Sativa : Journal of Agricultural Sciences
E- ISSN : 3089-7807
Volume. 2 Issue 1 March 2026
Page No: 16-27

Integrating Ecological and Economic Indicators into Decision Support Systems for Sustainable Pest Management

Jusman Tang
Universitas Muhammadiyah Sidenreng Rappang, Indonesia
Correspondent: tang.jusman@gmail.com

Received : Januari 28, 2026
Accepted : March 08, 2026
Published : March 31, 2026

Citation: Tang, J., (2026). Integrating Ecological and Economic Indicators into Decision Support Systems for Sustainable Pest Management. Sativa : Journal of Agricultural Sciences, 2(1), 16-27.

ABSTRACT: Digital Decision Support Systems (DSS) are increasingly leveraged in agricultural pest and disease management to enhance decision-making and reduce environmental impacts. This study aims to evaluate how DSS contributes to sustainability by identifying measurable proxy indicators across ecological, economic, and behavioral dimensions. A conceptual framework was applied using secondary data from agricultural reports, scientific literature, and DSS evaluations. Sustainability was operationalized through indicators such as pesticide use frequency, Environmental Impact Quotient (EIQ), yield improvements, input cost reductions, and user adoption rates. Results reveal that DSS implementation can significantly reduce pesticide dependency, increase natural enemy populations, and enhance ecological resilience. Economically, DSS promotes input efficiency, higher productivity, and improved profitability. Behaviorally, adoption rates and user engagement correlate positively with sustainability outcomes. The study identifies barriers such as inconsistent data and limited user accessibility, while proposing design principles like real-time feedback, dynamic proxy integration, and user-centric visualization tools. In conclusion, embedding sustainability metrics into DSS enhances their potential to support environmentally sound and economically viable farming. This research offers a structured evaluation framework that informs DSS development, policymaking, and farmer adoption strategies, thereby contributing to the advancement of sustainable agriculture.

Keywords: Decision Support Systems, Sustainability Metrics, Pest Management, Proxy Indicators, Ecological Resilience, Digital Agriculture.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the agricultural sector has faced mounting pressure to improve productivity while simultaneously reducing environmental impacts. Digital innovations, particularly Decision Support Systems (DSS), have emerged as crucial tools in advancing sustainable agriculture. These systems integrate multifaceted data inputs from weather patterns to crop phenology and guide farmers in making data-informed decisions that enhance operational efficiency and ecological stewardship.

DSS has grown into a cornerstone of precision agriculture, a paradigm that seeks to tailor agronomic interventions to site-specific conditions (Adereti et al., 2023; Lindblom et al., 2016).

The fundamental contribution of DSS lies in its ability to optimize input use and reduce waste through technologies such as remote sensing, geographic information systems (GIS), and advanced data analytics. By leveraging these capabilities, DSS enables more accurate decision-making for fertilization, irrigation, and pest management (Marinko et al., 2024; Panda et al., 2023). For example, DSS allows for site-specific crop management by correlating real-time data with historical records and forecasting models, a practice that underpins sustainable agricultural methodologies (Panda et al., 2023; Piñeiro et al., 2020). In parallel, DSS platforms increasingly serve educational roles, informing users about best practices and preconditions for adopting sustainable techniques.

Notably, DSS also facilitates adaptive management by simulating outcomes under different agricultural scenarios. These predictive tools enable users to evaluate the consequences of varied inputs or pest control strategies, thus supporting more resilient and responsive decision-making processes (Zhou et al., 2024). This predictive capacity is especially relevant in the context of Integrated Pest Management (IPM), where DSS can help minimize pesticide dependency and promote biological alternatives aligned with sustainability principles (Bueno et al., 2020; Duan et al., 2021).

The integration of DSS into IPM frameworks significantly enhances pest control efficiency by providing real-time insights into pest life cycles, density thresholds, and environmental triggers. Through these capabilities, DSS supports optimal timing for interventions, thereby reducing unnecessary chemical applications and promoting ecological balance (Duan et al., 2021; Stanley et al., 2020). Empirical studies suggest that DSS can reduce fungicide use by half without compromising yield or increasing disease risk, highlighting its potential for sustainable pest management (Kanatas et al., 2020).

