Soil Quality: A Critical Review

Rohit Pandey [a++], Shubhanjali Kori [b#], Anand Dinesh Jejal [c†], Pragya Kurmi [d‡], Rajendra Patel [e^], Sumit Raj [f##], Anil Muniya [g#^] and Nirjharnee Nandeha [h^*]

[a] Institute of Agricultural Sciences, RDVVV, Jabalpur, India.
[b] Centre for Rural Development and Technology, IIT Delhi, India.
[c] Department of Agronomy, Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola, India.
[d] College of Agriculture, RVSKVV, Gwalior, India.
[e] KVK, Narmadapuram, India.
[f] Department of Soil Conservation and Water Management, C.S. Azad University of Agriculture and Technology, Kanpur-02, India.
[g] Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, RVSKVV, Gwalior, India.
[h] KVK, Mahasamund, IGKV, Raipur, India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Review Article

ABSTRACT

From plot to national scales, sampling, analysis, and visual inspection of soil are common methods used to evaluate its condition and potential for use. However, due to the complexity and site-specificity of soils, the legacy impacts of past land use, and trade-offs across ecosystem services,

_____

[++] *Guest Faculty;*
[#] *Research Scholar;*
[†] *M.Sc Scholar;*
[‡] *Ph.D Research Scholar;*
[^] *SMS;*
[##] *Teaching Associate;*
[#^] *PhD Scholar;*
Corresponding author: E-mail: nirjharneenandeha04@gmail.com;

selecting relevant soil parameters and interpreting measurements are not simple tasks. Here, we go over the definition, methods of assessment, and choices and interpretations of indicators for soil quality and related concepts. Assessing soil condition and potential usage involves a range of methods, from small-scale sampling to nationwide analyses. Despite their prevalence, these approaches face challenges due to the intricate nature of soils, their site-specific characteristics, historical land use impacts, and the need to balance various ecosystem services. Selecting pertinent soil parameters and interpreting measurements becomes a complex task. In this context, we delve into the definition, assessment methods, and the choices and interpretations of indicators related to soil quality. Our focus is on widely used indicators within agricultural land use. Notably, explicit evaluations of soil quality for specific risks, functions, and ecosystem services remain limited. Furthermore, there is a scarcity of systems providing clear frameworks for interpreting measured indicator values, hampering their acceptance by both policymakers and land managers. We explore innovative indicators that shed light on often overlooked soil properties and processes. Biological/biochemical indicators are under-represented but show great potential. Soil quality assessment should specify targeted soil threats, functions and ecosystem services. Increasingly interactive assessment tools must be developed with target users.

1. INTRODUCTION

"Along with water and air quality, soil quality is one of the three elements of environmental quality". "The primary determinant of water and air quality is the level of pollution that directly affects the health and consumption of humans and animals, as well as natural ecosystems" [1, 2]. On the other hand, soil quality is generally understood to mean "the capacity of a soil to function within ecosystem and land-use boundaries to sustain biological productivity, maintain environmental quality, and promote plant and animal health"[3, 4], rather than just the level of soil pollution. It is expressly stated by [5] that human health is a component of animal health.

In order to identify parallels, significant discrepancies, and omissions, we will critically examine soil quality articles and assessment tools in this work, with a focus on soil quality indicators. In order to achieve this, section 2 introduces pertinent concepts and terminologies, while section 3 provides an overview of several methods for assessing soil quality. This review focuses on measurements using analytical methods. Since visual soil evaluations have recently been evaluated, a quick presentation of the most significant methods utilising visual soil evaluation in the field is provided [6]. After a list of the most often suggested indicators, there are sections on new indicators of soil quality that may have additional value as well as how to interpret indicator values, including how they might be combined to create an operational soil

quality index and any drawbacks. We outline the essential actions needed for a successful assessment of soil quality in the findings (section 5) and examine the degree to which they have been put into practise thus far. In conclusion, improving soil quality is seen in the broader context of improving environmental quality, where it is integrated into a collaborative process of knowledge production between scientists and other stakeholders in the pressing shift towards sustainable resource use and management.

