



ISSN: 2617-1295

# Bio-economic production potentiality of *Solanum lycopersicum* under smart agroforestry practice

Md. Hafiz All Amin<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Most. Mottakina Akter<sup>3</sup>, Arup Kumar Biswas<sup>2</sup>,  
Md. Masud Rana Parvej<sup>4</sup> and Sarkar Mohammad Rayhan<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Agroforestry and Environment, Faculty of Agriculture, Hajee Mohammad Danesh Science and Technology University, Dinajpur-5200, Bangladesh, <sup>2</sup>Sustainable Energy Management, Faculty of Environmental Management, Prince of Songkla University, Hat Yai, 90110, Songkhla, Thailand, <sup>3</sup>Agricultural Innovation and Management Division, Faculty of Natural Resources, Prince of Songkla University, Songkhla, Thailand, 90110, <sup>4</sup>Officer (Chemicals), Padma Oil Company Limited, Bangladesh, <sup>5</sup>Additional Deputy Commissioner, Panchagarh District, Bangladesh

## ABSTRACT

Food security and maximum land use system are the priorities of crop production technique in the present global food growing environment. The tomato-*Albizia lebbek* agroforestry is an effective smart production approach. The aim of this research is to find out the appropriate combination of organic mulch leads the tomato *Albizia lebbek* agroforestry production as compared to sole cropping technique for growth, yield, and quality that brings health hygiene for fresh and cooked consumption. The experiment was laid out following two factors split plot design with three (3) replications. Tomato in open field ( $T_0$ ) and tomato under *Albizia lebbek* woodlot agroforestry system ( $T_1$ ) were arranged in main plots. Conversely, the usage of organic mulches was set in sub-plots viz.  $M_0$  = No mulch,  $M_1$  = Ash mulch,  $M_2$  = Saw dust mulch, and  $M_3$  = Water hyacinth mulch. The results indicated the highest yield (32.65 t/ha) was found in water hyacinth mulch ( $M_3$ ) and the lowest yield (21.37 t/ha) was detected in  $M_0$  without mulch (control). The treatment  $M_3$  (water hyacinth mulch) gave the maximum sugar-acid ratio (12.04%) and minimum sugar-acid ratio (9.42%) was found in control (no mulch). Furthermore, the result showed the production potentiality was the highest yield (29.41 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) was found in tomato- *Albizia lebbek* agroforestry ( $T_1$ ) and the lowest yield (25.95 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) was recorded in sole cropping of tomato ( $T_0$ ). The maximum sugar-acid ratio (11.37%) was found in tomato- *Albizia lebbek* agroforestry ( $T_1$ ) and the minimum sugar-acid ratio (10.31%) was found in sole cropping of tomato ( $T_0$ ). On the other, the combined effect tomato- *Albizia lebbek* agroforestry with water hyacinth mulch gave the highest yield (35.01 while, the lowest yield (22.47 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) was observed in sole cropping of tomato without mulch. The research finding also revealed the maximum benefit-cost ratio (4.94) was found from the tomato- *Albizia lebbek* agroforestry which was 20 % higher than tomato was grown in sole cropping. Finally, the tomato- *Albizia lebbek* agroforestry production in association with organic hyacinth mulch can be an effective production approach for maximum return in terms of yield, quality and money.

**KEYWORDS:** Smart agroforestry, Organic mulch, *Solanum lycopersicum*, and Multipurpose woodlot

Received: March 14, 2021  
Revised: May 18, 2021  
Accepted: May 20, 2021  
Published: June 04, 2021