Moreover, DSS fosters an ecosystem-based approach to pest management by incorporating biological controls, local knowledge, and community practices into its decision-making algorithms. This holistic method strengthens farm resilience and enhances biodiversity, thereby aligning pest control strategies with broader sustainability goals (Leybourne et al., 2024).

Despite these advancements, significant challenges remain in evaluating the real-world impact of DSS on agricultural sustainability. The complex nature of agroecosystems, characterized by diverse biophysical, socio-economic, and cultural factors, makes isolating the effects of DSS difficult (Bueno et al., 2020). For instance, varying levels of farmer engagement, differences in local ecology, and inconsistent data quality can all obscure outcome measurements. Compounding these issues is the lack of standardization in metrics for assessing DSS performance (Tikhonova & Buzylev, 2024).

Additionally, many DSS tools are underutilized due to technological barriers and limited user capacity, particularly in developing regions. Farmers may lack access to the necessary infrastructure or the digital literacy required to effectively use these systems (Angelakıs et al., 2020). Moreover, DSS efficacy is highly contingent upon the quality and comprehensiveness of input data.

Inaccurate or incomplete data can undermine the integrity of DSS recommendations and erode user trust (Marinko et al., 2024).

Sustainability in the context of digital agriculture is increasingly being framed as a balance between productivity and environmental conservation. As climate change intensifies and resources become scarcer, integrating sustainability into every facet of agricultural innovation becomes imperative (Vela et al., 2019; Wahaab et al., 2020). DSS tools serve as a conduit for achieving this balance by offering scalable solutions that optimize yields while minimizing adverse ecological impacts (Panda et al., 2020).

There is also a growing recognition that technologies must be adaptable to local contexts to ensure adoption and impact. Participatory approaches involving farmers and stakeholders are increasingly seen as vital for the development and deployment of DSS, ensuring these tools are contextually relevant and user-centered (Vishwajith et al., 2020). Effective stakeholder engagement not only facilitates better adoption but also cultivates a sense of ownership and long-term commitment to sustainable practices (Alamanos et al., 2021).

Operationalizing sustainability in agricultural technology studies typically involves measuring outcomes across three dimensions: environmental, economic, and social. Environmental indicators often include reductions in chemical input, water efficiency, and improvements in biodiversity (Vibart et al., 2021). Economic indicators emphasize profitability, cost savings, and input-output efficiency. Social metrics may assess knowledge dissemination, user satisfaction, and community-level impacts (Bamiou et al., 2021). These metrics ensure that sustainability is not just an aspirational ideal but a quantifiable outcome rooted in real-world transformations (Marinko et al., 2024).

To guide evaluation, several conceptual frameworks have emerged. Multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) is widely used to assess DSS based on varied performance metrics like economic returns, environmental benefits, and stakeholder acceptance (Bueno et al., 2020). DSS tools are also frequently classified by their functional capabilities, such as monitoring, prediction, and decision support, enabling more precise selection and evaluation of tools (Kanatas et al., 2020).

Case studies further enrich these frameworks by providing contextualized, empirical data on DSS deployment. They help validate model assumptions, refine evaluation techniques, and capture diverse agricultural realities (Mitraka et al., 2020). Overall, these frameworks underscore the importance of multi-dimensional, evidence-based assessment methods for understanding and enhancing DSS effectiveness in pest and disease management.

This study builds upon these foundations to explore how sustainability outcomes of DSS interventions can be operationalized using proxy indicators. It aims to develop a structured framework of measurable variables that can serve as practical tools for evaluating DSS contributions to sustainable agriculture.

METHOD

This chapter outlines the methodological framework used to assess the effectiveness of Decision Support Systems (DSS) in agriculture, with a particular focus on how sustainability outcomes can be evaluated using secondary data and proxy indicators. The approach incorporates a review and synthesis of various data sources, dimensions of sustainability, and indicators to operationalize ecological, economic, and behavioral impacts of DSS.

