
590 in nitrogen flux in the soil in the “Double density strip” case; and landscape characteristics including plot
591 practices in the “Pollen beetles” and “Erosive runoff” cases. Regarding the organization of research, this

592 on-going construction of interdisciplinarity calls for scientific project formats that allow for a degree of
593 agility to explore the links between design issues and new fields of knowledge, without these links having
594 been anticipated at the start of the project.

595 Numerous authors have also called for greater attention to be paid to local real-life situations and
596 contexts, from three main perspectives: (i) questioning the alignment between the knowledge produced, the
597 techniques implemented and specific contexts (Duru et al., 2015); (ii) emphasizing the value of hybridizing
598 scientific and local knowledge (Caron et al., 2014; Doré et al., 2011); and (iii) promoting the involvement
599 of a diversity of actors in problem formulation and experimentation (Cerf, 2011; Warner, 2008). Our
600 findings add a new dimension: this relationship to local real-life situations appears to be a driver of
601 evolution in crop scientists' representations of the ecosystemic processes they explore, and therefore,
602 indirectly, of the production of general knowledge. Thus, in research projects, knowledge production
603 guided by confrontation with real-life situations challenges the dominant approach to agricultural research
604 (Hatt et al., 2016), where funding is associated with a schedule of predetermined timeframes and
605 deliverables. The timeframe of research projects combining design and the generation of scientific
606 knowledge seems difficult to predict: as most cases show, knowledge can be produced far into the design
607 process. Moreover, the production of the unexpected, which appears to be frequent in our cases, disrupts
608 the upstream identification of deliverables (for example new fields of knowledge can be opened and
609 explored) and timeframes (a reorganization of experimental frameworks may take much longer than
610 envisaged at the start of the design) (Meynard et al., 2012; Prost et al., 2018).

611 5 Conclusion

612 We have shown that original scientific knowledge may arise from a design process. Across all our crop
613 science case studies, three types of knowledge were produced during the design process: knowledge on
614 biological and ecological processes within agro-ecosystems, on effects of management actions on agro-
615 ecosystems, and models to represent these processes. However, our cross-analysis of the case studies
616 yielded further insights into the specificities of the production of scientific knowledge through design
617 processes. In most cases, the knowledge produced was not predictable at the start of the design process: it
618 followed a change in the design target, resulting from the researchers' confrontation with a wide range of
619 real-life situations, or from the application of prototypes of the object under design in these situations. We
620 therefore do not support the linear approach of the relationship between scientific knowledge and
621 innovation exemplified by the Technology Readiness Levels scale.

622 A further contribution this study makes to agricultural systems research is the description of how
623 design-related methods lead to renewal of representations underlying the study of processes within agro-
624 ecosystems. There is no doubt that sound and relevant knowledge can be produced without engaging in
625 design processes. Nevertheless, we have shown that confronting an object under design with real-life
626 situations of action contributes to opening up opportunities for exploration of unexpected knowledge issues,
627 and stimulates the renewal of researchers' representations surrounding the processes under study. These
628 findings suggest that even researchers dealing with subjects seemingly removed from the action (for

629 example crop physiology) would stand to gain from engaging with actors in their diverse situations of
630 practice, so as not to miss unexpected but relevant problematization reorientations.

631 These insights provide a sound basis for further reflection on the organization of research. Our results
632 show that innovation is not only the valorization of existing knowledge, but may be a source of original
633 and peer-reviewed scientific knowledge. This raises questions about the organization of research
634 institutions that should promote both innovative design and original knowledge generation. Such an
635 organization should accept unpredictable timeframes, the unpredictable characteristics of knowledge
636 production, and the management of innovative design activities as drivers of knowledge production. This
637 form of organization of research institutions is yet to be invented.

638

639 6 Acknowledgements

640 This study was carried out as part of the Initiative for Design in Agrifood Systems (IDEAS,
641 <https://www.inrae.fr/ideas-agrifood>). We would like to thank the *Laboratoire d'Excellence Biodiversité*
642 *Agroécosystèmes Société Climat* (BASC) for its funding (INDISS Project), and all the agricultural
643 researchers and partners who participated in the studied research projects. We are grateful to the editor and
644 anonymous reviewer for comments that greatly helped improve this article, and to Nonta Libbrecht-Carey
645 for English language edition.