**Corresponding author:**  
Md. Hafiz All Amin,  
E-mail: hafizallamin@gmail.com

## INTRODUCTION

The depletion and destruction of forests create the issue of food insecurity directly by impacting fruit production and other forest and tree-based food items as well as modification of the ecological factors important to crops and livestock and thereby affecting food supply (van Noordwijk *et al.*, 2014). Food protection happens where all residents have physical and economic access to appropriate, healthy and nutritious foods always that satisfy their nutritional requirements and generate and deliver them to individuals' food tastes and health status (Mah *et al.*, 2014). Although amazing improvements in production there is evidence that traditional agricultural

policies have not been able to eradicate world poverty, result in unbalanced, nutritionally deficient diets, raise people's vulnerability to high food markets, and fail to understand the ecological of enhanced agricultural processes over the longer term (FAO, 2013; FAO, 2014). Bangladesh is the world's eighth most heavily populated country having 163.7 million individuals with an area 147,570 square kilometers (BBS, 2018) 65 percent of the population lives in rural areas, and their livelihood depends mainly on agricultural activities (World Bank, 2016). The land area for agriculture has shrunk sharply due to rapid urbanization and industrialization. Over the last decade, 61,91% cultivated land and 27,77% vegetation covering reduced by replacing the urban morphology of major cities in Bangladesh (Hassan, 2017);

Copyright: © The authors. This article is open access and licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>) which permits unrestricted, use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, or format for any purpose, even commercially provided the work is properly cited. Attribution — You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made.

this trend is likely to get worse in the coming years (Hasan *et al.*, 2013). Additionally, it would not be adequate to fulfill the demands of the people living in rural areas to enforce the new scheme of land use with different allocations of agriculture and forestry (Hanif & Bari, 2013).

Besides, forests and tree-based systems can play a crucial role in supplementing agricultural production to provide better and more equitable nutrients for cooking (Vinceti *et al.*, 2013); wood for cooking; increased control of food consumption choices, especially during lean seasons and periods of vulnerability (including for marginalized groups) (FAO, 2011); This approach benefits local livelihoods, cultivation and food protection as essential environmental service providers (van Noordwijk *et al.*, 2012). Food sustainability, in all its facets, in an environment at risk of breaching global limits through its human exploitation and alteration of nature, atmosphere, water and nutrient cycles (Rockström *et al.*, 2009) implies an emphasis on food quality and diversity, beyond calorific volumes, and on simple choices to adopt suitable and sustainable diets to the anticipated population size and welfare goals (Bommarco *et al.*, 2013). Climate-Smart Agroforestry (CSA) seeks to contribute to adaptation and tolerance of climate change in agricultural systems, while also contributing to mitigation (reduction of emissions) and food protection (Campbell *et al.*, 2014; World Bank, 2015). Agroforestry is a prime example (Rosenstock *et al.*, 2016); it includes the combination of agriculture and forestry between farmers and multi-scale animals, crops and forests. Agroforestry includes the combined cultivation of trees and annual crops in cropland areas (Coulibaly *et al.*, 2017). It involves processes such as intercropping, silvopasture and home planting (Yasmin *et al.*, 2010).

Climate-Smart Agroforestry (CSA) is a modern approach of multi-product cultivation practice that rises crop yields, ensure food security and optimistic livelihood outcomes (Sileshi *et al.*, 2009; Akinifesi *et al.*, 2010). This approach would suitable, environmentally sound that meets the socio-economic needs of rural people (Mbow *et al.*, 2014; Chakraborty *et al.*, 2015). It can increase soil fertility; control soil erosion; boost the water quality, and improve biodiversity (Sharmin & Rabbi, 2016). It further reduces poverty by growing income and involves women in production activities (Leakey & Simons, 1998; Garrity, 2004). In this agroforestry system, *Albizia lebbek* the fast-growing deciduous, nitrogen-fixing tree performed a highly significant role in combined vegetable production, the environmental sustainability by reducing the carbon dioxide also added more economic returns (Rahman *et al.*, 2017).

Universally, Solanaceae grouped nutritious and popular vegetables Tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* L.) is the top producing vegetable in terms of production, consumption, and commercial use (Amin *et al.*, 2017b). It contains enough vitamin-A, vitamin-C, calcium, iron as well as antioxidant lycopene that reduces the risk of prostate cancer (Matin *et al.*, 1996). Though, this vegetable crop has huge prospect all around especially in Bangladesh, but the use of chemical fertilizers, pesticides, hormones etc. create an unsustainable farming

approach. Moreover, the mono cropping tomato production system reduces the soil fertility and natural resources result in climate change, health impacts, unstable incomes (Zaman *et al.*, 2006). It is important to use inputs and methods to boost the ecological equilibrium of natural systems to produce healthy, even nutritious foods. This arises because the organic crop is cultivated without pesticides, herbicides, highly soluble fertilizers.