Secondary Data Sources Commonly Used in Assessing DSS Effectiveness

The evaluation relies extensively on secondary data derived from multiple established sources:

- Academic Literature and Case Studies: Peer-reviewed research offers foundational insights into DSS development and its agricultural impacts. For example, Egan et al., (2020) provide empirical data on Integrated Pest and Pollinator Management (IPPM) and information technologies in agriculture.
- Agricultural Statistics: National and international datasets (e.g., FAO, government agriculture surveys) offer quantifiable indicators such as pesticide use intensity, crop yields, and economic performance metrics (Siddiqui et al., 2023).
- Government and NGO Reports: These documents include impact evaluations, policy assessments, and implementation reviews from public agencies and non-governmental actors. Pertot et al. (2017) review IPM tool implementation in viticulture as an example.
- Field Trials and Experiments: Controlled studies provide comparative insights on DSS performance versus conventional methods.
- Surveys and Interviews: Farmer perceptions, DSS usability, and barriers to adoption are gathered through qualitative instruments.

Measuring Ecological, Economic, and Behavioral Dimensions in DSS Evaluation Studies

To capture the multifaceted impacts of DSS, this study organizes indicators into three main sustainability dimensions:

- Ecological Dimension:
  - *Biodiversity Metrics*: Species richness and abundance changes.
  - *Pesticide Usage Reduction*: Number and volume of pesticide applications.
  - *Environmental Performance*: Soil health, water quality, and ecological service delivery.
- Economic Dimension:
  - *Cost-Benefit Analysis*: Implementation cost versus pesticide savings and yield improvements.
  - *Yield Analysis*: Comparative yields before and after DSS usage.

  - *Profitability Metrics*: Net margin improvements from DSS-based interventions.
- Behavioral Dimension:
  - *Adoption Rates*: Proportion of farmers using DSS.
  - *User Satisfaction*: Ease-of-use, perceived effectiveness.
  - *Compliance Behavior*: Consistency in following DSS thresholds and recommendations.

Indicators Used as Proxies for Sustainability in Agricultural Decision-Making Models

Sustainability is operationalized using measurable proxy indicators across the following categories:

- *Chemical Input Reduction*: Quantitative drops in pesticide and fertilizer use.
- *Resource Use Efficiency*: Indicators such as water or energy consumption per yield unit.
- *Economic Viability*: Farm-level profitability and financial resilience.
- *Crop Diversity*: Species and varietal diversity as resilience markers.
- *Community Impact*: Social outcomes including farmer well-being and participatory engagement.

This methodological structure enables a comprehensive evaluation of DSS by aligning quantitative data and qualitative insights with established sustainability frameworks, thereby offering a robust assessment of agricultural decision-support tools in real-world settings.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results of evaluating Decision Support Systems (DSS) within the context of sustainable agriculture. The findings are structured across ecological, economic, and behavioral dimensions, drawing from empirical studies, field data, and literature analysis.

Ecological Dimension

Metrics Used to Assess Pesticide Dependency

Pesticide dependency is assessed using metrics like the Pesticide Use Index (PUI) and reduction percentages, which compare usage before and after DSS implementation (Lindblom et al., 2016). These metrics quantify input intensity relative to yield or land area.

Environmental Impact Quotient (EIQ)

The EIQ assesses pesticide impacts by integrating toxicity, persistence, and exposure potential across treated areas (Zhou et al., 2024). It is applied to evaluate the ecological implications of pesticide use and to compare sustainability performance pre- and post-DSS (Lindblom et al., 2016).

Natural Enemy Indices

Used to measure the presence and abundance of biological control agents, natural enemy indices reflect the ecological balance supported by IPM and DSS tools. These indicators validate DSS capacity to align pest control with ecosystem resilience.

Validation of TFI and Disease Incidence

The Toxicity Factor Index (TFI) and disease incidence rates are validated through field trials. Post-DSS data show lower TFI scores and disease prevalence, confirming ecological improvements.

