

# Future Perspective in Organic Farming Fertilization: Management and Product

José David Flores-Félix<sup>1,2</sup>, Esther Menéndez<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Raúl Rivas<sup>1,2,3</sup> and Ma de la Encarnación Velázquez<sup>1,2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Microbiology and Genetics, University of Salamanca, Salamanca, Spain,*

<sup>2</sup>*Spanish-Portuguese Institute for Agricultural Research (CIALE), University of Salamanca, Spain,*

<sup>3</sup>*“Interacción Planta-Microorganismo” Associated Unit, USAL-CSIC (IRNASA), Salamanca, Spain*

## 9.1 INTRODUCTION

The concept of “organic farming” appeared during the second green revolution in the mid-20th century as an alternative to the prevailing conventional agriculture systems, in order to increase crop production for feeding a continuously growing world population (Srivastava et al., 2016). So-called conventional farming consists mainly of the application of two basic principles: the application of synthetic pesticides for the elimination of pests or diseases that can compromise, damage, or reduce crop production and the use of synthetic chemical fertilizers to enhance crop yields (Seufert et al., 2009). These principles are in agreement with those of organic farming; however, organic farming is restricted to the application of the “natural version” of pesticides and fertilizers (Stolze and Lampkin, 2009). The key point is the reduction of external threats that can compromise crop production, to obtain higher yields (Bellon et al., 2014).

The use of chemical fertilizers lead to the rapid industrialization of their synthesis processes and reduced the dependence on external factors to produce them (i.e., manure production). Fertilizers can be applied depending on the nutritional deficiencies of the plant, allowing the farmer to take direct actions to solve the problem. However, the use of those fertilizers and the

---

\* Current address: Institute of Mediterranean Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (ICAAM)-University of Evora apartment 94, 7002-554 Évora, Portugal.

agriculture practice by if self generate a rapid and constant loss of soil nutrients and biodiversity (Bellon and Penvern, 2014). Thus, a reduction in the use of chemical fertilizers will mitigate this loss with the aid of external contributions or the integration with other activities, such as livestock and their nutrient stocks recycling (Reganold and Wachter, 2016).

The application of synthetic fertilizers can be considered an advantage at first, however, it has generated several environmental impacts in many agricultural areas of the planet (Van Stappen et al., 2015). The uncontrolled use of these fertilizers, their application in suboptimal or negative conditions, as well as the losses of nutrients by runoff, leaching, or volatilization have caused public health problems and environmental deterioration (Jeločnik et al., 2015).

In this sense, organic farming aims to maintain rationalized production levels, friendly with the ecosystem where it is farmed, acting according to the inherent limits of the region (Van Stappen et al., 2015). Moreover, organic farming seeks the diversification of nutrient inputs as long as they do not generate an associated environmental problem and take advantage of the outputs generated in other farming systems, such as wastes or products derived from livestock, crop residues, or sewage sludges (Wezel et al., 2014).

The concept of “organic farming” is based on a holistic view of farming systems, which has each part completely integrated in the system, such as soil and its microbiota, climatic conditions, plants, and animals (Acs et al., 2005). Soil microbiota is also considered in the global analysis of agricultural systems, suggesting that a soil with the correct microbiota favors the development of healthier plants. Thus, plants are capable of efficiently capturing nutrients and dealing with different diseases. In this sense, plant growth-promoting bacteria (PGPB) are capable of interacting positively with plants, promoting their development directly and indirectly (Garcia-Fraile et al., 2015; Grobelak et al., 2015; Menéndez et al., 2016). Amongst these PGPB, the genus *Rhizobium* and related genera, which are commonly known as legume symbionts, are the best examples of beneficial microorganisms contained in soils (Bhattacharjee and Dey, 2014).

Moreover, this holistic view determines that the application of nutrient inputs must be conditioned to their geographical availability, making cultural practices the most cost-effective action (Provost and Pedneault, 2015). Farmers need to maximize their crops yields through specific actions, such as crop rotations and the application of nonsynthetic fertilizers, seeking the integration and synergy of different actions, such as cultural techniques and crop diversification (Benoit et al., 2016; Mu et al., 2016; Viaene et al., 2016).

Every action produces different effects on the organic farming system; for example, the application of intercropping, which is the mixed cultivation of different crops, is one of the agricultural practices matching perfectly with organic farming philosophy (Mao et al., 2015). In many cases, intercropping practices involve the cultivation of cereals in a row with leguminous plants,

due to the biological nitrogen fixation occurring in their root nodules (Hauggaard-Nielsen et al., 2009; Ngwira et al., 2012; Scalise et al., 2015). Legumes act as providers of nitrogen and make available other essential nutrients, due to the microbiota associated with their nodules and roots, which are able to solubilize phosphates and potassium and to mobilize other nutrients as well as produce phytohormones in order to enhance plant development (Chapagain and Riseman, 2014; Latati et al., 2016). Moreover, through indirect mechanisms, the microbiota associated with leguminous plants might play a role as biocontrollers in order to prevent or reduce plant diseases (Bhardwaj et al., 2014). Apart from intercropping, there are many agricultural and/or management practices. Thus, in this chapter, we will analyze each of the techniques used to improve the fertility of the agronomic systems in conditions of organic farming. Additionally, we will make a distinction between what are considered management practices and the application of organic or biological inputs employed to increase the fertility of fields in organic farming.

## 9.2 MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

To achieve a well-balanced agricultural system, the application of the best possible management practices is absolutely necessary. In the case of organic farming, these management practices have focused on the maintenance of the available pools of nutrients, and moreover they should explore new ways to obtain more nutrients in agricultural fields (Gomiero et al., 2011).

### 9.2.1 Conservation Tillage

The use of tillage in agriculture was one of the first techniques implemented by humans and generated many benefits in terms of weed control and soil aeration, making nutrients assimilable or mixing depths of soils, which were not explored by plant roots (Drakopoulos et al., 2016). However, tillage was one of the practices that most actively contributes to the loss of edaphic material, due to surface exposure of unconfined material that can be washed away by runoff or wind action (Crittenden et al., 2015).

Conservational tillage is based on the minimal disruption of the soil composition structure and biodiversity, reducing soil degradation and also water contamination (Holland, 2004). Ancient civilizations, such as Egyptians and Incas, also used this kind of practice, inserting seeds directly on the soil (Derpsch, 1998).

There are many studies analyzing the outcomes of this kind of practice (Karlen et al., 2013; Martínez et al., 2013; Nascente et al., 2013; Garcia-Franco et al., 2015); however, some of were of short duration and did not show the full reality (Derpsch et al., 2014). The implementation of agricultural practices with minimum tillage is a difficult task, due to the

problems of obtaining correct homogenization and integration of external nutrients to the environment, such as the necessity for inverting and mixing horizons, which is not in agreement with the restrictive point of view of conservational tillage (minimum actions and impact on the fields) (Säle et al., 2015).

The main potential positive effect on field fertility is the increase in the percentage of organic carbon available in the soil, which in turn affects the creation of humic–fulvic complexes that act by retaining the ions of the different nutrients (Soane et al., 2012; Zikeli et al., 2013). Soils with high concentrations of organic carbon influence positively the microbial activity and its diversity (Raphael et al., 2016). These parameters are directly related to crop production (Sun et al., 2016).

The application of conservational tillage is extremely interesting for tropical agricultural systems, due to the positive influence on the content of organic carbon in the soils. The climatic conditions, high temperatures, and precipitation rates, tend to accelerate the mineralization process of organic matter in agricultural soils, which is also favored by tillage, helping the development of aerobic microorganisms and causing the degradation of organic matter of the upper horizon into CO<sub>2</sub> (Chivenge et al., 2007; Lienhard et al., 2013; Raphael et al., 2016).

Nontillage systems tend to be deficient in K and P, due to their “extraction” along with crops. Most studies focus on how the different practices have an influence on these nutrients (Gadermaier et al., 2011; Rosolem and Calonego, 2013). Their loss can be partially compensated for by crop rotation, but it is often necessary to make external amendments (Rosolem and Calonego, 2013).

As a conservation practice, the main effects are reflected in the populations where the densities and their biological activities are affected (Mathew et al., 2012), being increased by the bacterial and fungal biomass in direct relation to the increase in organic carbon (Lienhard et al., 2013). This diversity and density decreases as depth increases, unlike in conventional tillage soils (Huang et al., 2013).

Nontillage systems are associated with the absence of cropping practices that break or produce inversions in surface horizons, thus, direct sowing is usually carried out (Lienhard et al., 2013; Nascente et al., 2013). In this type of system, the greatest problem is associated with the correct fertilization, since the use of fertilizers in solid form is difficult without mechanical incorporation to substrates. In some cases, occasional tillage is recommended to reduce the undesirable effects of loss of productivity, which, depending on the soil, may not affect the microbiota (Rincon-florez et al., 2016).

A very conservative cultural practice, but not as restrictive as the absence of tillage, is so-called minimum tillage, which only disturbs the first few centimeters of soil (not more than 20 cm), keeping the soil structure closer to natural conditions and allowing the application of both solid and liquid

residues, thus, the farmer might incorporate external nutrients more easily (Debiase et al., 2016).

### 9.2.2 Crop Rotation

This is one of the oldest techniques used in agriculture, dating back to the pre-Roman era in Europe, although it was this civilization that developed a forceful technique using the “food-feed-fallow” system. This system involves the division of cultivable land into three equal parts, one of which cultivated human-food vegetables, another with crops intended for animal feed and, finally, another part left for a year as pasture for cattle in order to regain fertility. This system is continuously reinitiated, rotating the three parts for annually (White, 1970).

There are old treaties about this practices dating back to Roman times, showing how to use crops in these rotational systems, as well as their contributions to soil fertility. In this sense, the Roman agronomist Columela (54 BC) showed the utility of the leguminous plants *Vicia* and *Lupinus* for the maintenance of soil fertility. Since the mid-19th century, scientific knowledge has been applied to agriculture, showing how different crops have different nutritional requirements. Moreover, it has been shown that the alternation of crops on the same land has a positive impact on land fertility, producing selective extraction or helping to mobilize some nutrients (Liebig and Playfair, 1847).

The concept of crop rotation defines all temporary succession of crops in the same field. This succession has to be done considering the environmental characteristics, such as climate and substrate, but also the agronomic requirements of crops (Brankatschk and Finkbeiner, 2015).

There are models that aim to automatically create crop rotations in an integrated way with regional conditions (Schönhart et al., 2011); however, these models do not usually take fertility factors directly into account because they are based on observations and measurements made under a conventional agriculture point of view (Dury et al., 2012). Only some of these models consider the inclusion of legumes in these systems as a positive factor with respect to nitrogen fixation, which is essential for crop rotations (Dogliotti et al., 2003).

Crop rotations were classified into different categories depending on the length and the rotation order (Castellazzi et al., 2008). There are four variants: (1) fixed duration and fixed rotation; (2) fixed duration and flexible rotation; (3) flexible duration and fixed rotation; and (4) flexible duration and flexible rotation. In those variants, crops with different nutritional requirements, root systems, and allelopathic qualities should be alternated (Hilton et al., 2013).

This action modifies the soil microbiota mainly due to changes in carbon concentrations, since it tends to improve fertility in crop rotations (Ferrari

et al., 2015). Although soil organic stability is also improved, soil components exhibit less variation and greater resilience (Venter et al., 2015). Moreover, this management practice is related to an increase in soil phosphatase activity, which influences the concentration of phosphorus available to plants (Jahan et al., 2016).

One of the most commonly used crop rotations is the maize/soybean association (Riedell et al., 2009; Karlen et al., 2013; Souza et al., 2013; Tomer and Liebman, 2014; Sindelar et al. 2015), although, this legume has also been combined with other monocotyledonous crops, such as wheat (Riedell et al., 2009; Souza et al., 2013), oat (Merlin et al., 2013), or rice (Hokazono and Hayashi, 2015). However, the use of soybean presents two disadvantages: Soybean is a summer crop and the biological nitrogen fixation taking part in its nodules is subjected to the presence of endosymbionts. Those endosymbionts do not exist naturally in Europe or America, thus this crop is usually replaced with *Pisum*, *Trifolium*, *Vicia*, or *Lupinus* (Espinoza et al., 2012; N'Dayegamiye et al., 2015; Pandiaraj et al., 2015), these two last legumes being those that give the best results (Angus et al., 2015). Multiannual legume crops such as alfalfa are also used, although in this case it is important to implement long rotations of over 8 years, being the nitrogen supply to soil is very significant (Triberti et al., 2016).

The so-called double-up legume rotation is also used to improve soil fertility; this rotation is based on cultivate leguminous crops in two successive years and later, concatenated with an exigent crop, such as maize (Smith et al., 2016).

Within nonleguminous crops used in rotations, the most attractive for farmers are those that develop pivotal and powerful root systems, such as rapeseed or sorghum (Hilton et al., 2013; Rosolem and Calonego, 2013). These crops are also useful for the acquisition of other nutrients because their root systems allow nutrient uptake from lower levels and mobilize them to agricultural horizons (Götze et al., 2016), as well as breaking of the consolidation structures in the soil, which allows for better distribution of the crop roots (Kumar et al., 2014).

Many studies focus on the implications of crop rotations in the nitrogen soil stock; however, other elements that should be as important as nitrogen, such as phosphorus and potassium, usually remain unnoticed. Nonleguminous crops play an important role due to differences in root systems with leguminous crops (Arroyo-Garcia et al., 2013). Another crop that might be of interest is ruzzi grass (*Brachiaria ruziziensis*), which facilitates an increase in the concentration of labile phosphorus in the soil (Merlin et al., 2013; Almeida and Rosolem, 2016). However, the main tendency is not the inclusion of other kinds of crops, it is to include these nutrients through amendments of different types (Cavigelli et al., 2013; Maltais-Landry et al., 2016).

Another rotation employed in organic farming, which can increase yields is canola with wheat or potato. This is applied in conventional agriculture or organic farming with good results in temperate climates. The results are related to high root system development and biofumigation effects (Bernard et al., 2014; Angus et al., 2015; Turinek et al., 2016).

Crop residues play an important role in the supply of micronutrients. Mobilization of essential nutrients is carried out through the action of previous crops, and they are stored temporally associated to organic matter. This affects positively the concentration in the soil and its availability, although the nutrient losses usually have to be compensated with external inputs (Jahan et al., 2016).

### 9.2.3 Cover Crops

The use of different crops, whose main objective is not production but maintenance of the land surface covered, is a concept that began to be considered from the beginning of the 20th century. Traditional agriculture has always eliminated other plants in order to maximize the use of resources by the crop of interest, leading to a massive use of herbicides. Therefore, we must first define the concept of cover crops to differentiate it from crop rotation systems. This is a short-term rotation that happens when the principal crop is not sowed (Robacer et al., 2016).

The main purpose of cover crops is the prevention of the loss of edaphic resources by erosion. These crops reduce the kinetic energy of water or wind, decreasing the aggression that they cause on the agricultural systems (Reeves, 1994). In this sense, it is possible to prevent erosion, and also reduce losses of soluble nutrients by runoff (Klodd et al., 2016).

The application of cover crops is considered by some relevant institutions, such as the USDA in its National Organic Program (USDA, 2010), which provides the actions, recommendations, and bases, highlighting the importance and determination that this kind of practice might have in organic farming. The document gathers evidence on the benefits of cover crops, such as elimination of weeds, soil compaction, or erosion reduction, and it also exposes possible contributions to mineral and organic content and, by extension, to crop nutrition (Scholberg et al., 2010).

In terms of soil fertility, the most notable advantages of the use of cover crops is the reduction in nitrogen losses (Novara et al., 2013), as well as the stabilization and recycling of other nutrients such as phosphorus, potassium, and magnesium, ensuring their permanence in the upper horizon of the soil for a longer time (Rosolem and Calonego, 2013). In addition, crops with pivotal or highly developed root systems are often used in order to reach deeper horizons, being beneficial for the transportation of nutrients from deep to superficial horizons and providing available nutrients for crops with superficial root systems like wheat (Pedraza et al., 2015). For this reason, some

species of the genus *Brassica* are widely used; their pivotal root systems explore deeper into the horizon, making available soil nutrients to other crops and reducing soil compaction (Maltais-Landry et al., 2016). Cover crops can be divided according to their periodicity into winter, summer, or annual crops (Snapp et al., 2005), the latter being applicable only to multi-annual and mainly woody crops. Summer cover crops are usually rapidly growing legumes, such as soybeans, which incorporate nitrogen to other crops or cereals (Raphael et al., 2016). In this case sorghum sudan grass is also widely used because of its extremely broad root system, which is capable of exploring a large volume of substrate per plant. This crop also shows several adaptations to environments with high temperatures, offering remarkable productivity. In this respect, the species used must be resistant to drought and heat, so that the cited sorghum sudan grass, and legumes such as soybean or cowpea are used in hot areas (Blanco-Canqui et al., 2012).