Mulching is a useful water-saving technique (Stolz *et al.*, 2011; Biswas *et al.*, 2015), usually, the presence of mulch typically decreases the net radiation and increases the heat allocation in the soil, lowers the required surface energy and thus reduces ET<sub>c</sub> (Dlamini *et al.*, 2017). The physical barrier created by the mulch prevents the loss of water by evaporation, which also raises the temperature of the soil (Fan *et al.*, 2017) and can also induce early harvesting (Díaz-Pérez, 2009). Water evaporated from the ground is unproductive since it does not participate in plant physiological as well as metabolic processes. Also, mulch prevents weed growth (Moreno *et al.*, 2016). Sheppard *et al.* (2020) reviewed the potentiality and response of agroforestry for the alleviation of climate change. The FAO study further suggests that research supports the concept that forests and trees often make important contributions to the UNEP Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) through the informal sector, gender equity, adaptation to climate change, and as part of a comprehensive approach to land depletion and biodiversity destruction (Kader *et al.*, 2017; Moreno *et al.*, 2013). AFS is commonly used in developed countries and is now a major land use system; in addition, at least 1.2 billion people around the world have been estimated to be relying on such schemes. Off-site advantages include decreased runoff, decreased loading of nutrients and increased water quality. Nevertheless, AFS can (and must) be complimentary to other current land uses. Organic production not only eliminates health risks for both farmers and customers, but also preserves and increases soil quality (Reith *et al.*, 2020). Rahman *et al.* (2011) investigated the output of tomatoes under various multistorey agroforestry development systems and found that except for plant height, all other morphological features were found. Hossain *et al.* (2014) reported that the economic performance of fruit tree-based tomato production system showed that both the net return and BCR of mango and guava-based system was higher over control and olive-based system. The contents of organic carbon, nitrogen, available phosphorus, potassium and sulfur of before experimentation soil were slightly higher in fruit tree-based agroforestry systems than the control. There is a plenty of scope to set a research in the production, quality and economic benefits of tomato grow under a multi-purpose tree woodlot influence by the organic mulch.

Thus, the existing land-use systems are insufficient to meet the demands of food, fuel, fodder, timber and other minor products in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Given the above, the research aims to contribute a climate-smart agroforestry approach to organic and safe tomato production by using organic mulch under the *Albizia lebbek* woodlots.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Site of the Experiment

The experiment was conducted in Agroforestry and Environment Research Farm, Hajee Mohammad Danesh Science and Technology University, Dinajpur. The site was between 25° 13' latitude and 88° 23' longitude, and about 37.5 m above the sea level. The experimental plot was in a medium high land belonging to the old Himalayan Piedmont Plain Area (AEZ No. 01). Land was well-drained and drainage system was well developed. The soil texture was sandy loam in nature. The soil pH was 5.1 found in the field. The experimental site was situated under the tropical climate characterized by heavy rainfall from July to August and scanty rainfall in the rest period of the year. Monthly maximum and minimum temperatures, rainfall and relative humidity recorded during the experimental period.

### Experimental Design And Treatment

The experiment was laid out following a split plot design with three (3) replications. Tomato under *Albizia lebbbeck* woodlot and tomato in open field were arranged in main plots  $T_0$  = tomato sole cropping (control) and  $T_1$  = tomato *Albizia lebbbeck* woodlot agroforestry system. On the other hand, application of organic mulches was in sub-plots;  $M_0$  = No mulch,  $M_1$  = Ash mulch,  $M_2$  = Saw dust mulch, and  $M_3$  = Water hyacinth mulch. Total numbers of experimental plots were 24 (2 x 4 x 3). The unit plot size is 2.5m x 2.5m = 6.25 m<sup>2</sup>. The total numbers of experimental plots were 2. The individual plot area was 4.5 m x 4.5 m = 20.25 m<sup>2</sup>. Twelve (12) plots were laid under *Albizia lebbbeck* woodlot agroforestry system and 12 plots were laid in the control (open field). The field research work was started in October 2018 and was completed in April 2019.