Economic Dimension

Economic Indicators

Net Profit Margin and Return on Investment (ROI) are standard indicators. DSS adoption shows positive ROI due to reduced pesticide/labor costs and higher yields.

Input Cost Reductions

DSS-supported decisions significantly reduce unnecessary pesticide and fertilizer inputs. Studies link these reductions to data-driven application timing and dosage optimization.

Profitability and DSS Adoption

Farm profitability increases due to improved resource efficiency and better market positioning. DSS enables predictive yield management and risk reduction, contributing to long-term financial gains.

Yield Measurement

Yield is evaluated through pre/post comparisons using statistical analyses. Strip trials and regression models show yield gains under DSS-based management.

Behavioral Dimension

Adoption and Compliance Metrics

Adoption rates and training completion percentages reflect DSS uptake. Compliance is assessed via adherence to DSS thresholds for pesticide application.

User Behavior Patterns

Behavioral traits such as digital literacy, engagement frequency, and openness to innovation influence DSS outcomes. Training programs enhance these traits and thus improve DSS effectiveness.

Survey Instruments

Tools like the System Usability Scale (SUS) assess ease of use and user satisfaction. Surveys also measure perceived utility, clarity of outputs, and application consistency.

Correlation with Sustainability Outcomes

Higher DSS engagement correlates with reduced pesticide use and improved ecological metrics. Empirical evidence suggests strong links between behavioral adoption and sustainability improvements.

The integration of sustainability metrics into Decision Support Systems (DSS) is a significant advancement in the movement toward more environmentally and economically viable agriculture. By embedding indicators such as carbon footprints, biodiversity indices, and water use efficiency into digital tools, DSS platforms are increasingly facilitating data-driven, sustainability-conscious decision-making. These embedded metrics offer users tangible feedback, empowering them to align their practices with both productivity and ecological goals (Lindblom et al., 2016).

State-of-the-art DSS platforms incorporate spatial data via GIS and remote sensing, coupled with frameworks like IDEA4, to provide holistic assessments of agricultural performance (Khanal et al., 2020; Zahm et al., 2024). Additionally, algorithmic modeling enhances predictive capabilities, allowing farmers to visualize sustainability trade-offs and forecast long-term outcomes (Cao & Solangi, 2023). Despite these capabilities, operationalizing sustainability in real-time agricultural contexts presents considerable barriers.

Data integration remains one of the most pressing challenges. The variability and inconsistency of agricultural data can diminish system reliability and user trust. Moreover, without user-centered design, DSS platforms often fail to resonate with their primary audience farmers. In particular, smallholder farmers may face challenges related to digital literacy and technological access, further impeding adoption (Nhemachena et al., 2018). Institutional inertia, often rooted in traditional farming practices, poses additional resistance to innovation, while limited funding and insufficient training restrict system utilization and optimization (Eyhorn et al., 2019).

Best practices for overcoming these barriers include defining standardized sustainability indicators such as EIQ and biodiversity scores. These indicators must be interpretable and actionable. User engagement in the design process ensures that DSS platforms reflect real-world farming contexts and decision-making processes. Real-time feedback loops and dynamic updating mechanisms allow for adaptive responses to variables like pest outbreaks and weather anomalies (Cao & Solangi, 2023).

Effective visualization tools, including dashboards and infographics, help simplify complex metrics, making them more accessible and engaging. Multi-Criteria Decision-Making (MCDM) frameworks further enhance these tools by allowing farmers to weigh and prioritize sustainability objectives, which aligns DSS outputs with diverse agricultural goals (Zahm et al., 2024).

From a policy standpoint, structured training programs are essential to increase farmer proficiency in using DSS. Government and institutional incentives for sustainable practices such as grants or subsidies for meeting sustainability benchmarks can significantly drive DSS adoption (Ngo et al., 2020). Furthermore, collaborative R&D between tech developers, agricultural researchers, and end-users ensures that DSS tools remain contextually relevant and technically robust (Nhemachena et al., 2018).