The second option is the use of winter cover crops. This option is applied to crops with spring and summer cycles, such as soybean, corn, peanut, or cotton. In addition, during the stage where the cover crop is active, there are often times of great rainfall that can trigger the loss of nutrients due to leaching and erosion (Lourenzi et al., 2015). A great solution to this problem is winter cover crops, like cereals or legumes, alone or in combination (Campiglia et al., 2014). In this regard, sowing legumes must be done carefully to avoid frost during the time of seed emergence. In this way, a double dividend is obtained on the nutrient pools, reducing the loss of nutrients and increasing it by means of the contribution of nitrogen carried by the legumes. The most commonly employed species from the genus *Vicia* include *V. villosa* (Campiglia et al., 2014; Pedraza et al., 2015) and *V. sativa* (Duval et al., 2016; Gabriel et al., 2016). Some species like *Avena sativa* (Duval et al., 2016), *Triticum aestivum* (Balota et al., 2014), or *Secale cereale* (Higashi et al., 2014) are widely employed due to this frozen resistance.

Cover crops might also be applied to woody crops, such as orchards or vineyards, recycling nutrients through part of the cover crop biomass (Novara et al., 2013). The use of well-adapted and rustic legumes can improve the concentration of N, P, and K in these soils by up to 30% (Gómez-Muñoz et al., 2014). Nevertheless, a correct analysis of the water crop is needed, as it can produce reductions in production due to the high demand on water (Klodd et al., 2016). Therefore, the inclusion of fast-growing legumes in monoculture or mixed with a cereal is important to improve the consolidation of C stocks in the soil and favor the retention of nutrients (Lee et al., 2013).

Generally, any use of cover crops usually triggers an improvement in soil osmotic potential due to an increase in organic carbon concentration (Sánchez de Cima et al., 2015). The increase in the available nitrogen is usually caused by the legumes in crop rotations. In this management, the election of the correct winter legumes, like the species of the genus *Vicia*, is



determinant for ensuring correct development (Gabriel et al., 2016). This genus can substitute any other external nitrogen contribution with available quantities of 100 kg N/ha (Robacer et al., 2016). The results are similar with summer cover crops, with the choice varieties having later maturity, which is essential to avoid the mobilization of nitrogen fixed to the seeds and to reduce the input of this element (Blanco-Canqui et al., 2012).

#### 9.2.4 Green Manures

One of the difficulties that farmers face in is the maintenance of an optimum level of productivity during successive campaigns, with nitrogen being the most sensitive and determinant element to reach optimal production. There is an intense nitrogen flow from the soil to the product. In many cases, a reduction in nitrogen supply is compensated by the application of different inputs derived from livestock activity; however, this type of application may have some limitations (Paredes et al., 2014). The application of green manure presents itself as a useful farming practice to avoid those limitations.

Green manure can be applied in two different ways: one in which the green manure crop and the main crop are cultivated in the same plot in different seasons, and another in which the green manure crop is cultivated in a different place and transported to the main crop plot (Skudienė et al., 2012).

Green manures involve several crops, mainly legumes, which are cultivated after the main crop harvest or during its standard growing season. These crops are described in Table 9.1, where we can distinguish between legume and nonlegume crops in temperate and tropical weathers. Crops used as green manures are planted with the objective of being incorporated back to the land without proceeding to the collection of the vegetal matter or at least of the aerial biomass (Talgre et al., 2012).

European farmers adopt this management practice due to its easiness and potential benefits, which not only improve soil fertility, but also prevent soil erosion, help with weed management, and maintain soil structure, features shared with the application of cover crops (Løes et al., 2016). Under normal conditions it is easy to reach an average yield of 100 kg N/ha, considerable values that ensure a good yield of the following crop. If it is carried out in short cycles or winter periods, the total productivity of the crop will be reduced, on account of reducing nitrogen fixation (Cookson et al., 2002).

The selection of crops for green manure is another relevant aspect; several studies have reported the use of different crops in temperate and tropical regions (Egodawatta et al., 2012; Raphael et al., 2016). In temperate regions, there are intrinsic variations depending on when the sowing happens. Thus, selected crops have to present further adaptations and the farmer must adhere to the sowing times for best results (Ferreira et al., 2013)

**TABLE 9.1** Green Manures Applied in Temperate and Tropical Weathers Climates

Crop Type	Climate Region	Species	Season	Authors		
Legumes	Temperate	<i>Astragalus sinicus</i>	Winter	Lee et al. (2010); Kim et al. (2012)		
		<i>Glycine max</i>	Summer	Northupl and Rao (2015)		
		<i>Lablab purpureus</i>	Summer	Northupl and Rao (2015)		
		<i>Lens culinaris</i>	Winter	Cicek et al. (2014b); Vaisman et al. (2014)		
		<i>Medicago media</i>	Annual	Talgre et al. (2009)		
		<i>Medicago sativa</i>	Annual	Skuodienė et al. (2012)		
		<i>Melilotus officinales</i>	Annual	Bruning et al. (2015)		
		<i>Pisum sativum</i>	Winter	Cicek et al. (2014a); Olesen et al. (2009)		
		<i>Trifolium pratense</i>	Annual	Talgre et al. (2009); Skuodienė et al. (2012); Sharifi et al. (2014)		
		<i>Trifolium repens</i>	Annual	Skuodienė et al. (2012)		
		<i>Vicia faba</i>	Winter	Olesen et al. (2009)		
		<i>Vicia villosa</i>	Winter	Cicek et al. (2014b); Hwang et al. (2015); Vaisman et al. (2014); Tarui et al. (2013)		
		Temperate and tropical		<i>Crotalaria juncea</i>	Summer	Miyazawa et al. (2014); Subaedah et al. (2016)
				<i>Lupinus angustifolius</i>	Winter	Olesen et al. (2009)
<i>Lotus corniculatus</i>	Summer			Talgre et al. (2009)		
<i>Lathyrus sativus</i>	Winter			Vaisman et al., (2014)		
	Tropicalwarm	<i>Albizia lebbbeck</i>	Annual	Kareem et al. (2014)		

(Continued)

**TABLE 9.1 (Continued)**

Crop Type	Climate Region	Species	Season	Authors
		<i>Arachis pintoi</i>	Seasonal	de Araujo Neto et al. (2014); Wang et al. (2015b)
		<i>Cajanus cajan</i>	Seasonal	Ferreira et al. (2013); Nascimento et al. (2016)
		<i>Canavalia ensiformis</i>	Annual	Ferreira et al. (2013); de Araujo Neto et al. (2014)
		<i>Crotalaria spectabilis</i>	Seasonal	de Araujo Neto et al. (2014)
		<i>Crotalaria ochroleuca</i>	Seasonal	Ferreira et al. (2013)
		<i>Gliciridia sepium</i>	Annual	Egodawatta et al. (2012)
		<i>Glycine ussuriensis</i>	Seasonal	Dabin et al. (2015)
		<i>Mucuna pruriens</i>	Seasonal	Ferreira et al. (2013); Poku et al. (2014)
		<i>Phaseolus radiatus</i>	Seasonal	Dabin et al. (2015)
		<i>Pueraria phaseoloides</i>	Seasonal	de Araujo Neto et al. (2014)
		<i>Sesbania aculeata</i>	Annual	Premi et al. (2013)
Non legumes	Temperate	<i>Avena sativa</i>	Winter	Cicek et al. (2014a),
		<i>Brassica napus</i>	Winter	Sánchez de Cima et al. (2015)
		<i>Brassica rapa</i>	Winter	Cicek and Entz (2014)
		<i>Hordeum vulgare</i>	Winter	Hwang et al. (2015)
		<i>Lolium multifloru</i>	Annual	Sánchez de Cima et al. (2015)
		<i>Lolium perenne</i>	Winter	Kim et al. (2012)
		<i>Phleum pratense</i>	Annual	Skuodienė et al. (2012)

(Continued)

**TABLE 9.1 (Continued)**

Crop Type	Climate Region	Species	Season	Authors
		<i>Raphanus sativus</i>	Winter	Cicek and Entz (2014)
		<i>Sinapis alba</i>	Winter	Bogužas et al. (2015)
		<i>Sorghum bicolor</i>	Summer	Miyazawa et al. (2014)
	Tropicalwarm	<i>Pennisetum glaucum</i>	Seasonal	Nascimento et al. (2016)
		<i>Sorghum drummondii</i>	Seasonal	Mkhathini and Modi (2012)
		<i>Tithonia diversifolia</i>	Seasonal	Partey et al. (2014)
		<i>Urochloa ruziziensis</i>	Seasonal	Nascimento et al. (2016)

Nowadays, the use of green manures is growing in importance and farmers are considering the employment of crops adapted to adverse conditions. Moreover, they should consider longer periods of application (more than 2–3 years), in order to increase the amount of available nutrients (Skuodiene et al, 2012). Several legumes might be applied as green manure following these new trends; i.e., red clover (*Trifolium pratense*), which improves available concentrations of N, P, and K in the soil, or vetch (*Vicia sativa/villosa*), which provides between 140–180 kg N/ha (Snapp et al., 2005).

The use of green manures in orchards is an extended practice with good results, since it improves nutrient retention and tree availability, compared to conventional production systems (Garcia-Franco et al., 2015; Park et al., 2015). In this sense, most of the studies reported the use of *Vicia*, *Cajanus*, *Arachis*, or *Avena* as green manure crops (Lim et al., 2012; Park et al., 2015; Millan et al., 2016).

The use of green manures is also widespread in cereal production systems such as wheat, barley, or rye, due to the global demands for these types of crops and the nutritional requirements, mainly of nitrogen. It is common practice in temperate latitudes, where it has been carried out continuously for hundreds of years, even allowing for areas with low productivity. However, the use of other nonleguminous green manure, such as radish (*Raphanus sativum*), which has a significant pivotal root, is useful in the extraction and incorporation of K and P into the agricultural system from lower edaphic horizons (Cicek et al., 2014a).

### 9.2.5 Intercropping

Intercropping consists of the simultaneous cultivation of two or more plant species acting in synergy and avoiding competition at the foliar, root, and nutritional levels (Andrew and Kassam, 1976). Intercropping is not a simple mix of crops, where the competition for space and nutrients is common. The use of this management practice was common in European countries in past centuries and is recently raising importance in commercial agriculture. This practice is also widely used in tropical farming systems.

Intercropping has many advantages, such as the easiness and efficiency of its application and reversion of the loss of soil biodiversity caused by the application of monocultures. Moreover, there is maximization of land use and benefits, and harvest yields are increased. However, it also presents a number of negative points compared to other techniques used in organic farming, such as a lower contribution of nitrogen and other nutrients to soils or difficulties in harvesting both crops at the same time, it being necessary for post-processing to separate yields.

Despite the disadvantages, this is an extremely versatile technique that can be applied to annual, perennial, arbustive, or mixed crops. The most common associations are cereals and legumes, i.e., corn/soybean association. In recent years, tuber crops have been used, due to the potential advantages that this kind of crops might have (Weerarathne et al., 2016). This practice has a very important effect on the soil nitrogen balance, reducing nitrogen losses that are not used by the crop, as well as reducing the needed for nitrogen (Tribouillois et al., 2016). Moreover, this practice can be applied together with green manures. In this case, pulse shoots are cut and incorporated into the main crop, usually a cereal; thus, the main crop will have a constant nitrogen contribution (Hödtke et al., 2016). However, the election of both crops should be done correctly; some authors described the association of oat and pea, which was used in certain regions of Europe, may not have the desired effect in nodulation and nitrogen fixation rates (Jannoura et al., 2014).

Although the results are endorsed by good yields, the cycle of nutrients such as phosphorus and potassium is not clear, and the influence of this activity on micronutrients such as iron, magnesium, or manganese are undefined. Only a few relationships have tested, for example, maize and peanut (Guo et al., 2014).

The association of wheat/chickpea generates an increase in the availability of phosphorus in the rhizosphere of both plants with respect to them as monocultures (Betencour et al., 2012). In tropical areas, *Gliricidia sepium*, an arboreal legume, is used in intercropping with maize, improving the availability of potassium and nitrogen supply (Beedy et al., 2010). Other authors suggest that the use of trees (*Acer* sp. and *Juglans* sp.) improves microbial

populations of both bacteria and mycorrhizae, improving nutrient absorption and production (Lacombe et al., 2009).

The incorporation of nonleguminous plants may also have an effect on nitrogen cycles, generating rapid reabsorption, as observed in *Festuca rubra* intercropped with maize (Manevski et al., 2015). Nevertheless, despite most of the studied systems having good results in practice, the new associations need to be tested in order to avoid associations that produce allelopathic problems.

### 9.3 APPLICABLE AMENDMENTS

The application of management practices, such as those described above, does not always meet the necessary conditions to ensure proper agricultural production. In organic farming, the applications of diverse inputs of natural origin are allowed, including the application of minerals such as rock phosphate, potassium salts, or natural sulfates (Regulation (EC) No 889/2008). In this section, we will focus on the application of inputs other than those described above, which might present novel application forms or be novel itself.

#### 9.3.1 Manures

Manure is a byproduct generated during livestock activity that has been used since ancient times as a fertilizer to enhance field productivity. Usually, it is mixed with crop residues or straw to increase water retention and facilitate its subsequent fermentation (Castellanos-Navarrete et al., 2014; Omari et al., 2016). The fermentation of this type of byproduct is air-filled, producing a change in the chemical composition of the product to less soluble but more stable forms, resulting in a loss of ammonium nitrogen (Gustafson et al., 2003). The application of manure depends on its composition, the crop needs, and the soil characteristics. This is a product that will undergo important transformations in the soil after its application, occurring before sowing (Yue et al., 2016).

The use of manure is still widespread because it is a source of fast-absorbing nutrients with proven effects for decades, with variable doses to obtain optimum yields in crops such as cereals (Borugă et al., 2016). This is due to the fact that nutrient concentrations have a wide variation, depending on the producer species, the animal nutrition, and the manure post-processing (Poku et al., 2014; Chaudhary et al., 2017).

Phosphorous is one of the most important elements to guarantee proper agricultural production; an adequate concentration of available phosphorus in the soil can be maintained by the application of manure (Shen et al., 2014).

Cow manure is one of the most commonly used manures, due to the hydrolytic action of its microbiota on plant fibers, allowing better processing

in small-scale conditions and improving its integration into the soil. Also, the low water content and its volume allow easy storage and use of this kind of manure (Wang et al., 2015a).

Other manures produced by hens and chickens have highly desirable characteristics for agriculture, such as high nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium contents (Li et al., 2016). These manures have proven useful for demanding crops, such as rice or sugarcane (Showler, 2015). In addition, this type of product has begun to be commercialized by being pelletized, facilitating its transport, reducing the geographic dependence and ceasing to be a purely local product (Burnett et al., 2015; Fernandez et al., 2016).

Many authors suggest that the application of manures of different species, such as horse, rabbit, or sheep, has short-term efficacy, which is usually associated with the chemical form in which the nutrients are present (Fernández-Hernández et al., 2014; Islas-Valdez et al., 2015). In some cases the concentrations of P are noteworthy, with high concentrations of P and K available (Jannoura et al., 2013). This fact is determined by the presence of readily available nonsoluble phosphorus (Vanden Nest et al., 2016).

## 9.3.2 Compost and Vermicompost

### 9.3.2.1 Compost

Compost is a versatile product generated by the fermentation of different residues, such as green or dry vegetation, manures from diverse origins, or urban waste (Zhao et al., 2017). The origin of the raw materials, mainly waste or remnants of other activities, has an important effect, increasing the concentration of carbon, usable nitrogen, and/or phosphorus (Castán et al., 2016; Meena et al., 2016).

Some efforts have been made to maximize the use of different residues through composting, such as food remains and urban solid waste, allowing the recirculation of outputs in the agricultural system (Papafilippaki et al., 2015; Pandey et al., 2016a,b). Residues of low potential or that are incompatible for agricultural use may become a product with homogeneous properties to be applied in different crops due to their concentrations of N, P, K, and micronutrients (Trivedi et al., 2015). Mature composts must have an acceptable C/N ratio of less than 20, acidic or slightly acidic pH, and discrete concentrations of soluble P or K (Showler, 2015; Cavoski et al., 2016; Pandey et al., 2016a,b).

The use of compost might represent the transition from conventional agriculture to organic agriculture. The use of high doses allows a high maintenance of the fertility, reaching a balance between soil and agricultural production (Hernández et al., 2015). However, an excess may lead to environmental problems similar to those occurring when there is an excessive use of inorganic fertilizers, such as nitrate losses (Papafilippaki et al., 2015).

Moreover, the use of compost often leads to an increase in diversity and microbial activity, like most organic amendments; however, the structure of these populations is not affected by their application, in contrast, the soil type influences the microbial population (Hernández et al., 2015; Allard et al., 2016).

In general, after the composting process, the concentration of certain elements, such as nitrogen or carbon, tends to be similar in composts of different origins. The elements that do not produce volatile compounds show a great dependence on the initial product, such as Cu, Zn, Cd, or Pb, with Cd and Pb usually being present in urban waste (Meena et al., 2016). However, the use of compost derived from residues from agricultural activities does not present high concentrations of metal elements (Scotti et al., 2016).