2. IDEAS ABOUT THE EVALUATION OF SOIL

2.1 The Fertility, Quality, Capability, Quality, and Health of the Soil

The primary interest in soil has historically been in its potential for agricultural productivity, aside from mineral mining. It's possible that assessments of the soil's potential for agricultural development were conducted prior to the existence of written records. Evidence can be found in the writings of Roman writers like Columella [7] as well as ancient Chinese works like "Yugong" and "Zhouli," which were written during the Xia (2070–1600 BCE) and Zhou (1048–256 BCE) dynasties, respectively [8, 9]. Additionally, ethnopedology offers a number of native soil classifications that highlight signs that enable determination of a specific soil's appropriateness for a range of crops [10,11, 89]. The idea of "soil fertility," which comes from German literature on "Bodenfruchtbarkeit," which is mostly correlated with crop yields, describes

how suitable a soil is for agricultural output [12]. Based on this, soil fertility is defined by the FAO as "the soil's capacity to provide necessary plant nutrients and soil water in sufficient amounts and proportions for plant growth and reproduction in the absence of harmful substances which may inhibit plant growth". A nutritious soil "provides essential nutrients for crop plant growth, supports a diverse and active biotic community, exhibits a typical soil structure, and allows for an undisturbed decomposition," according to [13, 14,15,86,87,88], who expand on this idea.

2.2 Connecting Ecosystem Services and Soil Functions to Soil Quality

"The benefits which humans derive from ecosystems" is the definition of ecosystem services" [15]. "In addition to addressing a single ecosystem service, like the production of food, the early notion of soil quality was created" by [16] and attempted to balance and portray the multifunctionality of soil. This has recently been further incorporated into the "functional land management" movement [17], which evaluates the advantages and disadvantages of a multifunctional system for managing soil-based ecosystem services in agriculture as well as a wider range of land uses [18].

3. METHODS FOR EVALUATING THE QUALITY OF SOIL

Since the 1990s, a vast array of instruments for evaluating and tracking soil quality have been accessible. Before going into greater detail about certain aspects of soil quality indicators in section 4.

3.1 Analytical Approaches to Soil Quality

"We provide a summary of the major advancements in various nations here. In 1988, Canada launched one of the first national programmes to evaluate and track the quality of its soil" [19]. "The programme used benchmark sites to evaluate changes in the soil over time, particularly with regard to the threats to the soil such as compaction, erosion, organic matter loss, acidification, and salinization" [20]. "The data are still utilised in part to evaluate agri-environmental indicators that span soil, water, and air quality, even if the Canadian soil quality monitoring programme as such was not continuously maintained" [21]. [22, 23] introduced

a coarser-scale GIS-based method to characterise mainly inherent soil quality.

3.2 Methods for Visual Evaluation of Soil Quality

The aforementioned methods of evaluating soil quality usually call for analytical laboratory space. More empirical, qualitative indicators that are easily evaluated in the field, produce quick findings, and improve communication between farmers and scientists are advantageous for approaches that focus on education and farmers [24].

For instance, a soil health score card was created for the Wisconsin Soil Health Programme that gathers farmer observations on the soil and plants in addition to a few questions about water quality and animal health [25]. Developed in 2016, the GROW Observatory in Europe aims to provide farmers and other soil stakeholders with basic soil management tools, including instructional materials and field-based assessments.

4. INDICATORS OF SOIL QUALITY

4.1 Conditions for Indicators of Soil Quality

Different techniques to evaluating soil quality have found different needs for indicators of soil quality, although by no means all of them. Every article that outlines these specifications includes at least one conceptual criteria, such as the need that the indicator of choice be pertinent and related to a specific soil function, danger, or ecosystem service.

This is not very helpful, though, if the assessment of soil quality is not focused on a particular soil hazard, function, or ecosystem service. Practical criteria almost usually include simplicity of measurement and sampling, as well as cost and reliability considerations. Practical factors, such as the drawback of indicators requiring undisturbed samples, frequently contribute significantly to the rejection of otherwise appropriate indicators of soil quality [26, 27, 28, 29, 30], which is a significant constraint from a scientific standpoint. Pedotransfer functions can provide a proxy value by measuring other properties, such as carbon and texture for bulk density, in cases where measuring a particular soil indicator, i.e. bulk

density, is deemed too costly, too difficult, or impractical due to the stoniness of the soil [31, 32, 33].