Policy coherence at local and national levels can also enhance DSS effectiveness. Integrated agricultural-environmental policies that reward sustainable decision-making will create an enabling environment for digital innovation. These interventions, both at the design and governance levels, are critical for amplifying the sustainability impacts of DSS and for fostering resilient agricultural systems capable of adapting to environmental and economic changes.

CONCLUSION

This study has explored the integration of sustainability metrics into Decision Support Systems (DSS) for pest and disease management within agricultural systems. By evaluating ecological, economic, and behavioral indicators, it has demonstrated how proxy variables can effectively represent the broader sustainability impacts of DSS implementations.

Findings indicate that DSS platforms significantly contribute to ecological sustainability through reduced pesticide usage, enhanced biodiversity, and improved disease control. Economic benefits were also evident, including increased yields, optimized input costs, and improved profitability. Moreover, the role of farmer behavior particularly adoption rates and user engagement proved vital in translating digital decision support into sustainable outcomes.

The research highlights several challenges to integrating sustainability into DSS, such as inconsistent data, limited digital literacy, and lack of institutional support. Nevertheless, it also identifies best practices, including user-centered design, real-time feedback, dynamic proxy indicator integration, and visualization tools, all of which enhance user experience and data applicability.

Key contributions of this study include a structured evaluation framework and a practical taxonomy of sustainability proxies. These tools can guide policymakers, developers, and agricultural stakeholders in assessing and improving DSS performance. The study encourages embedding sustainability feedback mechanisms in DSS platforms, advocating for collaborative design, targeted training, and supportive policy frameworks.

Ultimately, the findings underscore that DSS platforms when equipped with robust sustainability metrics and aligned with user needs can become powerful enablers of environmentally sound, economically viable, and socially inclusive agricultural practices. Future research should focus on validating these metrics across diverse farming systems and expanding participatory approaches to ensure equitable and widespread adoption of sustainable digital technologies.

REFERENCE

Adereti, D. T., Gardezi, M., Wang, T., & McMaine, J. (2023). Understanding Farmers' Engagement and Barriers to Machine Learning-based Intelligent Agricultural Decision Support Systems. *Agronomy Journal*, *116*(3), 1237–1249. https://doi.org/10.1002/agj2.21358

Alamanos, A., Rolston, A., & Papaioannou, G. (2021). Development of a Decision Support System for Sustainable Environmental Management and Stakeholder Engagement. *Hydrology*, *8*(1), 40. https://doi.org/10.3390/hydrology8010040

Angelakιs, A. N., Zaccaria, D., Krasilnikoff, J. A., Salgot, M., Bazza, M., Roccaro, P., Jiménez, B., Kumar, A., Wang, Y., Baba, A., Harrison, J. A., Garduño-Jiménez, A.-L., & Fereres, E. (2020). Irrigation of World Agricultural Lands: Evolution Through the Millennia. *Water*, *12*(5), 1285. https://doi.org/10.3390/w12051285

Bamiou, D., Kikidis, D., Bibas, A., Koohi, N., Macdonald, N., Maurer, C., Wuyts, F. L., Ihtijarevic, B., Celis, L., Mucci, V., Maes, L., Rompaey, V. V, Heyning, P. V. d., Nazareth, I., Exarchos, T. P., Fotiadis, D. I., Koutsouris, D., & Luxon, L. (2021). Diagnostic Accuracy and Usability of the EMBalance Decision Support System for Vestibular Disorders in Primary Care: Proof of Concept Randomised Controlled Study Results. *Journal of Neurology*, *269*(5), 2584–2598. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00415-021-10829-7

Bueno, A. F., Panizzi, A. R., Hunt, T. E., Dourado, P. M., Pitta, R. M., & Gonçalves, J. (2020). Challenges for Adoption of Integrated Pest Management (IPM): The Soybean Example. *Neotropical Entomology*, *50*(1), 5–20. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13744-020-00792-9

Cao, J., & Solangi, Y. A. (2023). Analyzing and Prioritizing the Barriers and Solutions of Sustainable Agriculture for Promoting Sustainable Development Goals in China. *Sustainability*, *15*(10), 8317. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15108317