The amounts of phosphorus derived from compost amendments are variable but usually have relatively low values (below 10 g/kg) compared to other organic amendments (Evanylo et al., 2008; Hall and Bell, 2015). This element has a recovery rate of 30%, since it has not undergone intense processes of oxidation or mineralization (Christel et al., 2014); however, it usually decreases with application in soil (Jorgensen et al., 2010). In some cases, the addition of rock phosphate, allowed in organic farming, may be of interest in order to improve phosphate availability (Bustamante et al., 2016; Moharana and Biswas, 2016).

Potassium is also of special interest in agriculture, as its concentration in compost is higher than phosphorus (2- or 10-fold; McLaughlin et al., 2015; Strik, 2016). However, it is a very soluble element that can be lost during compost processing; thus, its concentration is variable and depends on the compost raw material (Madejón et al., 2016).

Micronutrients will show great variability depending on the raw material, although they usually present concentrations that can be consumed by the crop fields, always within normal values (Morales-Corts et al., 2014). The application rates vary and will depend on the elemental composition of the applied compost, but are considered between 10 and 300 t/ha, although the optimum values are usually between 20 and 40 t/ha (Papafilippaki et al., 2015). Although many of the studies carried out cover a relatively short period of 2–4 years (Castán et al., 2016; Debiase et al., 2016), there are some works performed in long-term trials which can help us to understand its effects (Vanden Nest et al., 2016; Xin et al., 2016).

The application of composts has benefits in other parameters related indirectly to soil fertility, such as porosity and particle size, giving lower density and smaller particle size, through an increase in the high-molecular-weight carbon compounds. Additionally, this application helps to establish nutrient solution and regulate the immobilization and mineralization of elements such as N, P, or K (Showler, 2015; Xin et al., 2016).



### 9.3.2.2 Vermicompost

Vermicompost is composed of the organic waste transformed through different earthworm species' digestive systems into a homogeneous product of high nutritional value and with great possibilities for its application in agriculture (Suthar, 2009). This process allows the stabilization of solid residues, showing great possibilities when the concentration in cellulose fibers is high (Sahariah et al., 2014). In this case, different species of earthworms are used, although the most frequently used species are *Eisenia foetida*, *Eudrilus eugeniae*, and *Perionyx excavatus* (Pattnaik and Reddy, 2010; Soobhany et al., 2015; Subbulakshmi and Thirunee, 2015).

One of the main advantages of the use of earthworms in the production of compost is the production of a higher concentration of nutrients through the biological activity of these worms, which might be compared to traditional composting and allow the reuse of residues of low fertilization potential (Soobhany et al., 2015; Swarnam et al., 2016). Starting from the same raw material, the increase in the concentration of P, K, Ca, or Mg is usually between 30% and 120%, obtaining a product that can be used in crops with high nutritional requirements (Soobhany et al., 2015). However, this situation does not occur with nitrogen, which is lost by volatilization in the form of ammonium.

Interestingly, earthworms have the ability to remove toxic organic compounds that may present problems in traditional composting systems, being effective in the recovery of degraded agricultural soils with decreased nutrient reservoirs (Lim et al., 2015; Hussain et al., 2016). Moreover, being a pathogen-free end product and the high percentage of nutrients in available forms makes composts extensively used in horticulture or extensive crops, both in cereals and legumes (Baradari et al., 2013; John and Praba, 2013; Joshi et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2014; Sreevidya et al., 2016).

### 9.3.3 Biochar

Biochar is a product generated through a thermochemical process called pyrolysis, in which organic matter of low density and low caloric power and, in the absence of oxygen and high temperatures (400–700°C), generates three different byproducts: Syngas, bio-oil, and biochar, also called charcoal. All these derivatives have a high calorific value, can be used as fuels, and also allow the reuse and storage of organic waste with subsequent environmental benefit.

The employment of biochar in agriculture began more than 40 years ago but in the last 10 years, there has been a great increase due to its unique features and the easiness of its production at a small scale (Galgani et al., 2014; Kuppasamy et al., 2016). However, its production at an industrial scale

allows for greater use of all its byproducts, not only biochar, in addition to diversification in production methods (Li et al., 2016).

For several years, most studies have focused on the use of wood or city waste as a raw material for the production of biochar, which has generated some criticism due to the associated deforestation problems (Ahrends et al., 2010; Gwenzi et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2016a). However, this trend has changed, especially in developing countries, where raw materials are more diverse (Chidumayo and Gumbo, 2013; Jones et al., 2016; Khan et al., 2016a,b; Gonzaga et al., 2017). Also, trends are changing in industrialized countries, which are aware of the need to diversify raw materials for biochar production (Manolikaki et al., 2016; Thakkar et al., 2016).

From the point of view of agriculture, biochar presents various characteristics: basic pH between 8.5 and 10, high C/N ratio, moderate K and P concentrations, and high porosity (Joseph et al., 2015; Jeong et al., 2016; Plaza et al., 2016; Pluchon et al., 2016). Most of these features are derived from the raw material used, such as pruning, crop residues, logging residues, or sewage sludge (Paneque et al., 2016).

Although biochar is characterized by a low concentration of N, it can contribute to the soil with large amounts of other nutrients, such as K or P. Biochar structure allows a gradual release of phosphorus, emphasizing to some authors that its application can stimulate the transformation to labile forms of these nutrients (Plaza et al., 2016; Dari et al., 2016). As in other organic amendments, biochar structure will vary depending on the raw material, i.e., wood-derived biochars tend to have a lower concentration of K and P than those derived from pruning or crop residues (Gul et al., 2015; Buss et al. 2016). However, their application does not show any improvement in the N concentration alone (Hansen et al., 2016).

Due to the high percentage of organic carbon and its structure, the use of biochar for sandy soil amendment is an option to take into account due to the improvement of soil quality and water retention rate (Molnár et al., 2015; Suliman et al., 2017). The effectiveness of biochar will depend on the type of soil, climatic conditions, crop, and application (Obia et al., 2016). However, its greatest impact will be found in the recovery of overexploited soil (Novak et al., 2016; Paneque et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2016b). Therefore, the application of biochar can be a tool in the transition from conventional to sustainable and ecological systems, allowing us to rapidly increase the percentage of organic matter due to its high C/N ratio (Iqbal et al., 2015; Plaza et al., 2016). The large specific surface area of the biochar can be one of the keys to understanding the effect shown on microbial populations since it works by creating new spaces where bacteria can be established (Kookana et al., 2011).

Despite all of the described benefits, biochar has some disadvantages, mainly associated with its high pH, which increases the immobilization of the trace elements of a range of metals (Bell and Worrall, 2011).

Nevertheless, the high pH, together with its high porosity, makes the application of charcoal a widespread strategy for sandy soils and tropical acid soils with low organic matter concentration (Raboin et al., 2016). In addition, it presents a high cation exchange capacity (CEC), which makes it possible to retain soluble ions of the different nutrients in the soil (Xu et al., 2016).

Biochar can also be used to improve the qualities of other organic inputs used in organic agriculture, such as compost or manure. Its application in the animal composting process improves the fraction of humic–fulvic acid and provides stability (Jindo et al., 2015). Although the biochar is supplied with another product, such as compost, it has a synergistic effect on the absorption of this nutrient by the plant (Iqbal et al., 2015; Agegnehu et al., 2016)

The best results in terms of nutrient utilization are associated with combined solutions, i.e., the use of biochar and compost mixed with the application of phosphate-solubilizing bacteria, which can improve the efficiency in the absorption of this nutrient (Sáez et al., 2016; Wei et al., 2016). It is also described that biochar, in combination with vermicompost, green manure, or other amendments, has synergistic effects, improving nutrient absorption, contributing to the stability of humic–fulvic acid fraction, and slowing nutrient release (Ponge et al., 2006; Iqbal et al., 2015; Jindo et al., 2015; Agegnehu et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2016c).

#### 9.3.4 Other Amendments

Organic farming should explore all possible options to achieve better environmental benefits, mainly through the re-utilization of different byproducts. In this sense, the use of sewage sludge has been shown to be an effective tool in the case of cereals, even in conservative cases such as minimum tillage, where production similar to conventional treatments can be achieved (Debiase et al., 2016).

The application of sewage sludge generates high yields due to the very soluble chemical forms of its nutrients (Debiase et al., 2016). In many cases, the generation of these soluble forms is produced after anaerobic digestion, which is commonly called biogas, and also have some intermediate derivatives (Weiland, 2010). Biogas and derivatives have many advantages, such as easiness of application (on surfaces or by injection) and efficiency in nutrient managing, avoiding the loss of nitrogen and, thus, reducing its release to the atmosphere (Holm-Nielsen et al., 2009; Fangueiro et al., 2015). The production of biogas from residues and wastes derived from agricultural practices and livestock activities match perfectly with the holistic view of organic farming, also allowing energy recycling while producing a high-quality organic fertilizer (Siegmeier et al., 2015).

The separation of the different fractions is used to produce nutrient enrichment in the solid fraction, resulting in better yield (Hou et al., 2015). In spite of this enrichment, C/N ratios are high due to losses that occur

during the digestion process (Lopedota et al., 2013). Nutrient levels are also very varied, although in most cases high concentrations of K and P can be obtained and nitrogen is relatively abundant (Nkoa, 2014). However, it is necessary to monitor the application of sewage sludge in order to avoid an overdose of certain elements, such as heavy metals (Debiase et al., 2016).

The use of sewage sludge and products from anaerobic digesters is feasible in extensive cereal production and also in intensive crops, such as horticultural crops (Lopedota et al., 2013; Sieling et al., 2014; Alvarenga et al., 2015). However, as expected, the excessive application of this type of product can generate undesirable environmental effects; thus, it is recommended not to exceed 120 kg N/ha (Duffková, et al., 2015).

Slurry is widely applied in conventional agriculture and with good prospects in organic agriculture due to the elevated concentration of nutrients (N, P, K) in easily assimilable forms (Saez et al., 2016). The contribution of slurry to agricultural production should be considered due to the large amount of organic nitrogen and other organic compounds that, together with their liquid state, facilitate its application and dispersion in the soil (Penha et al., 2015).

The composition of pig slurry is highly variable depending on the type of farm, use, feeding, and climatic region (Antezana et al., 2016). Its use, single or combined, provides better soil qualities and reduces the toxicity of heavy metals, such as Zn and Cu, which are found in high concentrations (Sáez et al., 2016). However, excessive use of livestock slurries may adversely affect soil microfauna populations (Murchie et al., 2015).

Another amendment that seems to have a promising future is the biomass of *Spirulina platensis*, which is an alga that can be grown in sewage sludges and slurries of different types (Aung, 2011). Its application is able to contribute up to 8% of nitrogen, and also varying concentrations of Fe and Mg. This alga is able to recover nitrates and nitrites that are dissolved in those wastes (Wuang et al., 2016).

Finally, there are infinite possible options for agriculture inputs that can be applied as fertilizers in organic farming. Different climatic regions have different residue types derived from agriculture. In this sense, Mediterranean countries, such as Spain or Italy, have a potential source of fertilizers in the residues generated from olive oil production, a solid waste commonly called “alperujo,” which can be used in raw or composted crops (Proietti et al., 2015; Russo et al., 2015). The composting process of this residue generates a product with a high concentration of humic acids, slightly basic pH, 20–30 g/kg of nitrogen, 1–3 g/kg phosphorus, and varying concentrations of potassium and other micronutrients (Roig et al., 2006; Tortosa et al. 2014). Its use is common in woody crops, mainly olive orchards but also others, such as poplar plantations (Madejón et al., 2016). These amendments have demonstrated that they are able to perform a systematic improvement of the production of olives in both the quantity and quality of the final product (Fernández-Hernández et al., 2014).

## 9.4 BIOFERTILIZERS

Organic farming is a practice that considers the maintenance of strong and competent microbial populations as essential, being aware of the impact of microorganisms on plant health (Bhardwaj et al., 2014). The interaction of crops with other organisms occurs through the root, where dense microbe populations live in a soil fraction called the rhizosphere (Mendes et al., 2013; Zandi and Basu, 2016). Those microbes live in a close relationship with plant roots and are suitable to be employed as biofertilizers. However, not all microorganisms can be employed due to possible pathogenicity issues, technological difficulties, or inadequate interaction capacity with different crops (García-Fraile et al., 2012).

Microbial-based biofertilizers, with current global production estimated at over US\$5 trillion, are able to act directly and indirectly on plants, providing nutrients through their own biological activity, such as biological nitrogen fixation, phosphate mobilization, potassium solubilization, phytohormone production, and biological control (Lugtenberg and Kamilova 2009; Garcia-Fraile et al., 2015; Gupta et al., 2015; Velázquez et al., 2016). Therefore, the selection of those microorganisms that present better features is the key to agriculture improvement, although some have been sold and applied for decades, such as nitrogen-fixing bacteria.

Nitrogen-fixing bacteria, either free-living or associated with legumes, have already been commercialized, as is the case of *Azotobacter*, *Azospirillum*, *Rhizobium*, and related genera (Brockwell and Bottomley, 1995; Sivasakthivelan and Saranraj, 2013). Moreover, there are other kinds of microorganisms that can be applied as biofertilizers, such as cyanobacteria, mycorrhizae, potassium- and/or phosphate-solubilizing bacteria, biocontrollers, and other plant growth-promoting microorganisms (Berruti et al., 2016; Velázquez et al., 2016). Genera such as *Azoarcus*, *Exiguobacterium*, *Methylobacterium*, *Paenibacillus*, or *Pantoea* are also described as being able to interact with multiple plant species, to tolerate elevated temperatures, or to improve mycorrhizae interactions (Chauhan et al., 2015).

### 9.4.1 Carriers

One of the biggest challenges for industrial biofertilizer production is to solve the problems related to the transport and maintenance of the inocula during periods of storage and distribution. The formulation of a biofertilizer must maximize the chances of inocula survival, providing a suitable environment for the microbial component, as well as minimizing environmental changes in order that the farmer employs less time and effort to carry out the biofertilization. Unfortunately, the perfect formulation does not exist and we will always find problems associated with population decline or the type of inoculation.

The loss of effectiveness due to the death of inocula produces a decay of biological activity, an issue that can be solved with the inclusion of a proper carrier material. In this sense, carriers have been developed based on substrates that allow the transport of microorganisms in different presentations (Bashan, 1998). There are four possible types of carrier used in the preparation of commercial biofertilizers: Powder, liquid, granules, and encapsulated cells (Bashan et al., 2014).

Peat is the dominant solid carrier material in the market due to the easiness of its sterilization, obtention, and relatively low price (Chandran et al., 2014). Liquid formats based on aqueous solutions or oily suspensions are also widely used and easy to apply; however, they have disadvantages in storage and preservation, as well as the need for protectors (Pushpa et al., 2014). Calcite or silica is used as granulated carriers, which might be impregnated with a known concentration of microorganisms, favoring storage and subsequent dispersion of the biofertilizer (Swapna et al., 2016). Last but not least, cell encapsulation is possibly the most promising of all, because it employs a polymer to integrate microbial cells/spores/hyphae into a matrix that provides nutrients and protects against variations in pH, humidity, or salinity. There are up to 1350 polymers that have possibilities as carriers, although polyacrylamide and alginate are the most commonly used (Vassilev et al., 2015).

## 9.4.2 Plant Growth-Promoting Microorganisms Used in Formulations

Biofertilizers are used whilst taking into account the biological activities that can develop the microorganisms that form them; thus, their design and application can be conducted in a targeted manner, depending on the conditions under which the crop is grown (Edi Husen et al., 2007). Due to the different capacities that microorganisms exhibit, we can alleviate crop deficiencies by attending to the microbes composing the biofertilizer ability to fix atmospheric nitrogen, solubilize or mobilize nutrients, or to control biotic or abiotic stresses.

### 9.4.2.1 Nitrogen Fixation

One of the most limiting elements for optimal agricultural production is nitrogen. For this reason, it is necessary to replenish the nitrogen stock in the soil by the application of external inputs. Some prokaryotes have the ability to fix atmospheric nitrogen and provide it to the plant for the synthesis of amino acids. This process can be carried out by endosymbiotic species, such as those from the genera *Rhizobium*, *Mesorhizobium*, or *Bradyrhizobium*, the latter being used with great assiduity in soybean crops (Vejan et al., 2016). The nitrogen fixation process in leguminous crops occurs by establishing

strict symbiotic relationships between plant and host that culminate in the formation of specific structures called nodules where the nitrogen fixation takes part (Haag et al., 2013). This process can contribute an average of 140 kg N per ha per year, which is higher than that from other inputs such as vermicompost or green manures (Franche et al., 2009; Das and Singh, 2014; Tyagi et al., 2014).

In addition, nitrogen fixation can also be performed by bacteria under free-living conditions, being independent of the formation of nodules, as is the case of cereals and other nonleguminous crops (Santi et al., 2013). Formulations based on those free-living nitrogen-fixers are more attractive for biofertilizer markets (Sivasakthivelan and Saranraj, 2013). *Azotobacter*, *Azospirillum*, *Bacillus*, *Beijerinckia*, *Clostridium*, *Enterobacter*, and *Pseudomonas* are the most popular bacterial genera (Zandi and Basu, 2016).