646 7 Compliance with Ethical Standards:

647 Funding: The study was funded by the *Laboratoire d'Excellence Biodiversité Agroécosystèmes Société*
648 *Climat* (BASC) (grant associated with the INDISS research project).

649 Conflict of interest: The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

650 8 References

- 651 Altieri, M.A., Toledo, V.M., 2005. Natural resource management among small-scale farmers in semi-arid
652 lands: Building on traditional knowledge and agroecology. *Ann. Arid Zone* 44, 365.
- 653 Bayazit, N., 2004. Investigating design: A review of forty years of design research. *Des. Issues* 20, 16–29.
- 654 Béguin, P., Dedieu, B., Sabourin, E., 2011. Le travail en agriculture: son organisation et ses valeurs face à
655 l'innovation. Harmattan.
- 656 Berthet, E., Barnaud, C., Girard, N., Labatut, J., Martin, G., 2015. How to foster agroecological
657 innovations? A comparison of participatory design methods. *J. Environ. Plan. Manag.* 1–22.
658 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09640568.2015.1009627>
- 659 Bonnardel, N., 2000. Towards understanding and supporting creativity in design: analogies in a constrained
660 cognitive environment. *Knowl.-Based Syst.* 13, 505–513.
- 661 Borg, J., Kiær, L.P., Lecarpentier, C., Goldringer, I., Gauffreteau, A., Saint-Jean, S., Barot, S., Enjalbert,
662 J., 2017. Unfolding the potential of wheat cultivar mixtures: A meta-analysis perspective and
663 identification of knowledge gaps. *Field Crops Res.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2017.09.006>
- 664 Bos, A.P., Koerkamp, P.W.G.G., Gosselink, J.M.J., Bokma, S., 2009. Reflexive interactive design and its
665 application in a project on sustainable dairy husbandry systems. *Outlook Agric.* 38, 137–145.
- 666 Caron, P., Bienabe, E., Hainzelin, E., 2014. Making transition towards ecological intensification of
667 agriculture a reality: the gaps in and the role of scientific knowledge. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.*
668 8, 44–52.