4.2 Techniques for Choosing a Minimum Dataset

Collinearity and the complexity of the interactions between indicators and management alternatives can both rise with the quantity of indicators. Furthermore, measurement expenses can quickly become unaffordable, particularly when comprehensive soil biological parameters are taken into account [34, 35, 36]. For these reasons, a minimum dataset must be used to analyse the maximum number of soil quality indicators on a given set of samples. This choice was made using expert judgement in the first minimum datasets that were suggested [37, 38, 39, 40]. Statistical data reduction through multivariate techniques like multiple regression [41], principal component analysis (PCA), redundancy analysis (RDA), and discriminant analysis [42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47] became more popular as a result. Following this initial reduction of data, the number of indicators can be further reduced by simple or multiple correlation analysis [48, 49, 50]. In some cases, this is followed by the application of expert judgement to select only one highly correlated soil property out of two or more [51]. The final number of indicators chosen using these methods usually falls between six and eight. Validation of the minimum dataset is crucial, for example by examining its relationship to predetermined and independently measured management goals. This is because soil properties that are relevant for soil functioning but do not show much variation in a given study will not be included in the minimum dataset [52].

4.3 Often Suggested Markers of Soil Quality

We reviewed 65 minimal datasets of measured soil characteristics proposed in 62 publications in order to determine the most often suggested (combinations of) soil quality indicators. A specific categorization of measurable indicators was necessary due to the abundance of terms and methodologies; for example, aggregate stability, shear strength, tilth and friability, structure, consistency, and slake test were combined into a single category called structural stability. We attempted to cover the entire world by including both reports on national monitoring programmes and peer-reviewed academic articles on methods for assessing soil quality. Since assessing soil quality involves a number of steps, from choosing indicators to defining objectives to interpreting indicator values, we only included studies that addressed multiple steps and, therefore, had a certain conceptual and generalizable character. As a result, research that completely focused on comparing a set of indicators across various management systems was disqualified. We observed that increasing the number of analysed datasets from 45 to 65 during the compilation rarely affected the result, despite the possibility that we may have overlooked several publications, particularly from national assessment systems. As a result, we are certain that our analysis presents a reliable image of the most widely used soil quality indicators. The most often suggested indicators of soil quality are pH, total organic matter/carbon, and various water storage indicators.

4.4 New Markers of Soil Quality

When new or additional soil quality indicators are clearly valuable from the standpoint of the management objectives for a given scenario, they should be incorporated into minimal datasets. Future plans for measuring soil quality appear to be promising in light of recent advances in soil research, particularly in the area of soil biology but also in spectroscopy and other disciplines. We briefly cover these innovations below, which have the potential to significantly alter methods for assessing soil quality. They range from biological and biochemical indicators to data acquisition and high-throughput techniques. The functioning of soil is largely dependent on soil organisms. Thus, the inclusion of biological and biochemical indicators can significantly enhance evaluations of soil quality [53,54].

Furthermore, in order to link abiotic soil characteristics to (changes in) soil functions in terms of biochemical and biophysical transformations as well as (possible) aboveground vegetation performance, the evaluation of biological indicators of soil quality is necessary [55]. However, black-box metrics like microbial biomass and soil respiration constitute the majority of the time when soil biological indicators are included in soil quality assessments. More precise indicators, including those based on nematodes [56], (micro) arthropods [57], or a variety of soil biota [58],

have not been proposed much, despite their obvious promise. This may be because they call for specialised knowledge and abilities. Unfortunately, because soil biota is highly susceptible to environmental changes, they are thought to be the most sensitive indicators of soil quality [59, 60, 61, 62]. Particularly, indicators of soil-borne illnesses are desperately needed [63, 64, 65, 66, 67]. Soil suppressiveness—which is characterised as a soil's innate ability to lower the incidence of plant diseases—becomes relevant in this setting [68, 69, 70].