*Azospirillum* is one of the most widely used free-living nitrogen-fixing microorganisms, both in legume and nonlegume crops, with a well-developed technology for its production as an inoculant (Roy et al., 2015; Lesueur et al., 2016). *Azotobacter* is a similar example, with its application being made on legumes and other crops also (Aseri et al., 2008; Ansari et al., 2015). The commercially propagated *Azolla* fern is also used in India because of its association with cyanobacteria genus *Anabaena*, which is able to fix atmospheric nitrogen (Mahdi et al., 2010). This strategy is more effective than the inoculation of free cyanobacteria, since symbiosis induces the proliferation of heterocysts, where nitrogen fixation is carried out (Santi et al., 2013).

#### 9.4.2.2 Nutrient Mobilization and Solubilization

Phosphorus is another element with a special importance in agricultural production; in this aspect, the application of microorganisms is able to maximize the use of the available phosphorus in the soil. The use of bacteria produces better results than the application of fungi, except in the case of mycorrhizae, being able to solubilize 50% of available phosphorus (Chen et al., 2006; Mohammadi and Sohrabi, 2012).

The development of biofertilizers based on microbial consortia with complementary activities—either bacterium–bacterium, bacterium–fungus, or fungus–fungus—is the current trend (Vassilev et al., 2015). Those complementary activities will involve the synthesis of organic acids (lactic, citric, glycolic, succinic, fumaric, malic, oxalic, tartaric), inorganic acids (sulfuric acid), the production of specific enzymes (phosphatases), and chelating agents (Rathi and Gaur, 2016). Amongst phosphate-solubilizing bacteria, the common genera used as inoculants belong to the genera *Lactobacillus*, *Bacillus*, *Pseudomonas*, *Azotobacter*, *Beijerinckia*, *Burkholderia*, *Enterobacter*, *Erwinia*, *Flavobacterium*, *Microbacterium*, *Rhizobium*, and *Serratia* (Edi Husen et al., 2007; Bhattacharyya and Jha, 2012; Bhattacharjee

and Dey, 2014; Anand et al., 2016; Youssef and Eissa, 2016). In the case of fungi, the genera most commonly used are *Aspergillus*, *Penicillium*, *Agaulosposra*, *Sclerotium*, *Trichoderma*, *Rhizophagus*, *Gigaspora*, and *Glomus* (Ogbo, 2010; Suja et al., 2012; Naher et al., 2013; Abd-Alla et al., 2014; Saxena et al., 2014; Taktek et al., 2015; Anand et al., 2016; Li et al., 2016). However, it is necessary to know more about the bacterial interactions within biofertilizers and with plant hosts to avoid negative reactions, since the combination of nitrogen fixers and phosphate solubilizers does not always generate the desired result (Azimi et al., 2013).

In recent years, the use of microorganisms capable of solubilizing potassium is growing in importance, mainly in the solubilization of micas that are found in soil composition (Velázquez et al., 2016). The species *Acidithiobacillus ferrooxidans*, *Bacillus edaphicus*, *Bacillus mucilaginosus*, *Burkholderia* sp., *Paenibacillus* sp., and *Pseudomonas* sp. are used for this purpose (Gupta et al., 2015; Saha et al., 2016a,b). However, this is not a well-understood feature and its involvement in the production of biofertilizers went unnoticed until a few years ago (Parmar and Sindhu, 2013).

Microorganisms have also shown important qualities to solubilize elements, such as Zn, Cu, Ca, B, or Mo, indirectly through their metabolism, making important quantities of these micronutrients available to plants. In most cases, it is related to the synthesis of organic acids that modify the solubility of the elements. *Glomus*-based inoculant has been shown to have a positive effect on the absorption of Zn or Cu, also reducing the absorption of potentially hazardous elements, such as Pb or Cd (Baum et al., 2015).

#### 9.4.2.3 Organic Compounds Synthesis

Microorganisms are able to produce different substances that improve crop production or affect directly plant development; i.e., siderophores or phytohormones (Lugtenberg and Kamilova, 2009). Whereas phytohormone production is considered as a direct mechanism of plant growth promotion, the production of siderophores has been considered as an indirect mechanism because it limits the accessibility of the iron present in soil (Saha et al., 2016a,b), nevertheless, currently siderophore production is also considered a direct mechanism since it allows the mobilization of this element to plants (Freitas et al., 2015).

Siderophores are organic compounds of varied nature that have the peculiarity of chelating iron, making it available for plants. These compounds are synthesized by both bacteria and fungi and play a prominent role in the biocontrol of phytopathogenic microbes (Chu et al., 2010). Amongst siderophore-producing microbial genera are *Rhizobium*, *Phyllobacterium*, *Streptomyces*, *Pseudomonas*, and *Bacillus* (Flores-Félix et al., 2013, 2015; Sreevidya and Gopalakrishnan, 2015; Złoch et al., 2016).



The production of phytohormones is an extended capacity amongst rhizobacteria, in which the production of auxins, gibberellins (GAs), cytokinins (CK), or abscisic acid (ABA) has been described (Mangmang et al., 2015; Wong et al., 2015). The production of cytokinins, which promotes cell division, has been described in bacterial genera such as *Paenibacillus*, *Methylobacterium*, or *Bacillus* (Ahemad and Kibret, 2014) and the production of phytohormones like gibberellins and abscisic acid in *Rhizobium*, *Azospirillum*, and *Bacillus* (Gupta et al., 2015; Vejan et al., 2016). Nevertheless, indole acetic acid (IAA) is perhaps the most studied phytohormone produced by bacteria such as *Rhizobium*, *Azospirillum*, *Bacillus*, or *Streptomyces* that generate, amongst other effects, a greater development of the root system, being able to interact with a larger volume of soil (Duca et al., 2014).

Biofertilizers can also act on the crop by enhancing their ability to cope with stress situations. The synthesis of ACC-deaminase, which disrupts the synthesis of ethylene that is synthesized in stress situations, helps to support the stress stages (Glick, 2014). This ability has been described in a wide variety of genera, such as *Acinetobacter*, *Achromobacter*, *Agrobacterium*, *Alcaligenes*, *Azospirillum*, *Bacillus*, *Burkholderia*, *Enterobacter*, *Pseudomonas*, *Ralstonia*, *Rhizobium*, *Serratia*, or *Stenotrophomonas* (Ahemad and Kibret, 2014).

Some strains of the genus *Azotobacter*, used as biofertilizers, are able to synthesize vitamins of group B and contribute them to the plant (Mahdi et al., 2010; Pal et al., 2015). This mechanism has also been observed in the application of biofertilizers formulated based on cyanobacteria in wheat (Bhardwaj et al., 2014). The synthesis of other substances such as antibiotics can indirectly contribute to increased production by eliminating biofertilizers and pathogens in the plant (Gupta et al., 2015).

## 9.5 CONCLUSION

Due to the demands of markets, the production of organic food must increase to meet the needs of consumers. For this reason, farmers must begin to act to improve crop production under organic farming. For this, there is no universal tool applicable to all systems, but the farmer must adapt to the environmental conditions and crop needs through the use of various inputs, giving priority to those whose geographical availability ensures the integration of agricultural activity in the ecosystem. In addition, new technologies for the digestion of livestock or urban byproducts allow the integration of agriculture with the human environment.

We must emphasize that it is the mixed or integrated solutions that generate the best results, because as we have seen there is no perfect input, but the deficiencies of some can be compensated for with the application of others. In this sense, microorganisms play a fundamental role through various mechanisms such as nitrogen fixation or solubilization and nutrient

mobilization. In this way, the use of mixed inoculants of several bacterial strains or mixtures of bacteria and fungi generates very attractive results. The efficiency of the applied inputs is improved, favoring the recycling of nutrients and the production of the crop. There are also products, such as charcoal, with very interesting prospects because in addition to providing nutrients to the soil, they can be used as carriers for the application of microorganisms.

Cultivation techniques play a fundamental role in the development of new strategies, especially crop rotations with nitrogen-fixing crops or phosphate mobilizers. Green manure also has a promising future, where an improvement in nutrient availability can be achieved in addition to an improvement in soil structure. Improvement of organic matter is another consequence of management techniques, this will ensure a healthy microbial population, improving crop yields. In these cases, knowing the characteristics in depth of the agricultural system will help the farmer to carry out the actions correctly, using adequate techniques and applying the appropriate inputs.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank our numerous collaborators and students involved in this research over the years. Funding was provided by Ministerio de Economía, Ciencia Industria y Competitividad (MINECO) through the Projects AGL2015-70510-R and AGL2013-48098-P, by Junta de Castilla y León through the project JCyL SA169U14 and by the Diputación de Salamanca (local government) through the project V113/463AC06. JDFF is funded by a PhD fellowship of Salamanca University; EM was granted a postdoctoral of project AGL2013-48098-P.

## REFERENCES

- Abd-Alla, M.H., El-Enany, A.-W.E., Nafady, N.A., 2014. Synergistic interaction of *Rhizobium leguminosarum* bv. *viciae* and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi as a plant growth promoting biofertilizers for faba bean (*Vicia faba* L.) in alkaline soil. *Microbiol. Res.* 169, 49–58. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micres.2013.07.007>.
- Acs, S., Berentsen, P.B.M., Huirne, R.B.M., 2005. Modelling conventional and organic farming: A literature review. *NJAS - Wageningen J Life Sci* 53, 1–18. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-5214\(05\)80007-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-5214(05)80007-7).
- Agegehu, G., Bass, A.M., Nelson, P.N., Bird, M.I., 2016. Benefits of biochar, compost and biochar-compost for soil quality, maize yield and greenhouse gas emissions in a tropical agricultural soil. *Sci Total Environ* 543, 295–306. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.11.054>.
- Ahemad, M., Kibret, M., 2014. Mechanisms and applications of plant growth promoting rhizobacteria: Current perspective. *J King Saud Univ - Sci* 26, 1–20. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jksus.2013.05.001>.
- Ahrends, A., Burgess, N.D., Milledge, S.A.H., Bulling, M.T., Fisher, B., Smart, J.C.R., et al., 2010. Predictable waves of sequential forest degradation and biodiversity loss spreading

- from an African city. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA. 107, 14556–14561. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0914471107>.
- Allard, S.M., Walsh, C.S., Wallis, A.E., 2016. *Solanum lycopersicum* (tomato) hosts robust phyllosphere and rhizosphere bacterial communities when grown in soil amended with various organic and synthetic fertilizers. Sci Total Environ 573, 555–563. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.08.157>.
- Almeida, D.S., Rosolem, C.A., 2016. Ruzigrass grown in rotation with soybean increases soil labile phosphorus. Agron J 108, 2444. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj2015.0478>.
- Alvarenga, P., Mourinha, C., Farto, M., 2015. Sewage sludge, compost and other representative organic wastes as agricultural soil amendments: Benefits versus limiting factors. Waste Manag 40, 44–52. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2015.01.027>.
- Anand, K., Kumari, B., Mallick, M.A., 2016. Phosphate solubilizing microbes: An effective and alternative approach as biofertilizers. Int J Pharm Pharm Sci 8, 37–40.
- Andrews, D.J., Kassam, A.H., 1976. The importance of multiple cropping in increasing world food supplies in multiple cropping. Am. Soc. Agron. 27, 1–10.
- Angus, J.F., Kirkegaard, J.A., Hunt, J.R., 2015. Break crops and rotations for wheat. Crop Pasture Sci 66, 523–552. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1071/CP14252>.
- Ansari, M.F., Tipre, D.R., Dave, S.R., 2015. Efficiency evaluation of commercial liquid biofertilizers for growth of *Cicer arietinum* (chickpea) in pot and field study. Biocatal Agric Biotechnol 4, 17–24. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bcab.2014.09.010>.
- Antezana, W., De Blas, C., García-Rebollar, P., 2016. Composition, potential emissions and agricultural value of pig slurry from Spanish commercial farms. Nutr Cycl Agroecosystems 104, 159–173. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10705-016-9764-3>.
- Arroyo-Garcia, R., Li, Y., Rosolem, C.A., 2013. Soil organic matter and physical attributes affected by crop rotation under no-till. Soil Sci Soc Am J 77, 1724–1731. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj2012.0310>.
- Aseri, G.K., Jain, N., Panwar, J., 2008. Biofertilizers improve plant growth, fruit yield, nutrition, metabolism and rhizosphere enzyme activities of Pomegranate (*Punica granatum* L.) in Indian Thar Desert. Sci Hortic (Amsterdam) 117, 130–135. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scienta.2008.03.014>.
- Aung, K.L.N., 2011. Effect of spirulina biofertilizer suspension on growth and yield of vigna radiata (L.) Wilczek. Univ Res J 4, 9–14.
- Azimi, S.M., Farnia, A., Shaban, M., Lak, M., 2013. Effect of different biofertilizers on seed yield of barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.). Bahman cultivar. 1, 538–546.
- Balota, E.L., Calegari, A., Nakatani, A.S., Coyne, M.S., 2014. Benefits of winter cover crops and no-tillage for microbial parameters in a Brazilian Oxisol: A long-term study. Agric Ecosyst Environ 197, 31–40. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2014.07.010>.
- Baradari, J., Baj, B., Nasri, M., Zarghami, R., 2013. Yield evaluation and components of canola (Hyola- 401) species in different densities of seeds influenced by chemical, farmyard manure, vermicompost and biological fertilizers. Int J Agric Crop Sci 2227.
- Bashan, Y., 1998. Inoculants of plant growth-promoting bacteria for use in agriculture. Biotechnol. Adv. 16, 729–770.
- Bashan, Yoav, de-Bashan, Luz E., Prabhu, S.R., Hernandez, J.-P., 2014. Advances in plant growth-promoting bacterial inoculant technology: Formulations and practical perspectives (1998–2013). Plant Soil 378, 1–33.
- Baum, C., El-Tohamy, W., Gruda, N., 2015. Increasing the productivity and product quality of vegetable crops using arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi: A review. Sci Hortic (Amsterdam) 187, 131–141. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scienta.2015.03.002>.

- Beedy, T.L., Snapp, S.S., Akinnifesi, F.K., Sileshi, G.W., 2010. Impact of *Gliricidia sepium* intercropping on soil organic matter fractions in a maize-based cropping system. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 138, 139–146. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2010.04.008>.
- Bell, M.J., Worrall, F., 2011. Charcoal addition to soils in NE England: A carbon sink with environmental co-benefits? *Sci Total Environ* 409, 1704–1714. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2011.01.031>.
- Bellon, S., Penvern, S., 2014. Organic farming, prototype for sustainable agricultures: Prototype for sustainable agricultures. *Org Farming, Prototype Sustain Agric Prototype Sustain Agric* 9789400779, 1–489. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7927-3>.
- Bernard, E., Larkin, R.P., Tavantzis, S., 2014. Rapeseed rotation, compost and biocontrol amendments reduce soilborne diseases and increase tuber yield in organic and conventional potato production systems. *Plant Soil* 374, 611–627. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-013-1909-4>.
- Benoit, M., Garnier, J., Beaudoin, N., Billen, G., 2016. A participative network of organic and conventional crop farms in the Seine Basin (France) for evaluating nitrate leaching and yield performance. *Agric. Syst.* 148, 105–113. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2016.07.005>.
- Berruti, A., Lumini, E., Balestrini, R., Bianciotto, V., 2016. Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi as natural biofertilizers: Let's benefit from past successes. *Front Microbiol* 6, 1–13. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2015.01559>.
- Betencourt, E., Duputel, M., Colomb, B., Desclaux, D., Hinsinger, P., 2012. Intercropping promotes the ability of durum wheat and chickpea to increase rhizosphere phosphorus availability in a low P soil. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 46, 181–190.
- Bhardwaj, D., Ansari, M.W., Sahoo, R.K., Tuteja, N., 2014. Biofertilizers function as key player in sustainable agriculture by improving soil fertility, plant tolerance and crop productivity. *Microb Cell Fact* 13, 66. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2859-13-66>.
- Bhattacharyya, P.N., Jha, D.K., 2012. Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR): emergence in agriculture. *World J. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* 28, 1327–1350. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11274-011-0979-9>.
- Bhattacharjee, R., Dey, U., 2014. Biofertilizer, a way towards organic agriculture: A review. *African J Microbiol Res* 8, 2332–2342. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.5897/AJMR2013.6374>.
- Blanco-Canqui, H., Claassen, M.M., Presley, D.R., 2012. Summer cover crops fix nitrogen, increase crop yield, and improve soil-crop relationships. *Agron J* 104, 137–147. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj2011.0240>.
- Bogužas, V., Mikučionienė, R., Šlepetienė, A., 2015. Long-term effect of tillage systems, straw and green manure combinations on soil organic matter. *Zemdirbyste-Agriculture* 102, 243–250. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.13080/z-a.2015.102.031>.
- Borugă, T., Ciontu, C., Borugă, I., Sândou, D.-I., 2016. Optimizing the use of mineral and organic nitrogen fertilizers for barley crops on reddish preluvo soil at moara domnesca. *Agric Agric Sci Procedia* 10, 129–134. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aaspro.2016.09.039>.
- Brankatschk, G., Finkbeiner, M., 2015. Modeling crop rotation in agricultural LCAs - challenges and potential solutions. *Agric Syst* 138, 66–76. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2015.05.008>.
- Brockwell, J., Bottomley, P.J., Thies, J.E., 1995. Manipulation of rhizobia micro flora for improving legume productivity and soil fertility: a critical assessment. *Plant Soil* 174, 143–180.