- 669 Cerdan, O., Souchère, V., Lecomte, V., Couturier, A., Le Bissonnais, Y., 2002. Incorporating soil surface
670 crusting processes in an expert-based runoff model: Sealing and Transfer by Runoff and Erosion
671 related to Agricultural Management. *CATENA* 46, 189–205. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0341-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0341-8162(01)00166-7)
672 [8162\(01\)00166-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0341-8162(01)00166-7)
- 673 Cerf, M., 2011. Is participatory research a scientific practice? *J. Rural Stud.* 4, 414–418.
674 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2011.10.004>
- 675 Cerf, M., Jeuffroy, M.-H., Prost, L., Meynard, J.-M., 2012. Participatory design of agricultural decision
676 support tools: taking account of the use situations. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* 32, 899–910.
- 677 Cross, N., 2007. From a design science to a design discipline: Understanding designerly ways of knowing
678 and thinking, in: *Design Research Now*. Springer, pp. 41–54.
- 679 Dejoux, J.F., Recous, S., Meynard, J.M., Trinsoutrot, I., Leterme, P., 2000. The fate of nitrogen from
680 winter-frozen rapeseed leaves: mineralization, fluxes to the environment and uptake by rapeseed
681 crop in spring. *Plant Soil* 218, 257–272. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014934924819>
- 682 Dogliotti, S., García, M.C., Peluffo, S., Dieste, J.P., Pedemonte, A.J., Bacigalupe, G.F., Scarlato, M.,
683 Alliaume, F., Alvarez, J., Chiappe, M., Rossing, W.A.H., 2014. Co-innovation of family farm
684 systems: A systems approach to sustainable agriculture. *Agric. Syst., Designing sustainable
685 agricultural production systems for a changing world: Methods and applications* 126, 76–86.
686 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2013.02.009>
- 687 Doré, T., Makowski, D., Malézieux, E., Munier-Jolain, N., Tchamitchian, M., Tiftonell, P., 2011. Facing
688 up to the paradigm of ecological intensification in agronomy: Revisiting methods, concepts and
689 knowledge. *Eur. J. Agron.* 34, 197–210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2011.02.006>
- 690 Dorst, K., 2008. Design research: a revolution-waiting-to-happen. *Des. Stud.* 29, 4–11.
- 691 Dorst, K., Cross, N., 2001. Creativity in the design process: co-evolution of problem–solution. *Des. Stud.*
692 22, 425–437.
- 693 Duru, M., 2013. Combining agroecology and management science to design field tools under high
694 agrosystem structural or process uncertainty: Lessons from two case studies of grassland
695 management. *Agric. Syst.* 114, 84–94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2012.09.002>
- 696 Duru, M., Therond, O., Martin, G., Martin-Clouaire, R., Magne, M.-A., Justes, E., Journet, E.-P., Aubertot,
697 J.-N., Savary, S., Bergez, J.-E., Sarthou, J.P., 2015. How to implement biodiversity-based
698 agriculture to enhance ecosystem services: a review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* 35, 1259–1281.
699 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-015-0306-1>
- 700 Eekels, J., Roozenburg, N.F.M., 1991. A methodological comparison of the structures of scientific research
701 and engineering design: their similarities and differences. *Des. Stud.* 12, 197–203.
702 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0142-694X\(91\)90031-Q](https://doi.org/10.1016/0142-694X(91)90031-Q)
- 703 Francis, C., Lieblein, G., Gliessman, S., Breland, T.A., Creamer, N., Harwood, R., Salomonsson, L.,
704 Helenius, J., Rickerl, D., Salvador, R., others, 2003. Agroecology: the ecology of food systems. *J.*
705 *Sustain. Agric.* 22, 99–118.
- 706 Glanville, R., 1999. Researching design and designing research. *Des. Issues* 15, 80–91.
- 707 Hatchuel, A., Weil, B., 2009. CK design theory: an advanced formulation. *Res. Eng. Des.* 19, 181.
- 708 Hatchuel, A., Weil, B., 2002. CK theory: Notions and applications of a unified design theory, in:
709 *Proceedings of the Herbert Simon International Conference on "Design Sciences"*, Lyon. p. 22.
- 710 Hatt, S., Artru, S., Brédart, D., Lassois, L., Francis, F., Haubruge, É., Garré, S., Stassart, P.M., Dufrêne,
711 M., Monty, A., 2016. Towards sustainable food systems: the concept of agroecology and how it
712 questions current research practices. A review. *Biotechnol. Agron. Société Environ. Biotechnol.*
713 *Agron. Soc. Environ.* 20, 215–224.
- 714 Hill, S.B., 2006. Redesign as deep industrial ecology: lessons from ecological agriculture and social
715 ecology. *Link. Ind. Ecol. Quest. Des.* 29–49.
- 716 Hill, S.B., MacRae, R.J., 1995. Conceptual framework for the transition from conventional to sustainable
717 agriculture. *J. Sustain. Agric.* 7, 81–87.
- 718 INRA, 2016. Document d'orientation INRA 2025.
- 719 Jeuffroy, M.-H., Bouchard, C., 1999. Intensity and duration of nitrogen deficiency on wheat grain number.
- 720 Joannon, A., Souchère, V., Martin, P., Papy, F., 2006. Reducing runoff by managing crop location at the
721 catchment level, considering agronomic constraints at farm level. *Land Degrad. Dev.* 17, 467–478.
722 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.714>
- 723 Le Gal, P.-Y., Dugué, P., Faure, G., Novak, S., 2011. How does research address the design of innovative
724 agricultural production systems at the farm level? A review. *Agric. Syst.* 104, 714–728.
725 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2011.07.007>