4.5 Understanding the Values of the Indicators

An indicator is only helpful if reference values are provided and its value can be understood without a doubt. According to [71], reference values for a specific indicator can come from two different types of soils: natural soils, which might not be suited for agricultural production, or soils with maximum production and/or environmental performance. For instance, in the Netherlands, ten reference soils with good soil biological quality were chosen from 285 locations that had been under observation for more than a decade [72]. These reference soils (e.g., arable land on clay soil) illustrate particular combinations of soil type and land use. With the percentiles provided as a way to express the frequency distribution, soil quality indicators at a given site may thus be compared to those at the reference site as well as to the mean value, and the 5% and 95% percentiles of all sites under a certain land-use. The reference might not be at an optimal state in every parameter, which is a significant disadvantage of this strategy [73].

4.6 Creating an Index of Soil Quality and Substitutes

Notwithstanding [74] determination that this was not feasible, other investigations into soil quality have attempted to find a means of combining the data acquired for each soil quality indicator into a single soil quality index. For instance, to get the general indicator of soil quality (GISQ), [75, 76, 77, 78] added up the contributions of each of the five sub-indicators: hydraulic characteristics, chemical fertility, aggregation, organic matter, and biodiversity. An additive index in the SMAF produces a number between 1 and 10 [79, 80, 81]. Nonetheless, a weighting mechanism is required if the evaluated soil functions or

ecosystem services have drastically differed relative priorities.

5. CONCLUSION

Our analysis has shown how the goals, instruments and procedures, and general methodology of soil quality evaluation have evolved throughout time. The assessment of soil quality involves a number of phases, some of which are addressed in varying degrees by the numerous methodologies that have been developed over the past three decades and discussed in this article. A basic place to start would be with a precise statement of the goals, such as if the purpose of the soil assessment is to inform management decisions, serve as a teaching tool, or be a component of a monitoring programme. Likewise, to boost the adoption of the created assessment approach, target users should be identified and included from the start. A similar strategy has been used in the Horizon 2020 project LANDMARK, where stakeholder workshops were initially used to determine the assessment of soil functions and indicators. Applying stakeholder-based evaluation calls for various instruments depending on the level of knowledge. For instance, farmers can use visual soil assessment tools to understand the condition of the soil structure in the field. However, laboratory measurements are necessary to gain a more detailed understanding of productivity. These can be obtained, for example, from Cornell Soil Health Assessment [82] and from newly developed commercial soil testing services that use spectroscopic methods (see section 4).

In order to fully utilise soil quality indicators and to convert the interpretation into suitable management and policy recommendations, reference or threshold values are needed. Mathematics developed in ecological risk assessment [83, 84] can be applied to the assessment of the (dis)agreement of results obtained from different lines of evidence (e.g. sets of indicators based on physical, chemical, or biological parameters; see e.g. [85].

Although it is frequently requested, an overall soil quality index is actually not particularly significant because it is ideal to evaluate soil quality in connection to certain soil functions. When communicating with stakeholders, target users, and the general public, a graphical depiction of a soil's performance in fulfilling its multiple roles works far better than computing an overall index.

Depending on the range of soil risks and ecosystem services at risk, various sets of soil quality indicators will be applied with varying weightings in practise, as stated by the "stakeholders."

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Abdollahi L, Hansen EM, Rickson RJ, Munkholm LJ. Overall assessment of soil quality on humid sandy loams: effects of location, rotation and tillage. Soil and Tillage Research. 2015;145:29–36.

2. Acton DF, Gregorich LJ. The Health of Our Soils: toward Sustainable Agriculture in Canada. Centre for Land and Biological Resources Research, Research Branch, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Ottawa. 1995;Ont xiv:138.

3. Arshad MA, Martin S. Identifying critical limits for soil quality indicators in agro-ecosystems. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment. 2002;88:153–160.

4. Askari MS, Holden NM. Quantitative soil quality indexing of temperate arable management systems. Soil and Tillage Research. 2015;150:57–67.

5. BM. Visual soil evaluation: A summary of some applications and potential developments for agriculture. Soil and Tillage Research. 2017;173:114–124.

6. BT. (Eds.), Managing Soil Quality: Challenges in Modern Agriculture. CABI, Wallingford, UK; 139–171.

7. Barrera-Bassols N, Zinck JA, Ethnopedology: A worldwide view on the soil knowledge of local people. Geoderma. 2003;111:171–195.