- Bruning, B., van Logtestijn, R., Broekman, R., 2015. Growth and nitrogen fixation of legumes at increased salinity under field conditions: Implications for the use of green manures in saline environments. *AoB Plants* 7, 1–8. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/aobpla/plv010>.
- Burnett, S.E., Mattson, N.S., Williams, K.A., 2015. Substrates and fertilizers for organic container production of herbs, vegetables, and herbaceous ornamental plants grown in greenhouses in the United States. *Sci Hortic (Amsterdam)* 208, 111–119. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scienta.2016.01.001>.
- Buss, W., Graham, M.C., Shepherd, J.G., Mašek, O., 2016. Suitability of marginal biomass-derived biochars for soil amendment. *Sci Total Environ* 547, 314–322. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.11.148>.
- Bustamante, M.A., Ceglie, F.G., Aly, A., 2016. Phosphorus availability from rock phosphate: Combined effect of green waste composting and sulfur addition. *J Environ Manage* 182, 557–563. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2016.08.016>.
- Campiglia, E., Radicetti, E., Brunetti, P., Mancinelli, R., 2014. Do cover crop species and residue management play a leading role in pepper productivity? *Sci Hortic (Amsterdam)* 166, 97–104. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scienta.2013.12.018>.
- Castán, E., Satti, P., González-Polo, M., 2016. Managing the value of composts as organic amendments and fertilizers in sandy soils. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 224, 29–38. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2016.03.016>.
- Castellanos-Navarrete, A., Tittonell, P., Rufino, M.C., Giller, K.E., 2014. Feeding, crop residue and manure management for integrated soil fertility management - A case study from Kenya. *Agric Syst* 134, 24–35. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2014.03.001>.
- Castellazzi, M.S., Wood, G.A., Burgess, P.J., 2008. A systematic representation of crop rotations. *Agric Syst* 97, 26–33. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2007.10.006>.
- Cavigelli, M.A., Teasdale, J.R., Spargo, J.T., 2013. Increasing crop rotation diversity improves agronomic, economic, and environmental performance of organic grain cropping systems at the USDA-ARS beltsville farming systems project. *Crop Manag* 9–12. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1094/CM-2013-0429-02-PS.Despite>.
- Cavoski, I., Al Chami, Z., Jarrar, M., Mondelli, D., 2016. Solutions for soil fertility management to overcome the challenges of the mediterranean organic agriculture: Tomato plant case study. *Soil Res* 54, 125–133. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1071/SR15067>.
- Chandran, M., Manisha, A., Subashini, A., 2014. Production of phosphate biofertilizer using lignocellulosic waste as carrier material. *Asian J Chem* 26, 2065.
- Chapagain, T., Riseman, A., 2014. Barley-pea intercropping: Effects on land productivity, carbon and nitrogen transformations. *F Crop Res* 166, 18–25. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2014.06.014>.
- Chaudhary, S., Dheri, G.S., Brar, B.S., 2017. Long-term effects of NPK fertilizers and organic manures on carbon stabilization and management index under rice-wheat cropping system. *Soil Tillage Res* 166, 59–66. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2016.10.005>.
- Chauhan, H., Bagyaraj, D.J., Selvakumar, G., Sundaram, S.P., 2015. Novel plant growth promoting rhizobacteria-prospects and potential. *Appl Soil Ecol* 95, 38–53. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2015.05.011>.
- Chen Y.P., Rekha P.D., Arun A.B., Shen F.T., Lai W., Young C.C. (2006) Phosphate solubilizing bacteria from subtropical soil and their tricalcium phosphate solubilizing abilities. 34:33–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2005.12.002>.

- Chidumayo, E.N., Gumbo, D.J., 2013. The environmental impacts of charcoal production in tropical ecosystems of the world: A synthesis. *Energy Sustain Dev* 17, 86–94. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esd.2012.07.004>.
- Chivenge, P.P., Murwira, H.K., Giller, K.E., 2007. Long-term impact of reduced tillage and residue management on soil carbon stabilization: Implications for conservation agriculture on contrasting soils. *Soil Tillage Res* 94, 328–337. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2006.08.006>.
- Christel, W., Bruun, S., Magid, J., Jensen, L.S., 2014. Phosphorus availability from the solid fraction of pig slurry is altered by composting or thermal treatment. *Bioresour Technol* 169, 543–551. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2014.07.030>.
- Chu, B.C., Garcia-Herrero, A., Johanson, T.H., Krewulak, K.D., Lau, C.K., Peacock, R.S., et al., 2010. Siderophore uptake in bacteria and the battle for iron with the host; a bird's eye view. *Biomaterials* 23, 601–611. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10534-010-9361-x>.
- Cicek, H., Entz, M., 2014. Grazing green manures to optimize nitrogen supply on the canadian prairies. In: Rahmann, G., Aksoy, U. (Eds.), *Building Organic Bridges, 1. Johann Heinrich von Thünen-Institut, Braunschweig, Germany*, pp. 101–104, Thuenen Report, no. 20.
- Cicek, H., Martens, J.R.T., Bamford, K.C., Entz, M.H., 2014a. Forage potential of six leguminous green manures and effect of grazing on following grain crops. *Renew Agric Food Syst* 30, 503–514. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742170514000349>.
- Cicek, H., Thiessen Martens, J.R., Bamford, K.C., Entz, M.H., 2014b. Effects of grazing two green manure crop types in organic farming systems: N supply and productivity of following grain crops. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 190, 27–36. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2013.09.028>.
- Cookson, W.R., Cornforth, I.S., Rowarth, J.S., 2002. Winter soil temperature (2–15 °C) effects on nitrogen transformations in clover green manure amended or unamended soils; a laboratory and field study. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* 34, 1401–1415. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0038-0717\(02\)00083-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0038-0717(02)00083-4).
- Crittenden, S.J., Poot, N., Heinen, M., 2015. Soil physical quality in contrasting tillage systems in organic and conventional farming. *Soil Tillage Res* 154, 136–144. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2015.06.018>.
- Dabin, Z., Pengwei, Y., Na, Z., 2015. Responses of winter wheat production to green manure and nitrogen fertilizer on the loess plateau. *Agron J* 107, 361–374. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj14.0432>.
- Dari, B., Nair, V.D., Harris, W.G., 2016. Relative influence of soil- vs. biochar properties on soil phosphorus retention. *Geoderma* 280, 82–87. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2016.06.018>.
- Das, I., Singh, A.P., 2014. Effect of Ppgr and Organic Manures on Soil Properties of Organically Cultivated Mungbean. 9, 27–29.
- de Araujo Neto, S.E., Campos, P.A., Tavella, L.B., 2014. Organic polyculture of passion fruit, pineapple, corn and cassava: The influence of green manure and distance between espaliers. *Cienc E Agrotecnologia* 38, 247–255.
- Debiase, G., Montemurro, F., Fiore, A., 2016. Organic amendment and minimum tillage in winter wheat grown in mediterranean conditions: Effects on yield performance, soil fertility and environmental impact. *Eur J Agron* 75, 149–157. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2015.12.009>.
- Derpsch, R., 1998. Historical review of no-tillage cultivation of crops. In: *FAO International Workshop, Conservation Tillage for Sustainable Agriculture* 205–218.

- Derpsch, R., Franzluebbers, A.J., Duiker, S.W., 2014. Why do we need to standardize no-tillage research?. *Soil Tillage Res* 137, 16–22. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2013.10.002>.
- Dogliotti, S., Rossing, W.A.H., Van Ittersum, M.K., 2003. ROTAT, a tool for systematically generating crop rotations. *Eur J Agron* 19, 239–250. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1161-0301\(02\)00047-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1161-0301(02)00047-3).
- Drakopoulos, D., Scholberg, J.M.S., Lantinga, E.A., Tiftonell, P.A., 2016. Influence of reduced tillage and fertilization regime on crop performance and nitrogen utilization of organic potato. *Org Agric* 6, 75–87. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13165-015-0110-x>.
- Duca, D., Lorz, J., Patten, C.L., 2014. Indole-3-acetic acid in plant–microbe interactions. *Antonie Van Leeuwenhoek* 106, 85–125.
- Duffková, R., Hejčman, M., Libichová, H., 2015. Effect of cattle slurry on soil and herbage chemical properties, yield, nutrient balance and plant species composition of moderately dry Arrhenatherion grassland. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 213, 281–289. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2015.07.018>.
- Dury, J., Schaller, N., Garcia, F., 2012. Models to support cropping plan and crop rotation decisions. A review. *Agron Sustain Dev* 32, 567–580. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-011-0037-x>.
- Duval, M.E., Galantini, J.A., Capurro, J.E., Martinez, J.M., 2016. Winter cover crops in soybean monoculture: Effects on soil organic carbon and its fractions. *Soil Tillage Res* 161, 95–105. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2016.04.006>.
- Edi Husen, E.H., Simanungkalit, R.D.M., Saraswati, R., Irawan, I., 2007. Characterization and quality assessment of Indonesian commercial biofertilizers. *Indones. J. Agric. Sci.* 8, 31–38.
- Egodawatta, W.C.P., Sangakkara, U.R., Stamp, P., 2012. Impact of green manure and mineral fertilizer inputs on soil organic matter and crop productivity in a sloping landscape of Sri Lanka. *F Crop Res* 129, 21–27. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2012.01.010>.
- Espinoza, S., Ovalle, C., Zagal, E., 2012. Contribution of legumes to wheat productivity in mediterranean environments of central chile. *F Crop Res* 133, 150–159. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2012.03.006>.
- Evanylo, G., Sherony, C., Spargo, J., 2008. Soil and water environmental effects of fertilizer-, manure-, and compost-based fertility practices in an organic vegetable cropping system. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 127, 50–58. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2008.02.014>.
- Fangueiro, D., Surgy, S., Fraga, I., 2015. Band application of treated cattle slurry as an alternative to slurry injection: Implications for gaseous emissions, soil quality, and plant growth. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 211, 102–111. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2015.06.003>.
- Fernandez, A.L., Sheaffer, C.C., Wyse, D.L., 2016. Structure of bacterial communities in soil following cover crop and organic fertilizer incorporation. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 1–11. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-016-7736-9>.
- Fernández-Hernández, A., Roig, A., Serramiá, N., 2014. Application of compost of two-phase olive mill waste on olive grove: Effects on soil, olive fruit and olive oil quality. *Waste Manag* 34, 1139–1147. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2014.03.027>.
- Ferrari, A.E., Ravnskov, S., Larsen, J., 2015. Crop rotation and seasonal effects on fatty acid profiles of neutral and phospholipids extracted from no-till agricultural soils. *Soil Use Manag* 31, 165–175. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/sum.12165>.
- Ferreira, E.P.B., Stone, L.F., Didonet, A.D., 2013. Green manure species and sowing time effects on the agronomic performance of common bean. *Agron J* 105, 1721–1727. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj2012.0478>.

- Flores-Félix, J.D., Menéndez, E., Rivera, L.P., Marcos-García, M., Martínez-Hidalgo, P., Mateos, P.F., et al., 2013. Use of *Rhizobium leguminosarum* as a potential biofertilizer for *Lactuca sativa* and *Daucus carota* crops. *J. Plant Nutr. Soil Sci.* 176, 876–882. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1002/jpln.201300116>.
- Flores-Félix, J.D., Silva, L.R., Rivera, L.P., Marcos-García, M., García-Fraile, P., Martínez-Molina, E., et al., 2015. Plants probiotics as a tool to produce highly functional fruits: the case of phyllobacterium and vitamin C in strawberries. *PLoS One* 10, e0122281. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0122281>.
- Franche, C., Lindström, K., Elmerich, C., 2009. Nitrogen-fixing bacteria associated with leguminous and non-leguminous plants. *Plant Soil* 321, 35–59. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-008-9833-8>.
- Freitas, M.A., Medeiros, F.H.V., Carvalho, S.P., Guilherme, L.R.G., Teixeira, W.D., Zhang, H., et al., 2015. Augmenting iron accumulation in cassava by the beneficial soil bacterium *Bacillus subtilis* (GBO3). *Front Plant Sci* 6, 596.
- Gabriel, J.L., Alonso-Ayuso, M., García-González, I., 2016. Nitrogen use efficiency and fertiliser fate in a long-term experiment with winter cover crops. *Eur J Agron* 79, 14–22. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2016.04.015>.
- Gadermaier, F., Berner, A., Fließbach, A., 2011. Impact of reduced tillage on soil organic carbon and nutrient budgets under organic farming. *Renew Agric Food Syst* 27, 1–13. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742170510000554>.
- Galgani, P., van der Voet, E., Korevaar, G., 2014. Composting, anaerobic digestion and biochar production in Ghana. Environmental-economic assessment in the context of voluntary carbon markets. *Waste Manag* 34, 2454–2465. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2014.07.027>.
- García-Fraile, P., Menendez, E., Rivas, R., 2015. Role of bacterial biofertilizers in agriculture and forestry. *AIMS Bioeng* 2, 183–205. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3934/bioeng.2015.3.183>.
- García-Franco, N., Albaladejo, J., Almagro, M., Martínez-Mena, M., 2015. Beneficial effects of reduced tillage and green manure on soil aggregation and stabilization of organic carbon in a Mediterranean agroecosystem. *Soil Tillage Res* 153, 66–75. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2015.05.010>.
- García-Fraile, P., Carro, L., Robledo, M., Ramírez-Bahena, M.-H., Flores-Félix, J.-D., Fernández, M.T., et al., 2012. *Rhizobium* promotes non-legumes growth and quality in several production steps: towards a biofertilization of edible raw vegetables healthy for humans. *PLoS One* 7, e38122. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0038122>.
- Glick, B.R., 2014. Bacteria with ACC deaminase can promote plant growth and help to feed the world. *Microbiol Res* 169, 30–39. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micres.2013.09.009>.
- Gómez-Muñoz, B., Hatch, D.J., Bol, R., García-Ruiz, R., 2014. Nutrient dynamics during decomposition of the residues from a sown legume or ruderal plant cover in an olive oil orchard. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 184, 115–123. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2013.11.020>.
- Gomiero, T., Pimentel, D., Paoletti, M.G., 2011. Environmental impact of different agricultural management practices: Conventional vs. organic agriculture. *CRC Crit Rev Plant Sci* 30, 95–124. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/07352689.2011.554355>.
- Gonzaga, M.I.S., Mackowiak, C.L., Comerford, N.B., 2017. Pyrolysis methods impact biosolids-derived biochar composition, maize growth and nutrition. *Soil Tillage Res* 165, 59–65. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2016.07.009>.



- Götze, P., Rücknagel, J., Jacobs, A., 2016. Environmental impacts of different crop rotations in terms of soil compaction. *J Environ Manage* 181, 54–63. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2016.05.048>.
- Grobelak, A., Napora, A., Kacprzak, M., 2015. Using plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) to improve plant growth. *Ecol Eng* 84, 22–28. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2015.07.019>.
- Gul, S., Whalen, J.K., Thomas, B.W., Sachdeva, V., Deng, H., 2015. Physico-chemical properties and microbial responses in biochar-amended soils: mechanisms and future directions. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 206, 46–59. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2015.03.015>.
- Guo, X., Xiong, H., Shen, H., 2014. Dynamics in the rhizosphere and iron-uptake gene expression in peanut induced by intercropping with maize: Role in improving iron nutrition in peanut. *Plant Physiol Biochem* 76, 36–43. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plaphy.2013.12.019>.
- Gupta, G., Parihar, S.S., Ahirwar, N.K., 2015. Microbial biochemical technology plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR): Current and future prospects for development of sustainable agriculture. *J Microb Biochem Technol* 7, 96–102. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.4172/1948-5948.1000188>.
- Gustafson, G.M., Salomon, E., Jonsson, S., Steineck, S., 2003. Fluxes of K, P, and Zn in a conventional and an organic dairy farming system through feed, animals, manure, and urine - A case study at Öjebyn, Sweden. *Eur J Agron* 20, 89–99. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1161-0301\(03\)00077-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1161-0301(03)00077-7).
- Gwenzi, W., Chaukura, N., Mukome, F.N.D., Machado, S., Nyamasoka, B., 2015. Biochar production and applications in sub-Saharan Africa: opportunities, constraints, risks and uncertainties. *J. Environ. Manage.* 150, 250–261. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2014.11.027>.
- Haag, A.F., Arnold, M.F.F., Myka, K.K., Kerscher, B., Dall'Angelo, S., Zanda, M., et al., 2013. Molecular insights into bacteroid development during *Rhizobium*-legume symbiosis. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* 37, 364–383.
- Hall, D.J.M., Bell, R.W., 2015. Biochar and Compost Increase Crop Yields but the effect is short term on sandplain soils of Western Australia. *Pedosphere* 25, 720–728. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1002-0160\(15\)30053-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1002-0160(15)30053-9).
- Hansen, V., Müller-Stöver, D., Munkholm, L.J., 2016. The effect of straw and wood gasification biochar on carbon sequestration, selected soil fertility indicators and functional groups in soil: An incubation study. *Geoderma* 269, 99–107. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2016.01.033>.
- Hauggaard-Nielsen, H., Gooding, M., Ambus, P., 2009. Pea-barley intercropping for efficient symbiotic N<sub>2</sub>-fixation, soil N acquisition and use of other nutrients in European organic cropping systems. *F Crop Res* 113, 64–71. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2009.04.009>.
- Hernández, T., García, E., García, C., 2015. A strategy for marginal semiarid degraded soil restoration: A sole addition of compost at a high rate. A five-year field experiment. *Soil Biol Biochem* 89, 61–71. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2015.06.023>.
- Higashi, T., Yungui, M., Komatsuzaki, M., 2014. Tillage and cover crop species affect soil organic carbon in Andosol, Kanto, Japan. *Soil Tillage Res* 138, 64–72. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2013.12.010>.
- Hilton, S., Bennett, A.J., Keane, G., 2013. Impact of shortened crop rotation of oilseed rape on soil and rhizosphere microbial diversity in relation to yield decline. *PLoS One* 8, 1–12. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0059859>.