### Crop Establishment

Tomato seedlings were raised in a seed bed situated on a relatively high land adjacent to the Agroforestry and Environment Research field. Five gram of seeds were sown in a seedbed on October 10<sup>th</sup>, 2018. Sown seeds were covered with light soil. Complete germination of the seeds took place within 7 days after sowing. The land of experimental plot was tilled in the 2<sup>nd</sup> week of October 2018 with spade and it was made ready for transplanting on 31<sup>st</sup> October 2018. The corners of the land were spaded and visible larger clods were hammered to break into small pieces. All weeds and stubbles were removed from the field. The layout was done as per experimental design. All basal dosages of fertilizer as per scheduled of the experiment was incorporated in the soil and finally the plots were made ready for planting. Twenty one days old healthy and disease free seedlings were uprooted from the seedbed and transplanted in to the main field on 31<sup>st</sup> October 2018 maintain spacing 15 cm plant to plant and line to line 10cm. All the organic mulching materials were applied in 15 days after transplanting in the plot i.e. 16 November 2018.

### Samplings, Measurements, and Analyses

Five plants were selected randomly from each plot and tagged properly for data collection. For this purpose, the outer two rows

of plants and the plants in the extreme ends of the middle rows were not considered for selecting the sample plants.

Data were recorded on the following parameters for yield contributing characters of tomato.

- Plant height (cm)
- Number of branch per plant
- Number of fruits per plant
- Individual fruit weight
- Fruit yield per plant
- Yield (ton per ha)

Data were recorded on the following parameters for fruit quality of tomato.

- Reducing sugar (%)
- Soluble sugar (%)
- Vitamin C (mg 100 g<sup>-1</sup>)
- Organic acid (%)
- Sugar-acid ratio (%)

### Economic performance of tomato

For the evaluation the of tomato economic analysis under *Albizia lebbbeck* woodlot agroforestry system along with sole cropping, the cost of cultivation, gross and net returns per hectare and benefit-cost ratio were calculated.

The cost of cultivation of the tomato under *Albizia lebbbeck* woodlot agroforestry system along with sole cropping was estimated. Gross return is the monetary value of total product and by-product. Per hectare gross returns from tomato was calculated by multiplying the total amount of production by their respective market prices. Net return usually means the profit of the enterprises. Net return was calculated by deducting the total cost of production from the gross return.

Net return = Gross return (Tk. ha<sup>-1</sup>) – Total cost of production (Tk. ha<sup>-1</sup>)

Benefit-cost ratio is the ratio of gross return with total cost of production. It was calculated by using the following formula (Islam et al., 2004).

$$\text{Benefit-cost ratio} = \frac{\text{Gross return (Tk. ha}^{-1}\text{)}}{\text{Total cost of production (Tk. ha}^{-1}\text{)}}$$

Data were statistically analyzed using the (ANOVA) "Analysis of Variance" technique with the help of the computer package MSTAT. The mean differences were adjusted by the Duncan's Multiple Range Test (Gomez & Gomez, 1984).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Effect of Organic Mulch on Growth, Yield, and Quality of Tomato

Effect of different organic mulches on the plant height, number of branches plant<sup>-1</sup>, number of fruits plant<sup>-1</sup>, individual fruit