8. Barrios E. Soil biota, ecosystem services and land productivity. Ecological Economics. 2007;64:269–285.

9. Barrios E, Coutinho HLC, Medeiros CAB. InPaC-s: Participatory Knowledge Integration on Indicators of Soil Quality - Methodological Guide. World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), Embrapa, CIAT, Nairobi. 2012;1–178.

10. Barrios E, Delve RJ, Bekunda A, Mowo J, Agunda J, Ramisch J, Trejo MT, Thomas RJ. Indicators of soil quality: a South-South development of a methodological guide for linking local and technical knowledge. Geoderma. 2006;135;248–259.

11. Bastida F, Zsolnay A, Hernandez T, Garcia C. Past, present and future of soil quality indices: A biological perspective. Geoderma. 2008;147:159–171.

12. Baveye PC, Baveye J, Gowdy J, Soil "ecosystem" services and natural capital: Critical Appraisal of Research on Uncertain Ground. Frontiers In Environmental Science. 2016;4:1–49.

13. Callahan B, Proctor D, Relman D, Fukuyama J, Holmes S. Reproducible re-search workflow in r for the analysis of personalized human microbiome data. Pac Symp Biocomput. 2016;21:183–194.

14. Cambardella CA, Elliott ET. Particulate soil organic matter changes across a grassland cultivation sequence. Soil Science Society of America Journal. 1992; 56:777–783.

15. Candinas T, Neyroud JA, Oberholzer H, Weisskopf P. Grundlagen für die Beurteilung der nachhaltigen landwirtschaftlichen Bodennutzung. Bodenschutz. 2002;3:90–98.

16. Culman SW, Young-Mathews A, Hollander AD, Ferris H, Sánchez-Moreno S, O'Geen AT, Jackson LE. Biodiversity is associated with indicators of soil ecosystem functions over a landscape gradient of agricultural intensification. Landscape Ecology. 2010;25:1333–1348.

17. Davidson DA. Soil quality assessment: recent advances and controversies. Progress in Environmental Science. 2000; 2:342–350.

18. Davies J. The business case for soil. Nature. 2017;543;309–311.

19. de Groot GA, Geisen S, Laros I, Faber JH, Schmeltz R. A tiered approach for high-resolution characterization of the soil faunal community via DNA meta-barcoding. In: Book of Abstracts of the First Global Soil Biodiversity Conference. 2014;87.

20. de Paul Obade V, Lal R. Towards a standard technique for soil quality assess-ment. Geoderma. 2016;265:96–102.

21. Dumanski J, Pieri C. Land quality indicators: research plan. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 2000;81:93–102.

22. European Commission. Towards a thematic strategy for soil protection. European Commission, Brussels; 2002.

Available at: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ TXT/?uri=CELEX:52002DC0179.

23. FAO. A Framework for Land Evaluation. FAO Soils Bulletin 32. Food And Agriculture Organization of The United Nations, Rome; 1976.

24. Gautam AK, Shrivastava AK, Trivedi A. Effect of raised bed, zero and conventional till system on performance of soybean crop in vertisol. Agriculture Update. 2017; 12(4):923-927.

25. Gautam VK, Awasthi MK, Trivedi A. Optimum Allocation of Water and Land Resource for Maximizing Farm Income of Jabalpur District, Madhya Pradesh. International Journal of Environment and Climate Change. 2020;10(12):224-232.

26. Glenk K, McVittie A, Moran D. Deliverable D3.1: Soil and Soil Organic Carbon within an Ecosystem Service Approach Linking Biophysical and Economic Data. 2012. Available at: http://smartsoil.eu/smartsoil-toolbox/project-deliverables/.

27. Gonzalez-Quiñones V, Murphy DV, Bowles RW, Mele PM. A National Soil Quality Monitoring Framework. GRDC Soil Biology Initiative II. Final Report. UWA000138. 2015;258.

28. Harrison R, Strahm B, Yi X. Soil education and public awareness. In: Verheye; 2010.

29. Hartmann M, Frey B, Mayer J, Mader P, Widmer F. Distinct soil microbial diversity under long-term organic and conventional farming. The ISME Journal. 2015;9:1177–1194.

30. Haygarth PM, Ritz K. The future of soils and land use in the UK: Soil systems for the provision of land-based ecosystem services. Land Use Policy. 2009;26:S187–S197.