- Hödtker, M., Lopes de Almeida, D., Köpke, U., 2016. Intercropping of maize and pulses: an evaluation of organic cropping systems. *Org. Agric* 6, 1–17. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13165-015-0108-4>.
- Hokazono, S., Hayashi, K., 2015. Life cycle assessment of organic paddy rotation systems using land-and product-based indicators: a case study in Japan. *Int. J. Life Cycle Assess.* 20 (8), 1061–1075.
- Holland, J.M., 2004. The environmental consequences of adopting conservation tillage in Europe: reviewing the evidence. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 103, 1–25. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2003.12.018>.
- Holm-Nielsen, J.B., Seadi, T.A., Oleskowicz-Popiel, P., 2009. The future of anaerobic digestion and biogas utilization. *Bioresour. Technol.* 100, 5478–5484. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2008.12.046>.
- Hou, Y., Velthof, G.L., Oenema, O., 2015. Mitigation of ammonia, nitrous oxide and methane emissions from manure management chains: A meta-analysis and integrated assessment. *Glob Chang Biol* 21, 1293–1312. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12767>.
- Huang, M., Jiang, L., Zou, Y., 2013. Changes in soil microbial properties with no-tillage in Chinese cropping systems. *Biol Fertil Soils* 49, 373–377. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00374-013-0778-6>.
- Hussain, N., Abbasi, T., Abbasi, S.A., 2016. Vermicomposting transforms allelopathic parthenium into a benign organic fertilizer. *J Environ Manage* 180, 180–189. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2016.05.013>.
- Hwang, H.Y., Kim, G.W., Lee, Y.B., 2015. Improvement of the value of green manure via mixed hairy vetch and barley cultivation in temperate paddy soil. *F Crop Res* 183, 138–146. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2015.08.001>.
- Iqbal, H., Garcia-Perez, M., Flury, M., 2015. Effect of biochar on leaching of organic carbon, nitrogen, and phosphorus from compost in bioretention systems. *Sci Total Environ* 521–522, 37–45. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.03.060>.
- Islas-Valdez, S., Lucho-Constantino, C.A., Beltrán-Hernández, R.I., 2015. Effectiveness of rabbit manure biofertilizer in barley crop yield. *Environ Sci Pollut Res* . Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-015-5665-2>.
- Jahan, M.A.H.S., Hossain, A., Sarkar, M.A.R., 2016. Productivity impacts and nutrient balances of an intensive potato-mungbean-rice crop rotation in multiple environments of Bangladesh. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 231, 79–97. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2016.06.032>.
- Jannoura, R., Bruns, C., Joergensen, R.G., 2013. Organic fertilizer effects on pea yield, nutrient uptake, microbial root colonization and soil microbial biomass indices in organic farming systems. *Eur J Agron* 49, 32–41. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2013.03.002>.
- Jannoura, R., Joergensen, R.G., Bruns, C., 2014. Organic fertilizer effects on growth, crop yield, and soil microbial biomass indices in sole and intercropped peas and oats under organic farming conditions. *Eur J Agron* 52, 259–270. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2013.09.001>.
- Jeločnik, M., Ion, R.A., Jovanović, M., Popescu, C.G., 2015. Has organic farming potential for development? comparative study in Romania and Serbia. *Procedia Econ Financ* 22, 268–276. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(15\)00280-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(15)00280-4).
- Jeong, C.Y., Dodla, S.K., Wang, J.J., 2016. Fundamental and molecular composition characteristics of biochars produced from sugarcane and rice crop residues and by-products. *Chemosphere* 142, 4–13. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2015.05.084>.

- Jindo, K., Sonoki, T., Matsumoto, K., 2015. Influence of biochar addition on the humic substances of composting manures. *Waste Manag* 49, 545–552. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2016.01.007>.
- John, B., Praba, M.L., 2013. Effect of Vermicompost on the growth and yield of tomato. *Int J Pharma Bio Sci* 4, 1284–1290.
- Jones, D., Ryan, C.M., Fisher, J., 2016. Charcoal as a diversification strategy: The flexible role of charcoal production in the livelihoods of smallholders in central Mozambique. *Energy Sustain Dev* 32, 14–21. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esd.2016.02.009>.
- Jorgensen, K., Magid, J., Luxhøj, J., Jensen, L.S., 2010. Phosphorus distribution in untreated and composted solid fractions from slurry separation all rights reserved. No part of this periodical may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recor. *J Environ Qual* 39, 393–401. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2134/jeq2009.0168>.
- Joseph, S., Pow, D., Dawson, K., 2015. Feeding biochar to cows: An innovative solution for improving soil fertility and farm productivity. *Pedosphere* 25, 666–679. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1002-0160\(15\)30047-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1002-0160(15)30047-3).
- Joshi, R., Singh, J., Vig, A.P., 2014. Vermicompost as an effective organic fertilizer and biocontrol agent: effect on growth, yield and quality of plants. *Rev. Environ. Sci. Bio/Technol* 14, 137–159. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11157-014-9347-1>.
- Kareem, I.A., Adepetu, A.A., Olowolafe, E.A., 2014. Rattle tree (*Albizia lebbek* Benth.) effects on potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.) productivity on the Jos Plateau, Nigeria. *Ratar i Povrt* 51, 116–126. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.5937/ratpov51-5069>.
- Karlen, D.L., Cambardella, C.A., Kovar, J.L., Colvin, T.S., 2013. Soil quality response to long-term tillage and crop rotation practices. *Soil Tillage Res* 133, 54–64. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2013.05.013>.
- Khan, A.L., Halo, B.A., Elyassi, A., 2016a. Indole acetic acid and ACC deaminase from endophytic bacteria improves the growth of *Solanum lycopersicum*. *Electron J Biotechnol* 21, 58–64. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejbt.2016.02.001>.
- Khan, N., Clark, I., Sánchez-Monedero, M.A., 2016b. Physical and chemical properties of biochars co-composted with biowastes and incubated with a chicken litter compost. *Chemosphere* 142, 14–23. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2015.05.065>.
- Kim, S.Y., Gutierrez, J., Kim, P.J., 2012. Considering winter cover crop selection as green manure to control methane emission during rice cultivation in paddy soil. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 161, 130–136. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2012.07.026>.
- Klodd, A.E., Eissenstat, D.M., Wolf, T.K., Centinari, M., 2016. Coping with cover crop competition in mature grapevines. *Plant Soil* 400, 391–402. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-015-2748-2>.
- Kookana, R.S., Sarmah, A.K., Zwieten, L. Van, 2011. In: Sparks, D.L. (Ed.), Chapter three - Biochar Application to Soil: Agronomic and Environmental Benefits and Unintended Consequences. Academic Press, pp. 103–143.
- Kumar A., Choudhary C.S., Paswan D., (2014) Sustainable way for enhancing phosphorus efficiency in agricultural soils through phosphate solubilizing microbes. 9:300–310.
- Kuppusamy, S., Thavamani, P., Megharaj, M., 2016. Agronomic and remedial benefits and risks of applying biochar to soil: Current knowledge and future research directions. *Environ Int* 87, 1–12. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2015.10.018>.

- Lacombe, S., Bradley, R.L., Hamel, C., Beaulieu, C., 2009. Do tree-based intercropping systems increase the diversity and stability of soil microbial communities?. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 131, 25–31. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2008.08.010>.
- Latati, M., Bargaz, A., Belarbi, B., 2016. The intercropping common bean with maize improves the rhizobial efficiency, resource use and grain yield under low phosphorus availability. *Eur J Agron* 72, 80–90. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2015.09.015>.
- Lee, C.H., Park, K. Do, Jung, K.Y., 2010. Effect of Chinese milk vetch (*Astragalus sinicus* L.) as a green manure on rice productivity and methane emission in paddy soil. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 138, 343–347. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2010.05.011>.
- Lee, S.E., Park, J.M., Noh, J.S., 2013. Cutting frequency and liquid manure application on green manure production of rye and hairy vetch in pear orchard. *Korean J Soil Sci Fertil* 46, 322–326.
- Lesueur D., Deaker R., Herrmann L. (2016) The Production and potential of biofertilizers to improve crop yields.
- Li, J., Dai, J., Liu, G., 2016. Biochar from microwave pyrolysis of biomass: A review. *Biomass and Bioenergy* 94, 228–244. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2016.09.010>.
- Liebig, J., Playfair, L.P.B., 1847. *Chemistry in its application to agriculture and physiology*. TB Peterson.
- Lienhard, P., Tivet, F., Chabanne, A., 2013. No-till and cover crops shift soil microbial abundance and diversity in Laos tropical grasslands. *Agron Sustain Dev* 33, 375–384. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-012-0099-4>.
- Lim K.H., Choi H.S., Kim W.S., (2012) Nutrient contribution of green manure crops in an organic pear orchard.
- Lim, S.L., Wu, T.Y., Lim, P.N., Shak, K.P.Y., 2015. The use of vermicompost in organic farming: Overview, effects on soil and economics. *J Sci Food Agric* 95, 1143–1156. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.6849>.
- Løes, A.-K., Bünemann, E.K., Cooper, J., 2016. Nutrient supply to organic agriculture as governed by EU regulations and standards in six European countries. *Org Agric* . Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13165-016-0165-3>.
- Lopedota, O., Leogrande, R., Fiore, A., 2013. Yield and soil responses of melon grown with different organic fertilizers. *J Plant Nutr* 36, 415–428. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01904167.2012.748062>.
- Lourenzi C.R., Ceretta C.A., Tiecher T.L., (2015) Forms of phosphorus transfer in runoff under no-tillage in a soil treated with successive swine effluents applications. doi: 10.1007/s10661-015-4437-2.
- Lugtenberg, B., Kamilova, F., 2009. Plant-growth-promoting rhizobacteria. *Annu Rev Microbiol* 63, 541–556.
- Madejón, P., Alaejos, J., García-Álbalá, J., 2016. Three-year study of fast-growing trees in degraded soils amended with composts: Effects on soil fertility and productivity. *J Environ Manage* 169, 18–26. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2015.11.050>.
- Mahdi, S.S., Hassan, G.I., Samoon, S.A., 2010. Bio-fertilizers in organic. *Agriculture. J Phytol* 2, 42–54.
- Maltais-Landry, G., Scow, K., Brennan, E., 2016. Higher flexibility in input N: P ratios results in more balanced phosphorus budgets in two long-term experimental agroecosystems. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 223, 197–210. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2016.03.007>.
- Manevski, K., Børgesen, C.D., Andersen, M.N., Kristensen, I.S., 2015. Reduced nitrogen leaching by intercropping maize with red fescue on sandy soils in North Europe: A combined

- field and modeling study. *Plant Soil* 388, 67–85. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-014-2311-6>.
- Mangmang, J.S., Deaker, R., Rogers, G., 2015. Inoculation effect of azospirillum brasilense on basil grown under aquaponics production system. *Org Agric* 65–74. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13165-015-0115-5>.
- Manolikaki, I.I., Mangolis, A., Diamadopoulos, E., 2016. The impact of biochars prepared from agricultural residues on phosphorus release and availability in two fertile soils. *J Environ Manage* 181, 536–543. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2016.07.012>.
- Mao, L., Zhang, L., Zhang, S., Evers, J.B., Van Der Werf, W., Wang, J., et al., 2015. Resource use efficiency, ecological intensification and sustainability of intercropping systems. *J. Integr. Agric.* 14, 1542–1550. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2095-3119\(15\)61039-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2095-3119(15)61039-5).
- Martínez, E., Fuentes, J.P., Pino, V., 2013. Chemical and biological properties as affected by no-tillage and conventional tillage systems in an irrigated haploxoeroll of central chile. *Soil Tillage Res* 126, 238–245. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2012.07.014>.
- Mathew, R.P., Feng, Y., Githinji, L., 2012. Impact of no-tillage and conventional tillage systems on soil microbial communities. *Appl Environ Soil Sci.* Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1155/2012/548620>.
- McLaughlin, M.R., Brooks, J.P., Adeli, A., Miles, D.M., 2015. Using broiler litter and swine manure lagoon effluent in sawdust-based swine mortality composts: Effects on nutrients, bacteria, and gaseous emissions. *Sci Total Environ* 532, 265–280. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.05.119>.
- Meena, M.D., Joshi, P.K., Jat, H.S., 2016. Changes in biological and chemical properties of saline soil amended with municipal solid waste compost and chemical fertilizers in a mustard-pearl millet cropping system. *Catena* 140, 1–8. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2016.01.009>.
- Mendes, T.D., Borges, W.S., Rodrigues, A., Solomon, S.E., Vieira, P.C., Duarte, M.C.T., et al., 2013. Anti-*Candida* properties of urauchimycins from actinobacteria associated with *Trachymyrmex* ants. *Biomed Res. Int.* 2013, 835081.
- Menéndez, E., Mulas, R., González-Andrés, F., Velázquez, E., 2016. Bacterial endophytes and plant growth promotion. In: Gorawala, P., Mandhatri, S. (Eds.), *Agricultural Research Updates*. Nova Publishers, pp. 13–44.
- Merlin, A., He, Z.L., Rosolem, C.A., 2013. Ruzigrass affecting soil-phosphorus availability. *Pesqui Agropecu Bras* 48, 1583–1588. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0100-204X2013001200007>.
- Millan, M., Garcin, A., Chereau, R., Gehant, L., 2016. Mobilizing natural processes to increase nitrogen availability in organic apricot orchards. *Acta Horticulturae. International Society for Horticultural Science (ISHS), Leuven, Belgium*, pp. 87–90.
- Miyazawa, K., Takeda, M., Murakami, T., Murayama, T., 2014. Dual and triple intercropping: Potential benefits for annual green manure production. *Plant Prod Sci* 17, 194–201. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1626/pp.s.17.194>.
- Mkhathini, K., Modi, A., 2012. Effects of cover crops-green manure use on cabbage yield in the midlands of kwazulu-natal, South africa. *African Journal of Horticultural Science* 6.
- Mohammadi, K., Sohrabi, Y., 2012. Bacterial Biofertilizers for Sustainable Crop Production: a Review. 7, 307–316.
- Moharana, P.C., Biswas, D.R., 2016. Assessment of maturity indices of rock phosphate enriched composts using variable crop residues. *Bioresour Technol* 222, 1–13. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2016.09.097>.