weight, fruit yield plant<sup>-1</sup> was presented in the table 1. The plant height from the soil surface to the last opened leaves of the apex were recorded in the mature harvesting stage. The results revealed that the effect of organic mulches had significant variations over control. The highest plant height (131.70 cm) was recorded in M<sub>2</sub> and the lowest plant height (115.70 cm) was found in control treatment (M<sub>0</sub>). Hossain (1996) recorded that plant height of garlic were significantly higher for mulched than unmatched plants. In a trail with organic mulches or polythene mulch on tomato a minimum effect had been observed on plant height by Srivastara *et al.* (1981). The highest number of branch plant<sup>-1</sup> (14.16) was found in M<sub>1</sub> (ash mulch) which was followed by M<sub>3</sub> (water hyacinth mulch) and the lowest number of branch plant<sup>-1</sup> (7.76) was found in control (M<sub>0</sub>). Olasutan (1985) was found significantly higher number of branch/plant in tomato from mulched plants than unmulched plants. A similar finding was reported by Wojtaszek *et al.* (1977). Significantly the highest number of fruit plant<sup>-1</sup> (48.42) was recorded in M<sub>3</sub> (water hyacinth mulch). On the other hand, the lowest number of fruit plant<sup>-1</sup> (22.05) was recorded in M<sub>0</sub> control (no mulch treatment). Among all mulching treatments, the highest individual fruit weight (132.20 g) was recorded in M<sub>3</sub> (water hyacinth mulch) followed by M<sub>1</sub> (ash mulch). The lowest fruit weight (105.40 g) was recorded in M<sub>0</sub> control (without mulch). Medina *et al.* (2011) reported that all mulch treatment gave higher yield compared with the control. Significantly the highest fruits plant<sup>-1</sup> (6.41 kg) was recorded in M<sub>3</sub> (water hyacinth mulch) followed by M<sub>1</sub> (ash mulch). On the other hand, the lowest fruits plant<sup>-1</sup> (2.32 kg) was found in M<sub>0</sub> control (without mulch), respectively. Tomato yield was differed significantly by the organic mulching (Figure 1). The highest yield (32.65 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) was found in M<sub>3</sub> (water hyacinth mulch) which was followed by (30.04 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) found in M<sub>1</sub> (ash mulch). The lowest yield (21.37 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) was observed in M<sub>0</sub> control (without mulch), respectively. Medina *et al.* (2011) reported that all mulch treatment gave higher yield compared with the control.

The effect of organic mulch on the fruit quality (reducing sugar%, soluble sugar%, vitamin-C, organic acid ratio%) of tomato was found significantly different and the result was presented in the Table 2. Significantly the maximum soluble sugar (4.48%) was recorded in control treatment (M<sub>0</sub>) that was statistically similar to (4.24%) found in M<sub>1</sub> (ash mulch) and the minimum soluble sugar (4.24) was calculated in M<sub>3</sub> (water hyacinth mulch). But in case of vitamin-C content, water hyacinth mulch (M<sub>3</sub>) showed the maximum amount vitamin-C (14.58 mg/100g of tomato fruit) and the minimum vitamin-C (5.88 mg/100g of tomato fruit) was taken from control treatment (no mulch), respectively. The height percentage of organic acid (0.403) was measured in M<sub>1</sub> treatment which was statistically similar to M<sub>2</sub> and M<sub>3</sub> and the lowest percentage of organic acid (0.308) was found in control treatment. Finally, the treatment M<sub>3</sub> (water hyacinth mulch) gave the maximum sugar-acid ratio (12.04%) and minimum sugar-acid ratio (9.42%) was found in control (no mulch).

### Effect of Two Production System on Growth, Yield, and Quality of Tomato

Tomato grown under *Albizia lebbbeck* woodlot agroforestry system was more vigorous than grown in sole cropping i.e. in

**Table 1: Effects of organic mulch on yield contributing characters of tomato**

| Treatments            | Plant height (cm) | Number of branches plant <sup>-1</sup> | Number of fruits plant <sup>-1</sup> | Individual fruit weight (g) | Fruit yield (kg plant <sup>-1</sup> ) |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| M <sub>0</sub>        | 115.70 d          | 7.76 d                                 | 22.05 d                              | 105.40 d                    | 2.32 d                                |
| M <sub>1</sub>        | 123.30 b          | 14.16 a                                | 38.75 b                              | 119.80 b                    | 4.64 b                                |
| M <sub>2</sub>        | 131.70 a          | 11.79 c                                | 30.53 c                              | 115.70 c                    | 3.51 c                                |
| M <sub>3</sub>        | 118.1 c           | 13.12 b                                | 48.42 a                              | 132.20 a                    | 6.41 a                                |
| Level of Significance | **                | *                                      | *                                    | **                          | *                                     |
| CV (%)                | 1.11              | 3.33                                   | 0.96                                 | 2.97                        | 1.84                                  |

M<sub>0</sub> = no mulch; M<sub>1</sub> = ash mulch; M<sub>2</sub> = saw dust mulch; and M<sub>3</sub> = water hyacinth mulch.