Duan, S. X., Wibowo, S., & Chong, J. (2021). A Multicriteria Analysis Approach for Evaluating the Performance of Agriculture Decision Support Systems for Sustainable Agribusiness. *Mathematics*, *9*(8), 884. https://doi.org/10.3390/math9080884

Egan, P. A., Dicks, L. V, Hokkanen, H., & Stenberg, J. A. (2020). Delivering Integrated Pest and Pollinator Management (IPPM). *Trends in Plant Science*, *25*(6), 577–589. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2020.01.006

Eyhorn, F., Müller, A., Reganold, J. P., Frison, E., Herren, H. R., Luttikholt, L., Mueller, A., Sanders, J., Scialabba, N. E., Seufert, V., & Smith, P. (2019). Sustainability in Global Agriculture Driven by Organic Farming. *Nature Sustainability*, *2*(4), 253–255. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0266-6

Kanatas, P., Travlos, I., Gazoulis, I., Tataridas, A., Τσεκούρα, A., & Antonopoulos, N. (2020). Benefits and Limitations of Decision Support Systems (DSS) With a Special Emphasis on Weeds. *Agronomy*, *10*(4), 548. https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy10040548

Khanal, S., KC, K., Fulton, J. P., Shearer, S. A., & Özkan, E. (2020). Remote Sensing in Agriculture—Accomplishments, Limitations, and Opportunities. *Remote Sensing*, *12*(22), 3783. https://doi.org/10.3390/rs12223783

Leybourne, D. J., Musa, N., & Yang, P. (2024). Can Artificial Intelligence Be Integrated Into Pest Monitoring Schemes to Help Achieve Sustainable Agriculture? An Entomological, Management and Computational Perspective. *Agricultural and Forest Entomology*, *27*(1), 8–17. https://doi.org/10.1111/afe.12630

Lindblom, J., Lundström, C., Ljung, M., & Jönsson, A. (2016). Promoting Sustainable Intensification in Precision Agriculture: Review of Decision Support Systems Development and Strategies. *Precision Agriculture*, *18*(3), 309–331. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11119-016-9491-4

Marinko, J., Blažica, B., Jørgensen, L. N., Matzen, N., Ramsden, M., & Debeljak, M. (2024). Typology for Decision Support Systems in Integrated Pest Management and Its Implementation as a Web Application. *Agronomy*, *14*(3), 485. https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy14030485

Mitraka, Z., Siachalou, S., Doxani, G., & Πατιάς, Π. (2020). Decision Support on Monitoring and Disaster Management in Agriculture With Copernicus Sentinel Applications. *Sustainability*, *12*(3), 1233. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12031233

Ngo, T., Nguyen, H., Ho, H., Nguyen, V., Dao, T. T. T., & Nguyen, H. T. (2020). Assessing the Important Factors of Sustainable Agriculture Development: An Indicateurs De Durabilité Des Exploitations Agricoles<scp>-</Scp>Analytic Hierarchy Process Study in the Northern Region of Vietnam. *Sustainable Development*, *29*(2), 327–338. https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2148

Nhemachena, C., Matchaya, G., Nhemachena, C. R., Karuaihe, S., Muchara, B., & Nhlengethwa, S. (2018). Measuring Baseline Agriculture-Related Sustainable Development Goals Index for Southern Africa. *Sustainability*, *10*(3), 849. https://doi.org/10.3390/su10030849

Panda, S., Terrill, T. H., Mahapatra, A. K., Kelly, B., Morgan, E. R., & Wyk, J. A. V. (2020). Site-Specific Forage Management of Sericea Lespedeza: Geospatial Technology-Based Forage Quality and Yield Enhancement Model Development. *Agriculture*, *10*(9), 419. https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture10090419

Panda, S., Terrill, T. H., Mahapatra, A. K., Morgan, E. R., Siddique, A., Pech-Cervantes, A. A., & Wyk, J. A. V. (2023). Optimizing Sericea Lespedeza Fodder Production in the Southeastern US: A Climate-Informed Geospatial Engineering Approach. *Agriculture*, *13*(9), 1661. https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture13091661