31. Haynes RJ. Labile organic matter fractions as central components of the quality of agricultural soils: an overview. In: Sparks, D.L. (Ed.), Advances in Agronomy. 2005; 85:221–268.

32. Hurni H, Giger M, Liniger H, Mekdaschi Studer R, Messerli P, Portner B, Schwilch G, Wolfgramm B, Breu T. Soils, agriculture and food security: the interplay between ecosystem functioning and human well-being. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability. 2015;15: 25–34.

33. Maul JS, , Smith JE, , Collins JL, Halvorson HP, Kremer JJ, Lundgren RJ, , Ducey JG, , Jin TF, Karlen VL, DL. Understanding and enhancing soil biological health: the solution for reversing soil degradation. Sustainability. 2015;7:988–1027.

34. Jackson LE, Pulleman MM, Brussaard L, Bawa KS, Brown GG, Cardoso IM, de Ruiter PC, García-Barrios L., Hollander AD, Lavelle P, Ouédraogo E, Pascual U, Setty S, Smukler SM, Tscharntke T, Van Noordwijk M. Social-ecolo- gical and regional adaptation of agrobiodiversity management across a global set of research regions. Global Environmental Change. 2012;22: 623–639.

35. Karimi B, Maron PA, Chemidlin-Prevost Boure N, Bernard N, Gilbert D, Ranjard L. Microbial diversity and ecological networks as indicators of environmental quality. Environmental Chemistry Letters. 2017;15: 265–281.

36. Karlen DL, Andrews SS, Doran JW. Soil quality: current concepts and appli-cations. Advances in Agronomy. 2001;74(74):1–40.

37. Kumari A, Sumer S, Jalan B, Nongbri PL, Laskar MA. Impact of next-gen- eration sequencing Technology in plant–microbe interaction study. In: Kalia VC, Kumar P. (Eds.), Microbial Applications: Bioremediation and Bioenergy. Springer International Publishing, Cham. 2017;1: 269–294.

38. Kyselková M, Almario J, Kopecký J, Ságová-Marečková M, Haurat J, Muller D, Grundmann G.L, Moënne-Loccoz,Y. Evaluation of rhizobacterial indicators of tobacco black root rot suppressiveness in farmers' fields. Environmental Microbiology Reports. 2014;6:346–353.

39. Larson WE, Pierce FJ. Conservation and enhancement of soil quality: Evaluation for sustainable land management in the developing world. In: IBSRAM Proceedings. Technical Papers, Bangkok, Thailand. 1991;12(2):175–203.

40. Larson WE, Pierce FJ. The dynamics of soil quality as a measure of sustainable management. In: Doran JW, Coleman DC, Bezdicek DF, Stewart BA. (Eds.), Defining Soil Quality for a Sustainable Environment. SSSA, Madison, WI. 1994; 37–51.

41. Lavelle P, Decaëns T, Aubert M, Barot S, Blouin M, Bureau F, Margerie P, Mora P, Rossi JP. Soil invertebrates and ecosystem services. European Journal of Soil Biology . Lehman RM, Cambardella CA, Stott DE, Acosta-Martinez V, Manter DK, Buyer. 2006;42(Suppl. 1):S3–S15.

42. Liu X, Zhang S, Jiang Q, Bai Y, Shen G, Li S, Ding W. Using community analysis to explore bacterial indicators for disease suppression of tobacco bacterial wilt. Scientific Reports. 2016;6:36773.

43. Loveland PJ, Thompson TRE. Identification and Development of a Set of National Indicators for Soil Quality. R&D Project Record P5–053/PR/02. Environment Agency, UK; 2002.

44. McKenzie N, Bramley R, Farmer T, Janik L, Murray W, Smith C, McLaughlin M. Rapid soil measurement–a review of potential benefits and opportunities for the Australian grains industry. Report for the Grains Research and Development Corporation. 2003:1-41.,

45. Merrington G. The Development and Use of Soil Quality Indicators for Assessing the Role of Soil in Environmental Interactions. The Environment Agency Science Report SC030265; 2006.