- 726 Limaux, F., Recous, S., Meynard, J.-M., Guckert, A., 1999. Relationship between rate of crop growth at
727 date of fertiliser N application and fate of fertiliser N applied to winter wheat. *Plant Soil* 214, 49–
728 59. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1004629511235>
- 729 Louridas, P., 1999. Design as bricolage: anthropology meets design thinking. *Des. Stud.* 20, 517–535.
- 730 Mankins, J.C., 1995. Technology readiness levels. White Pap. April 6.
- 731 Matt, M., Gaunand, A., Joly, P.-B., Colinet, L., 2017. Opening the black box of impact – Ideal-type impact
732 pathways in a public agricultural research organization. *Res. Policy* 46, 207–218.
733 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2016.09.016>
- 734 McCown, R.L., 2001. Learning to bridge the gap between science-based decision support and the practice
735 of farming: evolution in paradigms of model-based research and intervention from design to
736 dialogue. *Crop Pasture Sci.* 52, 549–572.
- 737 Meynard, J.M., Dedieu, Benoit, Bos, A.P. (Bram), 2012. Re-design and co-design of farming systems. An
738 overview of methods and practices, in: Darnhofer, I., Gibbon, D., Dedieu, Benoît (Eds.), *Farming
739 Systems Research into the 21st Century: The New Dynamic*. Springer Netherlands, pp. 405–429.
- 740 Meynard, J.-M., Justes, E., Machet, J.M., Recous, S., 1997. Fertilisation azotée des cultures annuelles de
741 plein champ., in: Lemaire, G. & Nicolardot, B. *Maîtrise de l'azote Dans Les Agrosystèmes*.
742 Editions Quae, Paris, pp. 183–189.
- 743 Owen, C.L., 1998. Design research: Building the knowledge base. *Des. Stud.* 19, 9–20.
- 744 Papalambros, P.Y., 2015. Design Science: Why, What and How. *Des. Sci.* 1.
745 <https://doi.org/10.1017/dsj.2015.1>
- 746 Prost, L., Reau, R., Paravano, L., Cerf, M., Jeuffroy, M.-H., 2018. Designing agricultural systems from
747 invention to implementation: the contribution of agronomy. Lessons from a case study. *Agric. Syst.*
748 164, 122–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agry.2018.04.009>
- 749 Rémy, J.C., Hébert, J., 1977. Le devenir des engrais dans le sol, *CR Acad. Agric Fr* 63, 700–710.
- 750 Romera, A.J., Bos, A.P., Neal, M., Eastwood, C.R., Chapman, D., McWilliam, W., Royds, D., O'Connor,
751 C., Brookes, R., Connolly, J., Hall, P., Clinton, P.W., 2020. Designing future dairy systems for
752 New Zealand using reflexive interactive design. *Agric. Syst.* 181, 102818.
753 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agry.2020.102818>
- 754 Roozenburg, N.F., 1993. On the pattern of reasoning in innovative design. *Des. Stud.* 14, 4–18.
- 755 Rusch, A., Valantin-Morison, M., Sarthou, J.-P., Roger-Estrade, J., 2013. Effect of crop management and
756 landscape context on insect pest populations and crop damage. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 166, 118–
757 125.
- 758 Salembier, C., Lefevre, A., Lesur-Dumoulin, C., Perrin, B., Meynard, J.M., 2015. Participatory design of
759 innovative intercropping systems in protected market gardening production, in: *Innovation in
760 Integrated & Organic Horticulture, INNOHORT 2015*. p. np.
- 761 Schon, D.A., Wiggins, G., 1992. Kinds of seeing and their functions in designing. *Des. Stud.* 13, 135–156.
762 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0142-694X\(92\)90268-F](https://doi.org/10.1016/0142-694X(92)90268-F)
- 763 Simon, H.A., 1969. *The sciences of the artificial*. Camb. MA.
- 764 Souchère, V., Le Bissonnais, Y., Cerdan, O., Couturier, A., 2002. Soil erosion patterns at catchment scale:
765 coupling of interrill and ephemeral gully erosion modules in the STREAM model.
- 766 Stake, R.E., 1994. Case Study: Composition and Performance. *Bull. Counc. Res. Music Educ.* 31–44.
- 767 Thomke, S.H., 2003. *Experimentation Matters: Unlocking the Potential of New Technologies for
768 Innovation*. Harvard Business Press.
- 769 Tiftonell, P., 2014. Ecological intensification of agriculture—sustainable by nature. *Curr. Opin. Environ.
770 Sustain.* 8, 53–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2014.08.006>
- 771 Toffolini, Q., Jeuffroy, M.-H., Mischler, P., Pernel, J., Prost, L., 2017. Farmers' use of fundamental
772 knowledge to re-design their cropping systems: situated contextualisation processes. *NJAS -
773 Wagening. J. Life Sci.* 80, 37–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.njas.2016.11.004>
- 774 Tomich, T.P., Brodt, S., Ferris, H., Galt, R., Horwath, W.R., Kebreab, E., Leveau, J.H., Liptzin, D., Lubell,
775 M., Merel, P., others, 2011. Agroecology: a review from a global-change perspective.
- 776 Vasseur, C., Joannon, A., Aviron, S., Burel, F., Meynard, J.-M., Baudry, J., 2013. The cropping systems
777 mosaic: How does the hidden heterogeneity of agricultural landscapes drive arthropod populations?
778 *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 166, 3–14.
- 779 Vial, S., 2015. *Le design*, PUF. ed, Que sais-je? Paris.
- 780 Wageningen University of Research, 2016. Strategic Plan 2015-2018.