- Molnár, M., Vaszita, E., Farkas, É., 2015. Acidic sandy soil improvement with biochar - a microcosm study. *Sci Total Environ* 563–564, 855–865. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.01.091>.
- Morales-Corts, M.R., Gómez-Sánchez, M.Á., Pérez-Sánchez, R., 2014. Evaluation of green/pruning wastes compost and vermicompost, slumgum compost and their mixes as growing media for horticultural production. *Sci Hortic (Amsterdam)* 172, 155–160. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scienta.2014.03.048>.
- Mu, D., Horowitz, N., Casey, M., Jones, K., 2016. Environmental and economic analysis of an in-vessel food waste composting system at Kean University in the U.S. *Waste Manag.* Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2016.10.026>.
- Murchie, A.K., Blackshaw, R.P., Gordon, A.W., Christie, P., 2015. Responses of earthworm species to long-term applications of slurry. *Appl Soil Ecol* 96, 60–67. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2015.07.005>.
- N'Dayegamiye, A., Whalen, J.K., Tremblay, G., 2015. The benefits of legume crops on corn and wheat yield, nitrogen nutrition, and soil properties improvement. *Agron J* 107, 1653–1665. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj14.0416>.
- Naher, U.A., Othman, R., Panhwar, Q.A., 2013. Beneficial effects of mycorrhizal association for crop production in the tropics - a review. *Int J Agric Biol* 15, 1021–1028.
- Nascente, A.S., Crusciol, C.A.C., Cobucci, T., 2013. The no-tillage system and cover crops alternatives to increase upland rice yields. *Eur J Agron* 45, 124–131. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2012.09.004>.
- Nascimento V., Arf O., Aparecida M., (2016) Economic analysis of rice and common bean production in succession to green manure crops and mechanical soil decomposition. 315–322.
- Ngwira, A.R., Aune, J.B., Mkwinda, S., 2012. On-farm evaluation of yield and economic benefit of short term maize legume intercropping systems under conservation agriculture in Malawi. *Field Crops Res.* 132, 149–157. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2011.12.014>.
- Nkoa, R., 2014. Agricultural benefits and environmental risks of soil fertilization with anaerobic digestates: A review. *Agron Sustain Dev* 34, 473–492. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-013-0196-z>.
- Northupl, B.K., Rao, S.C., 2015. Green manures in continuous wheat systems affect grain yield and nitrogen content. *Agron J* 107, 1666. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj14.0428>.
- Novak, J., Ro, K., Ok, Y.S., 2016. Biochars multifunctional role as a novel technology in the agricultural, environmental, and industrial sectors. *Chemosphere* 142, 1–3. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2015.06.066>.
- Novara, A., Gristina, L., Guaitoli, F., Santoro, A., Cerdà, A., 2013. Managing soil nitrate with cover crops and buffer strips in Sicilian vineyards. *Solid Earth* 4, 255–262. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.5194/se-4-255-2013>.
- Obia, A., Mulder, J., Martinsen, V., Cornelissen, G., Børresen, T., 2016. In situ effects of biochar on aggregation, water retention and porosity in light-textured tropical soils. *Soil Tillage Res.* 155, 35–44. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2015.08.002>.
- Ogbo, F.C., 2010. Conversion of cassava wastes for biofertilizer production using phosphate solubilizing fungi. *Bioresour Technol* 101, 4120–4124. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2009.12.057>.
- Olesen, J.E., Askegaard, M., Rasmussen, I.A., 2009. Winter cereal yields as affected by animal manure and green manure in organic arable farming. *Eur J Agron* 30, 119–128. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2008.08.002>.

- Omari, R.A., Aung, H.P., Hou, M., 2016. Influence of different plant materials in combination with chicken manure on soil carbon and nitrogen contents and vegetable yield. *Pedosphere* 26, 510–521. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1002-0160\(15\)60061-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1002-0160(15)60061-3).
- Pal S., Singh H.B., Farooqui A., Rakshit A. (2015) Fungal biofertilizers in Indian agriculture: Perception, demand and promotion. 10:101–113.
- Pandey, P.K., Cao, W., Biswas, S., Vaddella, V., 2016a. A new closed loop heating system for composting of green and food wastes. *J Clean Prod* 133, 1252–1259. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.05.114>.
- Pandey, V., Patel, A., Patra, D.D., 2016b. Biochar ameliorates crop productivity, soil fertility, essential oil yield and aroma profiling in basil (*Ocimum basilicum* L.). *Ecol Eng* 90, 361–366. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2016.01.020>.
- Pandiaraj, T., Selvaraj, S., Ramu, N., 2015. Effects of Crop Residue Management and Nitrogen Fertilizer on Soil Nitrogen and Carbon Content and Productivity of Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) in Two Cropping Systems. 17, 249–260.
- Paneque, M., De la Rosa, J.M., Franco-Navarro, J.D., 2016. Effect of biochar amendment on morphology, productivity and water relations of sunflower plants under non-irrigation conditions. *Catena* 147, 280–287. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2016.07.037>.
- Papafilippaki, A., Paranychiakis, N., Nikolaidis, N.P., 2015. Effects of soil type and municipal solid waste compost as soil amendment on *cichorium spinosum* (spiny chicory) growth. *Sci Hortic (Amsterdam)* 195, 195–205. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scienta.2015.09.030>.
- Paredes, C., Pérez-Murcia, M.D., Bustamante, M.A., 2014. Valorization of mediterranean livestock manures: Composting of rabbit and goat manure and quality assessment of the compost obtained. *Commun Soil Sci Plant Anal* 46, 248–255. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00103624.2014.989027>.
- Park J.-H., Park S.-J., Kwon O.-H., (2015). Effect of green manure cultivations on yield and anthocyanin content in organic grapevine. *한국유기농업학회지* 23:281–289.
- Parmar, P., Sindhu, S.S., 2013. Potassium solubilization by rhizosphere bacteria: Influence of nutritional and environmental conditions. *J Microbiol Res* 3, 25–31. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.5923/j.microbiology.20130301.04>.
- Partey, S.T., Preziosi, R.F., Robson, G.D., 2014. Short-term interactive effects of biochar, green manure, and inorganic fertilizer on soil properties and agronomic characteristics of maize. *Agric Res* 3, 128–136. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40003-014-0102-1>.
- Pattnaik, S., Reddy, M.V., 2010. Nutrient status of vermicompost of urban green waste processed by three earthworm species—*eisenia fetida*, *eudrilus eugeniae*, and *perionyx excavatus*. *Appl Environ Soil Sci*. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1155/2010/967526>.
- Penha, H.G.V., Menezes, J.F.S., Silva, C.A., 2015. Nutrient accumulation and availability and crop yields following long-term application of pig slurry in a Brazilian Cerrado soil. *Nutr Cycl Agroecosystems* 101, 259–269. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10705-015-9677-6>.
- Plaza, C., Giannetta, B., Fernandez, J.M., 2016. Response of different soil organic matter pools to biochar and organic fertilizers. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 225, 150–159. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2016.04.014>.
- Pluchon, N., Vincent, A.G., Gundale, M.J., 2016. The impact of charcoal and soil mixtures on decomposition and soil microbial communities in boreal forest. *Appl Soil Ecol* 99, 40–50. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2015.11.020>.
- Poku, P.A., Agyarko, K., Dapaah, H.K., Dawuda, M.M., 2014. The productivity of soils under long-term crop production in Ghana has been declining. Influence of *Mucuna pruriens*

- Green Manure, NPK and Chicken Manure Amendments on Soil Physico – Chemical Properties and Growth and Yield of Carrot (*Daucus carota* L.) 5, 26–44.
- Ponge, J.F., Topoliantz, S., Ballof, S., 2006. Ingestion of charcoal by the amazonian earthworm *pontoscolex corethrurus*: A potential for tropical soil fertility. *Soil Biol Biochem* 38, 2008–2009. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2005.12.024>.
- Premi, O.P., Kandpal, B.K., Rathore, S.S., 2013. Green manuring, mustard residue recycling and fertilizer application affects productivity and sustainability of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) in Indian semi-arid tropics. *Ind Crops Prod* 41, 423–429. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indcrop.2012.04.030>.
- Proietti, P., Federici, E., Fidati, L., 2015. Effects of amendment with oil mill waste and its derived-compost on soil chemical and microbiological characteristics and olive (*Olea europaea* L.) productivity. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 207, 51–60. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2015.03.028>.
- Provost, C., Pedneault, K., 2015. The organic vineyard as a balanced ecosystem: Improved organic grape management and impacts on wine quality. *Sci Hortic (Amsterdam)* 208, 43–56. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scienta.2016.04.024>.
- Pushpa, A., Subhash, P.C., Reddy, M.A.H., 2014. Development of liquid formulation for the dual purpose of crop protection and production. *J Environ. Res Dev* 8, 378.
- Raboin, L.-M., Razafimahafaly, A.H.D., Rabenjarisoa, M.B., 2016. Improving the fertility of tropical acid soils: Liming versus biochar application? A long term comparison in the highlands of Madagascar. *F Crop Res* 199, 99–108. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2016.09.005>.
- Raphael, J.P.A., Calonego, J.C., Milori, D.M.B.P., Rosolem, C.A., 2016. Soil organic matter in crop rotations under no-till. *Soil Tillage Res* 155, 45–53. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2015.07.020>.
- Rathi M., Gaur N. (2016) Phosphate solubilizing bacteria as biofertilizer and its applications. 10:146–148.
- Reganold, J.P., Wachter, J.M., 2016. Organic agriculture in the twenty-first century. *Nat. Plants* 2, 15221. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1038/NPLANTS.2015.221>.
- Reeves, D.W., 1994. Cover crops and rotations. *Adv Soil Sci Crop Residue* 125–172.
- Riedell, W.E., Pikul, J.L., Jaradat, A.A., Schumacher, T.E., 2009. Crop rotation and nitrogen input effects on soil fertility, maize mineral nutrition, yield, and seed composition. *Agron J* 101, 870–879. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj2008.0186x>.
- Rincon-florez, V.A., Ng, C., Dang, Y.P., 2016. Short-term impact of an occasional tillage on microbial communities in a vertosol after 43 years of no-tillage or conventional tillage. *Eur J Soil Biol* 74, 32–38. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejsobi.2016.03.001>.
- Robacer, M., Canali, S., Kristensen, H.L., 2016. Cover crops in organic field vegetable production. *Sci Hortic (Amsterdam)* 208, 104–110. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scienta.2015.12.029>.
- Roig, A., Cayuela, M.L., Sánchez-Monedero, M.A., 2006. An overview on olive mill wastes and their valorisation methods. *Waste Manag* 26, 960–969. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2005.07.024>.
- Rosolem, C.A., Calonego, J.C., 2013. Phosphorus and potassium budget in the soil-plant system in crop rotations under no-till. *Soil Tillage Res* 126, 127–133. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2012.08.003>.
- Roy, M., Saha, S., Das, J., Srivastava, R.C., 2015. Technologies of microbial inoculation in rice - a review. *Agric Rev* 36, 125. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.5958/0976-0741.2015.00014.8>.



- Russo, G., Vivaldi, G.A., De Gennaro, B., Camposeo, S., 2015. Environmental sustainability of different soil management techniques in a high-density olive orchard. *J Clean Prod* 107, 498–508. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.06.064>.
- Sáez, J.A., Belda, R.M., Bernal, M.P., Fornes, F., 2016. Biochar improves agro-environmental aspects of pig slurry compost as a substrate for crops with energy and remediation uses. *Ind Crop Prod* 94, 97–106. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indcrop.2016.08.035>.
- Saha, M., Maurya, B.R., Meena, V.S., 2016a. Identification and characterization of potassium solubilizing bacteria (KSB) from Indo-Gangetic plains of India. *Biocatal Agric Biotechnol* 7, 202–209. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bcab.2016.06.007>.
- Saha, M., Sarkar, S., Sarkar, B., Sharma, B.K., Bhattacharjee, S., Tribedi, P., 2016b. Microbial siderophores and their potential applications: A review. *Environ Sci Pollut Res International* 23, 3984–3999.
- Sahariah, B., Sinha, I., Sharma, P., Goswami, L., Bhattacharyya, P., Gogoi, N., et al., 2014. Efficacy of bioconversion of paper mill bamboo sludge and lime waste by composting and vermicomposting technologies. *Chemosphere* 109, 77–83. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2014.02.063>.
- Säle, V., Aguilera, P., Laczko, E., 2015. Impact of conservation tillage and organic farming on the diversity of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. *Soil Biol Biochem* 84, 38–52. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2015.02.005>.
- Sánchez de Cima, D., Tein, B., Eremeev, V., 2015. Winter cover crop effects on soil structural stability and microbiological activity in organic farming. *Biol Agric Hortic* 8765, 1–12. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01448765.2015.1130646>.
- Santi, C., Bogusz, D., Franche, C., 2013. Biological nitrogen fixation in non-legume plants. *Ann Bot* 111, 743–767. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1093/aob/mct048>.
- Saxena, J., Minaxi, Jha, A., 2014. Impact of a phosphate solubilizing bacterium and an arbuscular mycorrhizal fungus (*Glomus etunicatum*) on growth, yield and P concentration in wheat plants. *Clean - Soil, Air, Water* 42, 1248–1252. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1002/clen.201300492>.
- Scalise, A., Tortorella, D., Pristeri, A., 2015. Legume-barley intercropping stimulates soil N supply and crop yield in the succeeding durum wheat in a rotation under rainfed conditions. *Soil Biol Biochem* 89, 150–161. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2015.07.003>.
- Scholberg, J.M.S., Dogliotti, S., Leoni, C., Cherr, C.M., Zotarelli, L., Rossing, W.A.H., 2010. Cover crops for sustainable agrosystems in the Americas. In: Lichtfouse, E. (Ed.), *Genetic Engineering, Biofertilisation, Soil Quality and Organic Farming*. Springer, Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp. 23–58.
- Schönhart, M., Schmid, E., Schneider, U.A., 2011. CropRota - a crop rotation model to support integrated land use assessments. *Eur J Agron* 34, 263–277. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2011.02.004>.
- Scotti, R., Pane, C., Spaccini, R., 2016. On-farm compost: A useful tool to improve soil quality under intensive farming systems. *Appl Soil Ecol* 107, 13–23. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2016.05.004>.
- Sharifi, M., Lynch, D.H., Hammermeister, A., 2014. Effect of green manure and supplemental fertility amendments on selected soil quality parameters in an organic potato rotation in Eastern Canada. *Nutr Cycl Agroecosystems* 135–146. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10705-014-9633-x>.

- Shen, P., Xu, M., Zhang, H., 2014. Long-term response of soil Olsen P and organic C to the depletion or addition of chemical and organic fertilizers. *Catena* 118, 20–27. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2014.01.020>.
- Showler, A.T., 2015. Effects of compost and chicken litter on soil nutrition, and sugarcane phytochemistry, yield, and injury caused by Mexican rice borer, *Eoreuma loftini* (Dyar) (Lepidoptera: Crambidae). *Crop Prot* 71, 1–11. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2015.01.020>.
- Siegmeier, T., Blumenstein, B., Möller, D., 2015. Farm biogas production in organic agriculture: system implications. *Agric. Syst.* 139, 196–209. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2015.07.006>.
- Sieling, K., Ni, K., Kage, H., 2014. Application of pig slurry—first year and residual effects on yield and N balance. *Eur J Agron* 59, 13–21. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2014.05.003>.
- Sindelar, A.J., Schmer, M.R., Jin, V.L., 2015. Long-term corn and soybean response to crop rotation and tillage. *Agron J* 107, 2241–2252. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj15.0085>.
- Sivasakthivelan, P., Saranraj, P., 2013. Azospirillum and its formulations: A review. *Int J Microbiol Res* 4, 275–287. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.ijmr.2013.4.3.825>.
- Skuodienė R., Nekrošienė R., Repšienė R. (2012) Residual effects of perennial grasses as green manure on soil agrochemical properties and spring barley. 99:237–246.
- Smith, A., Snapp, S., Dimes, J., 2016. Doubled-up legume rotations improve soil fertility and maintain productivity under variable conditions in maize-based cropping systems in Malawi. *Agric Syst* 145, 139–149. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2016.03.008>.
- Snapp, S.S., Swinton, S.M., Labarta, R., 2005. Evaluating cover crops for benefits, costs and performance within cropping system niches of crop and impact of foregoing a cash crop, some farmers express Michigan and New York producers are experimenting. *Agron J* 97, 322–332. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj2005.0322>.
- Soane, B.D., Ball, B.C., Arvidsson, J., 2012. No-till in northern, western and south-western Europe: A review of problems and opportunities for crop production and the environment. *Soil Tillage Res* 118, 66–87. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2011.10.015>.
- Soobhany, N., Mohee, R., Garg, V.K., 2015. Recovery of nutrient from Municipal Solid Waste by composting and vermicomposting using earthworm *Eudrilus eugeniae*. *J Environ Chem Eng* 3, 2931–2942. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jece.2015.10.025>.
- Souza, R.C., Cantão, M.E., Vasconcelos, A.T.R., 2013. Soil metagenomics reveals differences under conventional and no-tillage with crop rotation or succession. *Appl Soil Ecol* 72, 49–61. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2013.05.021>.
- M. Sreevidya, S. Gopalakrishnan (2015) Direct and indirect plant growth-promoting abilities of *Bacillus* species on chickpea, isolated from compost and rhizosphere soils. doi: 10.1007/s13165-015-0141-3
- Sreevidya, M., Gopalakrishnan, S., Kudapa, H., Varshney, R.K., 2016. Exploring plant growth-promotion actinomycetes from vermicompost and rhizosphere soil for yield enhancement in chickpea. *Brazilian J Microbiol* 47, 390–392. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjm.2015.11.030>.
- Srivastava, P., Singh, R., Tripathi, S., Raghubanshi, A.S., 2016. An urgent need for sustainable thinking in agriculture - an Indian scenario. *Ecol Indic* 67, 611–622. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.03.015>.
- Stolze, M., Lampkin, N., 2009. Policy for organic farming: rationale and concepts. *Food Policy* 34, 237–244. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodpol.2009.03.005>.