46. Moebius-Clune BN, Moebius-Clune DJ, Gugino BK, Idowu OJ, Schindelbeck RR, Ristow AJ, Van Es HM, Thies JE, Shayler HA, McBride MB, Wolfe DW, Abawi GS . Comprehensive Assessment of Soil Health. The Cornell frame- work manual. third ed. Cornell University, Geneva, NY; 2016.

47. Montanarella L. The EU Thematic Strategy on Soil Protection. 2002;275–288.

48. Montgomery DR. Growing a Revolution - Bringing Our Soil Back to Life. W.W. Norton & Company, New York, London; 2017.

49. Morvan X, Saby NPA, Arrouays D, Le Bas C, Jones RJA, Verheijen FGA, Bellamy PH, Stephens M, Kibblewhite MG. Soil monitoring in Europe: a review of existing systems and requirements for harmonisation. The Science of the Total Environment. 2008;391:1–12.

50. Mouazen AM, Steffens M, Borisover M. Reflectance and fluorescence spectro-scopy in soil science—Current and future research and developments. Soil and Tillage Research. 2016;155:448–449.

51. Neher DA. Role of nematodes in soil health and their use as indicators. Journal of Nematology. 2001;33:161–168.

52. Nielsen MN, Winding A. Microorganisms as Indicators of Soil Health. NERI Technical Report No. 388. National Environmental Research Institute, Denmark. Nortcliff S. Standardisation of soil quality attributes. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment. 2002;88:161–168.

53. Norton L, Greene S, Scholefield P, Dunbar M. The importance of scale in the development of ecosystem service indicators? Ecological Indicators. 2016;61:130–140.

54. Orgiazzi A, Dunbar MB, Panagos P, de Groot GA, Lemanceau P. Soil bio- diversity and DNA barcodes: opportunities and challenges. Soil Biology and Biochemistry. 2015;80:244–250.

55. O'Sullivan L, Bampa F, Knights K, Creamer RE. Soil protection for a sus- tainable future: options for a soil monitoring network for Ireland. Soil Use & Management. 2017;33:346–363.

56. Pankhurst CE, Doube BM, Gupta VVSR. Biological indicators of soil health: synthesis. in: pankhurst, c.e., doube, b.m., gupta, v.v.s.r. (eds.), biological Indicators of Soil Health. CAB International, Wallingford, Oxon. 1997; 419–435.

57. Parisi V, Menta C, Gardi C, Jacomini C, Mozzanica E. Microarthropod communities as a tool to assess soil quality and biodiversity: a new approach in Italy. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment. 2005;105:323–333.

58. Peerlkamp PK. A visual method of soil structure evaluation. Meded. v.d. Landbouwhogeschool en Opzoekingsstations van de Staat te Gent. 1959;XXIV(24):216–221.

59. Pielke R. The honest broker - Making Sense of science in policy and politics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK; 2007.

60. Pulido Moncada M, Gabriels D, Cornelis WM. Data-driven analysis of soil quality indicators using limited data. Geoderma. 2014;235–236,271–278.

61. Ritz K, Black HIJ, Campbell CD, Harris JA, Wood C. Selecting biological indicators for monitoring soils: a framework for balancing scientific and technical opinion to assist policy development. Ecological Indicators. 2009;9:1212–1221.

62. Robinson DA, Panagos P, Borrelli P, Jones A, Montanarella L, Tye A, Obst CG . Soil natural capital in Europe: a framework for state and change assessment. Scientific Reports. 2017;7.

63. Römbke J, Gardi C, Creamer R, Miko L. Soil biodiversity data: actual and potential

use in European and national legislation. Applied Soil Ecology. 2016;97: 125–133.

64. Rossiter DG. A theoretical framework for land evaluation. Geoderma. 1996;72:165–190.

65. Rüdisser J, Tasser E, Peham T, Meyer E, Tappeiner U. The dark side of biodiversity: Spatial application of the biological soil quality indicator (BSQ). Ecological Indicators. 2015;53:240–246.

66. Rutgers M, Jensen J. Site-specific Ecological Risk Assessment. 2011;693–720.

67. Saxton KE, Rawls WJ. Soil water characteristic estimates by texture and organic matter for hydrologic solutions. Soil Science Society of America Journal. 2006; 70:1569–1578.