- 781 Warner, K.D., 2008. Agroecology as Participatory Science Emerging Alternatives to Technology Transfer
782 Extension Practice. *Sci. Technol. Hum. Values* 33, 754–777.
783 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243907309851>
- 784 Wezel, A., Casagrande, M., Celette, F., Vian, J.-F., Ferrer, A., Peigné, J., 2014. Agroecological practices
785 for sustainable agriculture. A review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* 34, 1–20.
786 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-013-0180-7>
787

Case studies (short names)	Case study selection and characterization criteria				
	Scientific publications (selection criterion)	Initial design target (selection criterion)	Final outcome of the design process (selection criterion)	Duration	Scale
1 Double density strip	Limaux et al. 1999, <i>Plant and Soil</i> , 214 :49-59. Limaux et al. 2001, <i>Persp. Agri.</i> ,	<i>Action targeted by the design:</i> to fertilize wheat (rate and timing of nitrogen applications). <i>Design target:</i> a calculation method of N fertilization rate that does not require any measurement of the inorganic nitrogen in soil after winter	A decision support tool to determine the date of the first nitrogen application based on the yellowing of a double density strip (DDS). A N fertilization strategy that maximizes Nitrogen Use Efficiency and uses the DDS indicator to decide on the first N application.	10 years (1990 – 2000)	Plot
2 NNI trajectories	Ravier et al. 2016, <i>NJAS</i> , 79 :31-40. Ravier et al. 2017, <i>EJA</i> , 89 :16-24. Ravier et al, 2018, <i>Nutrient cycling, in Agroecosystems</i> , 110 : 117-134.	<i>Action targeted by the design:</i> to fertilize wheat (rate and timing of nitrogen applications). <i>Design target:</i> a method for managing N fertilization that replaces the Balance Sheet method while reducing application rates and maximizing NUE.	Nitrogen fertilization rules based on real-time monitoring of the crop throughout the cycle, maximizing the use of nitrogen fertilizer and accepting deficiencies that are not detrimental to yield.	5 years (2012 – 2017)	Plot
3 Frozen leaves	Dejoux et al. 2000, <i>Plant & Soil</i> , 218 :257-272. Dejoux et al. 2003, <i>Agronomie</i> , 23 :725-736.	<i>Action targeted by the design:</i> to manage rapeseed cropping practices (including fertilization) and the consistency between them. <i>Design target:</i> A low-input rapeseed management route that improves environmental performance while maintaining economic performance.	A low-input rapeseed management route based on very early sowing, which limits the use of pesticides and N leaching. A method to calculate spring N fertilization on rapeseed (usable for any sowing date), accounting for frozen leaves.	4 years (1996 – 1999)	Plot
4 Wheat variety mixtures	Borg et al. 2017, <i>Field Crop Research</i> , 221: 298-313. Vidal et al. 2017, <i>Plos One</i> , 12 : e0187788	<i>Action targeted by the design:</i> to select wheat varieties to be grown together, in order to reduce crop sensitivity to biotic and abiotic stresses (N and water). <i>Design target:</i> Rules for building variety mixtures that have an advantage over a pure variety on farms.	Blending rules for stabilizing production and simplifying crop management, adapted to the characteristics of the agricultural situation. Locally designed variety mixtures. A multi-criteria assessment tool for variety mixtures.	4 years + (2014 – in progress)	Plot