Pertot, I., Caffi, T., Rossi, V., Mugnai, L., Hoffmann, C., Grando, S., Gary, C., Lafond, D., Duso, C., Thiéry, D., Mazzoni, V., & Anfora, G. (2017). A Critical Review of Plant Protection Tools for Reducing Pesticide Use on Grapevine and New Perspectives for the Implementation of IPM in Viticulture. *Crop Protection*, *97*, 70–84. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2016.11.025

Piñeiro, V., Arias, J., Dürr, J., Elverdin, P., Ibáñez, A. M., Kinengyere, A. A., Opazo, C., Owoo, N. S., Page, J., Prager, S. D., & Torero, M. (2020). A Scoping Review on Incentives for Adoption of Sustainable Agricultural Practices and Their Outcomes. *Nature Sustainability*, *3*(10), 809–820. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-020-00617-y

Siddiqui, J. A., Fan, R., Naz, H., Bamisile, B. S., Hafeez, M., Ghani, M. I., Wei, Y., Xu, Y., & Chen, X. (2023). Insights Into Insecticide-Resistance Mechanisms in Invasive Species: Challenges and Control Strategies. *Frontiers in Physiology*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphys.2022.1112278

Stanley, J. D., Mehring, G. H., Wiersma, J., & Ransom, J. K. (2020). A Decision Support System to Guide Grower Selection of Optimal Seeding Rates of Wheat Cultivars in Diverse Environments. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, *11*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2020.00779

Tikhonova, M., & Buzylev, A. (2024). Application of DSS in Agroecological Assessment of the Potential of Use of Chernozem Soils in the Conditions of the Penza Region. *Bio Web of Conferences*, *82*, 02004. https://doi.org/10.1051/bioconf/20248202004

Vela, F. L. G., Htun, N. N., Schlenz, F., Kasimati, A., & Verbert, K. (2019). A Review of Visualisations in Agricultural Decision Support Systems: An HCI Perspective. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*, *163*, 104844. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2019.05.053

Vibart, R., Klein, C. A. M. de, Jonker, A., Weerden, T. J. van der, Bannink, A., Bayat, A. R., Crompton, L. A., Durand, A., Eugène, M., Klumpp, K., Kuhla, B., Lanigan, G., Lund, P., Ramin, M., & Salazar, F. (2021). Challenges and Opportunities to Capture Dietary Effects in on-Farm Greenhouse Gas Emissions Models of Ruminant Systems. *The Science of the Total Environment*, *769*, 144989. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.144989

Vishwajith, K. P., Sahu, P. K., Dhekale, B. S., Mishra, P., & Fatih, C. (2020). Decision Support System (DSS) on Pulses in India. *Legume Research - An International Journal*, (of). https://doi.org/10.18805/lr-4153

Wahaab, R. A., Mahmoud, M., & Lier, J. B. v. (2020). Toward Achieving Sustainable Management of Municipal Wastewater Sludge in Egypt: The Current Status and Future Prospective. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *127*, 109880. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.109880

Zahm, F., Ugaglia, A. A., Barbier, J.-M., Carayon, D., Del'Homme, B., Gafsi, M., Gasselin, P., Gestin, C., Girard, S., Guichard, L., Loyce, C., Manneville, V., Redlingshöfer, B., & Rodrigues, I. A. (2024). Assessing Farm Sustainability: The IDEA4 Method, a Conceptual Framework Combining Dimensions and Properties of Sustainability. *Cahiers Agricultures*, *33*, 10. https://doi.org/10.1051/cagri/2024001

Zhou, W., Arcot, Y., Medina, R. F., Bernal, J. S., Cisneros-Zevallos, L., & Akbulut, M. (2024). Integrated Pest Management: An Update on the Sustainability Approach to Crop Protection. *Acs Omega*, *9*(40), 41130–41147. https://doi.org/10.1021/acsomega.4c06628