68. Schipper LA, Sparling GP. Performance of soil condition indicators across taxonomic groups and land uses. Soil Science Society of America Journal. 2000;64:300–311.

69. Schlatter D, Kinkel LL, Thomashow LS, Weller DM, Paulitz TC. Disease suppressive soils: New insights from the soil microbiome. Phytopathology. 2017; 107:1284–1297.

70. Schleyer C, Lux A, Mehring M, Görg C. Ecosystem services as a boundary concept: arguments from social ecology. Sustainability. 2017;9:1107.

71. Suman S, Sharma A, Trivedi A. Bioactive Phytochemicals in Rice Bran: Processing and Functional Properties: A Review. Int.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci. 2020Special Issue;11:2954-2960.

72. Trivedi A. Reckoning of Impact of Climate Change using RRL AWBM Toolkit. Trends in Biosciences. 2019;12(20):1336-1337.

73. Trivedi A, Awasthi MK. A review on river revival. International Journal of Environment and Climate Change. 2020; 10(12):202-210.

74. Trivedi A, Awasthi MK. Runoff Estimation by Integration of GIS and SCS-CN Method for Kanari River Watershed. Indian Journal of Ecology. 2021;48(6):1635-1640.

75. Trivedi A, Gautam AK. Hydraulic characteristics of micro-tube dripper. Life Science Bulletin. 2017;14(2):213-216.

76. Trivedi A, Gautam AK. Temporal Effects on the Performance of Emitters. Bulletin of Environment, Pharmacology and Life Sciences. 2019;8(2):37-42.

77. Trivedi A, Gautam AK. Decadal analysis of water level fluctuation using GIS in Jabalpur district of Madhya Pradesh. Journal of Soil and Water Conservation. 2022;21(3):250-259.

78. Trivedi A, Gautam AK, Pyasi SK, Galkate RV. Development of RRL AWBM model and investigation of its performance, efficiency and suitability in Shipra River Basin. Journal of Soil and Water Conservation. 2020;20(2):1-8.

79. Trivedi A, Gautam AK, Vyas H. Comparative analysis of dripper. Agriculture Update Techsear. 2017;12(4): 990-994.

80. Trivedi A, Nandeha N, Mishra S. Dryland agriculture and farming technology: Problems and solutions. Climate Resilient Smart Agriculture: Approaches & Techniques. 2022;35-51.

81. Trivedi A, Pyasi SK, Galkate RV. A review on modelling of rainfall – runoff process. The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2018;7(4): 1161-1164.

82. Trivedi A, Pyasi SK, Galkate RV. Estimation of Evapotranspiration using Cropwat 8.0 Model for Shipra River Basin in Madhya Pradesh, India. Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci. 2018;7(05):1248-1259.

83. Trivedi A, Pyasi SK, Galkate RV. Impact of Climate Change Using Trend Analysis of Rainfall, RRL AWBM Toolkit, Synthetic and Arbitrary Scenarios. Current; 2019.

84. Trivedi A, Pyasi SK, Galkate RV, Gautam VK. A Case Study of Rainfall Runoff Modelling for Shipra River Basin. nt.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci. 2020;Special Issue-11:3027-3043.

85. Trivedi A, Singh BS, Nandeha N. Flood Forecasting using the Avenue of Models. JISET - International Journal of Innovative Science, Engineering & Technology. 2020; 7(12):299-311.

86. Trivedi A, Verma NS, Nandeha N, Yadav D, Rao KVR, Rajwade Y. Spatial data modelling: Remote Sensing Sensors and Platforms. Climate resilient smart agriculture: Approaches & Techniques. 2022;226-240.

87. van Diepen CE, Keulen Hv, Wolf J, Berkhout JAA. Land evaluation: from intuition to quantification. Advances in Soil Science. 1991;15:139–204.

88. van Eekeren N, de Boer H, Hanegraaf M, Bokhorst J, Nierop D. Bloem J, Schouten

T, de Goede R, Brussaard L. Ecosystem services in grassland associated with biotic and abiotic soil parameters. Soil Biology and Biochemistry. 2010;42:1491–1504.

89.   van Latesteijn HC. Assessment of future options for land use in the European Community. Ecological Engineering. 1995; 4:211–222.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/110128