5 Pollen beetles	Valantin-Morison & Meynard 2008, <i>Agron.Sust.Dev</i> , 28:527-539. Rusch et al 2011, <i>Agr. For. Ent.</i> , 14:37-47. Rusch et al. 2013, <i>AEE</i> , 166:118-125. Vinatier et al. 2012, <i>Landscape Ecology</i> , 27 :1421-1433.	<i>Action targeted by the design:</i> to manage rapeseed cropping practices and consistency between them, at plot and landscape level. <i>Design target:</i> improved low-input rapeseed management routes.	A landscape indicator to determine the probability of exceeding a pollen beetle's abundance threshold. Landscape management rules to favor natural enemies and biological control of pollen beetles.	16 years + (2002 – in progress)	Landscape
6 Miscanthus	Lesur et al. 2014, <i>Global Change Biology Bioenergy</i> , 6 :439-449 Lesur et al. 2013, <i>FCR</i> , 149 :252-260 Lesur-Dumoulin et al. 2015, <i>GCBB</i> , 8 :122-135.	<i>Action targeted by the design:</i> to choose the crop sequences and management that increase the cropping system's multi-performance. <i>Design target:</i> environmentally efficient cropping systems including energy crops in a local context.	Cropping systems that include miscanthus and reduce GHG emissions by 75% compared to the territory's dominant cropping system (Rapeseed – Wheat – Barley rotation).	7 years (2009 – 2016)	Farm and plot
7 Erosive runoff	Souchère et al. 1998, <i>J. of Hydrology</i> , 206 : 256-267. Cerdan et al. 2002, <i>Catena</i> , 46 :189-205. Joannon et al. 2005, <i>AEE</i> , 111 :13-20. Joannon et al. 2006, <i>LDD</i> , 17 :467-478.	<i>Action targeted by the design:</i> to choose crop rotation, tillage and management practices that limit erosive runoff. <i>Design target:</i> cropping systems and their spatial organization to limit erosive runoff in silty watersheds.	Guidelines to avoid crop spatial arrangement and management practices that generate erosive runoff at watershed level. An indicator linking a quantity of water – runoff – to a quantity of sediment – erosion.	18 years (1988 – 2006)	Watershed
8 Vegetable intercropping	Salembier et al. 2015, INNOHORT Lefèbvre et al. 2015, FSD symposium	<i>Action targeted by the design:</i> to choose the species to associate, their management, and their arrangement in space. <i>Design target:</i> a market gardening organic cropping system catering to short value chains, which makes it possible to manage crop health using natural regulations.	An organic vegetable cropping system that promotes natural regulations, catering to short circuits. Management and blending rules for a intercropping, according to agronomic and commercial criteria.	6 years (2012 – in progress)	Plot
9 Participatory wheat breeding	Goldringer 2001, <i>Gen. Select. Evol.</i> Bonneuil et al. 2006, <i>Cour.env. INRA</i> , 30 : 29-51. Bonneuil et al 2012, <i>Ecol. Ind</i> , 23 :280-289 Thomas et al. 2011, <i>Gen. Res. Crop Evo.</i> , 58:321-338.	<i>Action targeted by the design:</i> to preserve and manage cultivated wheat genetic diversity through mass selection and seed exchanges. <i>Design target:</i> A participatory breeding scheme (dynamic management of genetic diversity) for wheat.	An original participatory selection approach (experimental multi-local system and statistical analysis method). Population varieties adapted to growing environments. An indicator of cultivated genetic diversity.	15 years + (2003 – in progress)	Breeding landscape

Table 1: Description of the case studies and selection criteria: scientific publications, action targeted by the design and design target, final outcome of the design process, duration and main scale of the project.