- Strik, B.C., 2016. A review of optimal systems for organic production of blueberry and blackberry for fresh and processed markets in the northwestern United States. *Sci. Hortic. (Amsterdam)* 208, 92–103. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scienta.2015.11.044>.
- Subaedah, S., Aladin, A., Nirwana, 2016. Fertilization of nitrogen, phosphor and application of green manure of crotalaria juncea in increasing yield of maize in marginal dry land. *Agric Agric Sci Procedia* 9, 20–25. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aaspro.2016.02.114>.
- Subbulakshmi, G., Thirunee, R., 2015. *Commerce Agricultural Sciences Promotion of Organic Farming Using Vermicomposting Technology in TamilNadu Department of Chemistry. India Departments of Chemistry. GRT Institute of Engineering and Technology, Tiruttani, Thiruvallur, Tamil Nadu-631209, pp. 26–27.*
- Suja, G., Sundaresan, S., John, K.S., 2012. Higher yield, profit and soil quality from organic farming of elephant foot yam. *Agron Sustain Dev* 32, 755–764. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-011-0058-5>.
- Suliman, W., Harsh, J.B., Abu-Lail, N.I., 2017. The role of biochar porosity and surface functionality in augmenting hydrologic properties of a sandy soil. *Sci Total Environ* 574, 139–147. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.09.025>.
- Sun, H., Koal, P., Liu, D., 2016. Soil microbial community and microbial residues respond positively to minimum tillage under organic farming in Southern Germany. *Appl Soil Ecol* 108, 16–24. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2016.07.014>.
- Suthar, S., 2009. Impact of vermicompost and composted farmyard manure on growth and yield of garlic (*Allium stivum* L.) field crop. *Int J Plant Prod* 3, 27–38.
- Swapna, G., Divya, M., BrahmaPrakash, G.P., 2016. Survival of microbial consortium in granular formulations, degradation and release of microorganisms in soil. *Ann. Plant Sci.* 5, 1348–1352.
- Swarnam, T.P., Velmurugan, A., Pandey, S.K., Dam Roy, S., 2016. Enhancing nutrient recovery and compost maturity of coconut husk by vermicomposting technology. *Bioresour Technol* 207, 76–84. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2016.01.046>.
- Taktek, S., Trépanier, M., Servin, P.M., 2015. Trapping of phosphate solubilizing bacteria on hyphae of the arbuscular mycorrhizal fungus *rhizophagus irregularis* DAOM 197198. *Soil Biol Biochem* 90, 1–9. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2015.07.016>.
- Talgre, L., Luringson, E., Roostalu, H., Astover, A., 2009. The effects of green manures on yields and yield quality of spring wheat. *Agron Res* 7, 125–132.
- Talgre, L., Luringson, E., Roostalu, H., 2012. Green manure as a nutrient source for succeeding crops. *Plant, Soil Environ* 58, 275–281.
- Tarui, A., Matsumura, A., Asakura, S., 2013. Evaluation of mixed cropping of aat and hairy vetch as green manure for succeeding corn production. *Plant Prod Sci* 1008, 1–10. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1626/pp.16.383>.
- Thakkar, J., Kumar, A., Ghatora, S., Canter, C., 2016. Energy balance and greenhouse gas emissions from the production and sequestration of charcoal from agricultural residues. *Renew Energy* 94, 558–567. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2016.03.087>.
- Tomer, M.D., Liebman, M., 2014. Nutrients in soil water under three rotational cropping systems, Iowa, USA. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 186, 105–114. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2014.01.025>.
- Tortosa, G., Alburquerque, J.A., Bedmar, E.J., 2014. Strategies to produce commercial liquid organic fertilisers from “alperujo” composts. *J Clean Prod* 82, 37–44. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.06.083>.

- Triberti, L., Nastri, A., Baldoni, G., 2016. Long-term effects of crop rotation, manure and mineral fertilisation on carbon sequestration and soil fertility. *Eur J Agron* 74, 47–55. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2015.11.024>.
- Tribouillois, H., Cohan, J.P., Justes, E., 2016. Cover crop mixtures including legume produce ecosystem services of nitrate capture and green manuring: assessment combining experimentation and modelling. *Plant Soil* 401, 347–364. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-015-2734-8>.
- Trivedi S., Chahar O., Mehta K. (2015) Solid waste management using biogas technology. 5:2742–2750.
- Turinek, M., Bavec, M., Repič, M., 2016. Effects of intensive and alternative production systems on the technological and quality parameters of rapeseed seed (*Brassica napus* L. “Siska”). *J Sci Food Agric*. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.8088>.
- Tyagi P.K., Upadhyay A.K., Raikwar R.S. (2014) Integrated approach in nutrient management of. 9:1529–1533.
- USDA (2010) Organic Production: Using NRCS Practice Standards to Support Organic Growers. 1–7.
- Vaisman, I., Entz, M.H., Bamford, K.C., Cushon, I., 2014. Green manure species respond differently to blade rolling. *Can J Plant Sci* 94, 1507–1511. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.4141/cjps-2014-083>.
- Van Stappen, F., Lories, A., Mathot, M., Planchon, V., Stilmant, D., Debode, F., 2015. Organic versus conventional farming: the case of wheat production in Wallonia (Belgium). *Agric. Agric. Sci. Procedia* 7, 272–279. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aaspro.2015.12.047>.
- Vanden Nest, T., Ruyschaert, G., Vandecasteele, B., 2016. The long term use of farmyard manure and compost: Effects on P availability, orthophosphate sorption strength and P leaching. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 216, 23–33. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2015.09.009>.
- Vassilev, N., Vassileva, M., Lopez, A., 2015. Unexploited potential of some biotechnological techniques for biofertilizer production and formulation. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 99, 4983–4996. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-015-6656-4>.
- Vejan, P., Abdullah, R., Khadiran, T., 2016. Role of plant growth promoting rhizobacteria in agricultural sustainability-A review. *Molecules* 21, 1–17. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules21050573>.
- Velázquez, E., Silva, L.R., Ramírez-Bahena, M.-H., Peix, A., 2016. Diversity of potassium-solubilizing microorganisms and their interactions with plants. *Potassium Solubilizing Microorganisms for Sustainable Agriculture*. Springer, pp. 99–110.
- Venter, Z.S., Jacobs, K., Hawkins, H.J., 2015. The impact of crop rotation on soil microbial diversity: A meta-analysis. *Pedobiologia (Jena)* 59, 215–223. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pedobi.2016.04.001>.
- Viaene, J., Van Lancker, J., Vandecasteele, B., 2016. Opportunities and barriers to on-farm composting and compost application: A case study from northwestern Europe. *Waste Manag* 48, 181–192. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2015.09.021>.
- Wang, K.H., Radovich, T., Pant, A., Cheng, Z., 2014. Integration of cover crops and vermicompost tea for soil and plant health management in a short-term vegetable cropping system. *Appl Soil Ecol* 82, 26–37. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2014.05.003>.
- Wang, K., He, C., You, S., 2015a. Transformation of organic matters in animal wastes during composting. *J Hazard Mater* 300, 745–753. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2015.08.016>.

- Wang, Y.X., Weng, B.Q., Ye, J., 2015b. Carbon sequestration in a nectarine orchard as affected by green manure in China. *Eur J Hort Sci* 80, 208–215. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.17660/eJHS.2015/80.5.2>.
- Wong, W.S., Tan, S.N., Ge, L., 2015. The importance of phytohormones and microbes in biofertilizers. *Bacterial metabolites in sustainable agroecosystem*. Springer, pp. 105–158.
- Weerarathne, L.V.Y., Marambe, B., Chauhan, B.S., 2016. Intercropping as an effective component of integrated weed management in tropical root and tuber crops: A review. *Crop Prot* 1–12. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2016.08.010>.
- Wei, Y., Zhao, Y., Wang, H., 2016. An optimized regulating method for composting phosphorus fractions transformation based on biochar addition and phosphate-solubilizing bacteria inoculation. *Bioresour Technol* 221, 139–146. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2016.09.038>.
- Weiland, P., 2010. Biogas production: Current state and perspectives. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 85, 849–860. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-009-2246-7>.
- Wezel, A., Casagrande, M., Celette, F., 2014. Agroecological practices for sustainable agriculture. A review. *Agron Sustain Dev* 34, 1–20. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-013-0180-7>.
- White, K.D., 1970. Fallowing, crop rotation, and crop yields in roman times. *Agric Hist* 44, 281–290.
- Wuang, S.C., Khin, M.C., Chua, P.Q.D., Luo, Y.D., 2016. Use of spirulina biomass produced from treatment of aquaculture wastewater as agricultural fertilizers. *Algal Res* 15, 59–64. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.algal.2016.02.009>.
- Xin, X., Zhang, J., Zhu, A., Zhang, C., 2016. Effects of long-term (23 years) mineral fertilizer and compost application on physical properties of fluvo-aquic soil in the North China Plain. *Soil Tillage Res* 156, 166–172. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2015.10.012>.
- Xu, N., Tan, G., Wang, H., Gai, X., 2016. Effect of biochar additions to soil on nitrogen leaching, microbial biomass and bacterial community structure. *Eur J Soil Biol* 74, 1–8. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejsobi.2016.02.004>.
- Youssef, M.A., Eissa, M.A., 2016. Comparison between organic and inorganic nutrition for tomato. *J Plant Nutr* 1–10.
- Yue, X., Zhang, J., Shi, A., 2016. Manure substitution of mineral fertilizers increased functional stability through changing structure and physiology of microbial communities. *Eur J Soil Biol* 77, 34–43. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejsobi.2016.10.002>.
- Zandi P., Basu S.K. (2016) Role of plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) as bioFertilizers in stabilizing agricultural ecosystems.
- Zhang, D., Yan, M., Niu, Y., 2016a. Is current biochar research addressing global soil constraints for sustainable agriculture? *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 226, 25–32. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2016.04.010>.
- Zhang, D., Pan, G., Wu, G., 2016b. Biochar helps enhance maize productivity and reduce greenhouse gas emissions under balanced fertilization in a rainfed low fertility inceptisol. *Chemosphere* 142, 106–113. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2015.04.088>.
- Zhang, J., Chen, G., Sun, H., 2016c. Straw biochar hastens organic matter degradation and produces nutrient-rich compost. *Bioresour Technol* 200, 876–883. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2015.11.016>.
- Zhao, Y., Wei, Y., Zhang, Y., 2017. Roles of composts in soil based on the assessment of humification degree of fulvic acids. *Ecol Indic* 72, 473–480. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.08.051>.

- Zikeli, S., Gruber, S., Teufel, C.F., 2013. Effects of reduced tillage on crop yield, plant available nutrients and soil organic matter in a 12-year long-term trial under organic management. *Sustain* 5, 3876–3894. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.3390/su5093876>.
- Złoch, M., Thiem, D., Gadzała-Kopciuch, R., Hrynkiewicz, K., 2016. Synthesis of siderophores by plant-associated metalotolerant bacteria under exposure to Cd<sup>2+</sup>. *Chemosphere* 156, 312–325. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2016.04.130>.

## FURTHER READING

- Al-Kaisi, M.M., Archontoulis, S., Kwaw-Mensah, D., 2016. Soybean spatiotemporal yield and economic variability as affected by tillage and crop rotation. *Agron J* 108, 1267–1280. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj2015.0363>.
- Anderson, R.L., 2015. Integrating a complex rotation with no-till improves weed management in organic farming. A review. *Agron Sustain Dev* 35, 967–974. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-015-0292-3>.
- Calonego, J.C., Rosolem, C.A., 2013. Phosphorus and potassium balance in a corn-soybean rotation under no-till and chiseling. *Nutr Cycl Agroecosystems* 96, 123–131. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10705-013-9581-x>.
- Cameron, K.C., Di, H.J., Moir, J.L., 2013. Nitrogen losses from the soil/plant system: A review. *Ann Appl Biol* 162, 145–173. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/aab.12014>.
- Husen, E., Simanungkalit, R., Saraswati, R., Irawan, I., 2016. Characterization and quality assessment of Indonesian commercial biofertilizers. *Indonesian Journal Of Agricultural Science* 8 (1), 31–38.
- Fornes, F., Belda, R.M., Lidón, A., 2015. Analysis of two biochars and one hydrochar from different feedstock: Focus set on environmental, nutritional and horticultural considerations. *J Clean Prod* 86, 40–48. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.08.057>.
- Foster, E.J., Hansen, N., Wallenstein, M., Cotrufo, M.F., 2016. Biochar and manure amendments impact soil nutrients and microbial enzymatic activities in a semi-arid irrigated maize cropping system. *Agric Ecosyst Environ* 233, 404–414. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2016.09.029>.
- Hauggaard-Nielsen, H., Johansen, A., Carter, M.S., 2013. Annual maize and perennial grass-clover strip cropping for increased resource use efficiency and productivity using organic farming practice as a model. *Eur J Agron* 47, 55–64. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2013.01.004>.
- Herrmann, L., Lesueur, D., 2013. Challenges of formulation and quality of biofertilizers for successful inoculation. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* 97, 8859–8873. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00253-013-5228-8>.
- Holm-Nielsen, J.B., Seadi, T. Al, Oleskiewicz-Popiel, P., 2009. The future of anaerobic digestion and biogas utilization. *Bioresour Technol* 100, 5478–5484. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2008.12.046>.
- Hussain, N., Abbasi, T., Abbasi, S.A., 2015. Vermicomposting eliminates the toxicity of Lantana (*Lantana camara*) and turns it into a plant friendly organic fertilizer. *J Hazard Mater* 298, 46–57. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2015.04.073>.
- Ildo, M., Cranenbrouck, S., Declerck, S., 2011. Methods for large-scale production of AM fungi: Past, present, and future. *Mycorrhiza* 21, 1–16. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00572-010-0337-z>.
- Lakshmi Prabha, M., Nagalakshmi, N., Shanmuga Priya, M., 2015. Analysis of nutrient contents in vermicompost. *Eur J Mol Biol Biochem* 2, 42–48.

- Leaungvutiviroj, C., Ruangphisam, P., Hansanimitkul, P., 2010. Development of a new biofertilizer with a high capacity for N<sub>2</sub> fixation, phosphate and potassium solubilization and auxin production. *Biosci Biotechnol Biochem* 74, 1098–1101. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1271/bbb.90898>.
- Liu, S., Yang, J.Y., Zhang, X.Y., 2013. Modelling crop yield, soil water content and soil temperature for a soybean-maize rotation under conventional and conservation tillage systems in Northeast China. *Agric Water Manag* 123, 32–44. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2013.03.001>.
- Miller, P.R., Bekkerman, A., Jones, C.A., 2015. Pea in rotation with wheat reduced uncertainty of economic returns in southwest Montana. *Agron J* 107, 541–550. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj14.0185>.
- Ngwira, A.R., Aune, J.B., Mkwinda, S., 2012. On-farm evaluation of yield and economic benefit of short term maize legume intercropping systems under conservation agriculture in Malawi. *F Crop Res* 132, 149–157. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2011.12.014>.
- Peigné, J., Casagrande, M., Payet, V., 2015. How organic farmers practice conservation agriculture in Europe. *Renew Agric Food Syst* 1–14. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742170514000477>.
- Pereira, S.I.A., Monteiro, C., Vega, A.L., Castro, P.M.L., 2016. Endophytic culturable bacteria colonizing *Lavandula dentata* L. plants: Isolation, characterization and evaluation of their plant growth-promoting activities. *Ecol Eng* 87, 91–97. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2015.11.033>.
- Rajeev, S., Dwivedi, H.S., Dwivedi, P., 2016. Utilization of three obnoxious weeds (*Parthenium hysterophorus*, *Lantana camara* and *Eichhornia crassipes*) through vermicomposting and their response on vegetative growth of soybean crop. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Biological Sciences* 3, 13–20. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.22192/ijarbs>.
- Rodrigues, M., Pavinato, P.S., Withers, P.J.A., 2016. Legacy phosphorus and no tillage agriculture in tropical oxisols of the Brazilian savanna. *Sci Total Environ* 542, 1050–1061. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.08.118>.
- Ruzzi, M., Aroca, R., 2015. Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria act as biostimulants in horticulture. *Sci Hort (Amsterdam)* 196, 124–134. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scienta.2015.08.042>.
- Sellami, F., Jarboui, R., Hachicha, S., 2008. Co-composting of oil exhausted olive-cake, poultry manure and industrial residues of agro-food activity for soil amendment. *Bioresour Technol* 99, 1177–1188. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2007.02.018>.
- Tang, X., Placella, S.A., Daydé, F., 2016. Phosphorus availability and microbial community in the rhizosphere of intercropped cereal and legume along a P-fertilizer gradient. *Plant Soil* 1–16. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-016-2949-3>.
- William Lockeretz editor. (2012) *Organic farming an international history*.
- Zhou, K., Sui, Y., Liu, X., 2015. Crop rotation with nine-year continuous cattle manure addition restores farmland productivity of artificially eroded Mollisols in Northeast China. *F Crop Res* 171, 138–145. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2014.10.017>.