	Cases	Three types of knowledge generated: i) <i>Agro-ecosystem processes</i> ii) <i>Effect of actions</i> iii) <i>Systemic modeling to steer the action</i>	Dominant representations in the scientific field at the time of knowledge production	Originality of the representations on which knowledge is based	
				New objects of interest and new processes within the agro-ecosystem	New forms of farmer practices and indicators for action
1	Double Density Strip	Relationship between NUE and the crop growth rate (i). NUE variations explained by gaseous losses (i). Modeling of the evolution of NUE (iii).	Flow and process modeling of the N cycle in soil, mainly influenced by soil conditions.	The plant as a major factor in the variation of N gaseous losses.	The evolution of NUE during the crop cycle as a reference to set the date of the first fertilizer application.
2	NNI trajectories	Minimum NNI trajectory that maintains wheat yield and quality (and increases NUE) (i). A fertilizer rate calculation method based on the viability theory (iii).	Modeling N cycle in soil to improve the estimation and prediction of Balance Sheet terms. Modeling the effect of temporary deficiencies on yield based on a static indicator, combining the intensity and duration of the deficiencies.		A trajectory of nitrogen nutrition status to decide on nitrogen input (tolerating deficiencies but avoiding yield losses).
3	Frozen leaves	Quantity of N absorbed by rapeseed in autumn under non-limiting conditions (i). Fate of the N from frozen leaves: the N from frozen leaves is mineralized quickly enough for the crop to absorb 50% of the nitrogen (iii).	Modeling the mineralization of the residues of the previous crop.	The frozen leaves as providers of mineral N to the crop in spring.	
4	Wheat variety mixtures	Quantification of mean overyielding. Effect of height diversity across susceptible and resistant varieties on the spread of airborne diseases (i). Influence of cultural factors and varietal characteristics on overyielding (ii). Change in the evaluation criteria for mixtures, integrating multiple objectives including the simplification of management (ii).	Epidemiology-ecophysiology: spread of diseases in variety mixtures. Evaluation of the over-yielding effect of mixtures, without taking into account the production context and the farmers' objectives.	The multi-varietal stand in diverse farming conditions, with a wide range of heights, and analyzed across diverse farmers' evaluation criteria.	
5	Pollen beetles	The limiting factors of rapeseed in low-inputs systems: weeds, nitrogen, and pests including pollen beetles. Distance of response of pollen beetles and auxiliaries to landscape. Distances of dispersion (i). The environment of the plot influences the presence and abundance of pollen beetles more than cultivation practices do (ii).	Study of species abundance and richness according to habitat qualities in landscape ecology (mosaics of cropping systems not taken into account). Study of the effects of pest damage at plot level.	The natural and semi-natural elements of the landscape and the cropping system mosaic as part of the same landscape.	
6	Miscanthus	Variability of Nitrate losses under a young miscanthus crop (i). Stem density during the crop establishment explains the variability in miscanthus yields observed within a network of agricultural plots (ii). Modeling of the temporal evolution of miscanthus yields (iii).	Performance of miscanthus evaluated on the basis of experimental data and models unrelated to the cropping systems in which it is grown.	The on-farm miscanthus crop in relation to the diversity of farmers' cropping systems.	
7	Erosive runoff	Effect of the arrangement of surface crop patterns, related to the direction of tillage, dead furrows, dirt tracks, ditches, and the quantity and direction of runoff flow (ii). A model of the impact of the spatial arrangement of crops and management practices on runoff and erosion (iii).	Deterministic modeling of biophysical processes that influence surface conditions, not taking into account temporary soil structures resulting from tillage.	The temporary soil condition induced by the soil tillage direction, dead furrows, dirt tracks, ditches.	The runoff dynamics according to the evolution of soil surface conditions and meteorological events.
8	Vegetable intercropping	Effects of the composition, arrangement and management of intercrops on different pests (ii); interactions between technical options (for instance the spatial arrangement determines possible irrigation methods) (ii).	Intercrop usually described in terms of the species involved and their spatial arrangement. Pests and diseases within the intercrop mainly linked to the sensitivity of each species.	The intercrop characterization also includes other techniques (trellising, uprooting, etc.) influencing plant health.	The dynamics of insect populations' evolution and movement, informed by the traits of the intercropped species and their management.
9	Participatory wheat breeding	Evolution (conservation) of cultivated genetic diversity through breeding and seed exchanges (ii).	Varietal breeding in networks of controlled trials in experimental stations, and non-limiting conditions.	From peasant seeds exchanged and selected to several populations selected within a network of farms.	

Table 2: Knowledge generated during the design processes, and forms of originality of the representations on which they are based.




Figure 1: An example of the co-evolution of design target formulations, knowledge needs and representations of processes of interest in the agro-ecosystems at stake. Case 5: “Pollen beetles”.




Figure 2: Comparison of the co-evolutions between design targets, knowledge production, and representations of processes of interest in the agro-ecosystems at stake (of the key in Figure 1 also applies here).