Columns with the same letter or without letter (s) are not significantly different. Columns with dissimilar letters indicate treatments which differ significantly based on DMRT.

<sup>ns</sup> Not significant; \* significant at p ≤ 0.05; \*\* significant at p ≤ 0.01. The CV indicates the ratio of the SD to the mean


**Table 2: Effects of organic mulch on fruit quality of tomato**

| Treatments            | Reducing sugar (%) | Soluble sugar (%) | Vitamin C (mg 100 g <sup>-1</sup> ) | Organic acid (%) | Sugar-acid ratio (%) |
|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| M <sub>0</sub>        | 2.88               | 4.48 a            | 5.88 c                              | 0.308 b          | 9.42 d               |
| M <sub>1</sub>        | 2.79               | 4.37 ab           | 12.02 b                             | 0.403 a          | 11.31 b              |
| M <sub>2</sub>        | 2.75               | 4.31 bc           | 12.03 b                             | 0.362 ab         | 10.62 c              |
| M <sub>3</sub>        | 2.74               | 4.24 c            | 14.58 a                             | 0.397 a          | 12.04 a              |
| Level of Significance | ns                 | *                 | *                                   | *                | **                   |
| CV (%)                | 0.73               | 0.60              | 1.79                                | 1.73             | 0.60                 |

M<sub>0</sub> = no mulch; M<sub>1</sub> = ash mulch; M<sub>2</sub> = saw dust mulch; and M<sub>3</sub> = water hyacinth mulch.

Columns with the same letter or without letter (s) are not significantly different. Columns with dissimilar letters indicate treatments which differ significantly based on DMRT.

<sup>ns</sup> Not significant; \* significant at p ≤ 0.05; \*\* significant at p ≤ 0.01. The CV indicates the ratio of the SD to the mean



**Figure 1: Effect of organic mulch on tomato fruit yield ton/ha**  
Bars with the same letter are not significantly different; bars with dissimilar letters indicate treatments which significantly differ based on DMRT


full sun light conditions (Table 3). In mature harvesting stage, significantly the highest plant height (132.2 cm) was observed in T<sub>1</sub> treatment (tomato-*Albizia lebbbeck* agroforestry) and the lowest plant height (122.2 cm) was observed in sole cropping of tomato (T<sub>0</sub>). Hillman (1984) reported that, plant grown



in low light levels was found to be more apical dominant than those grown in high light environment resulting in taller plants under shade. The highest number of branches plant<sup>-1</sup> (12.57) was observed in T<sub>1</sub> treatment (tomato- *Albizia lebbbeck* agroforestry) whereas the lowest number of branches plant<sup>-1</sup> (10.84) was recorded in sole cropping of tomato (T<sub>0</sub>). Significantly the highest number of fruits plant<sup>-1</sup> (35.81) was recorded in T<sub>1</sub> treatment (tomato- *Albizia lebbbeck* agroforestry). On the other hand, the lowest number of fruits plant<sup>-1</sup> (34.07) was found in sole cropping of tomato (T<sub>0</sub>), respectively. The highest fruits weight (120.8 g) was recorded in T<sub>1</sub> treatment (tomato- *Albizia lebbbeck* agroforestry) and the lowest fruits weight (106.9 g) was found in sole cropping of tomato (T<sub>0</sub>). The highest fruits plant<sup>-1</sup> (4.44 kg) was recorded in T<sub>1</sub> treatment (tomato- *Albizia lebbbeck* agroforestry) and the lowest fruits plant<sup>-1</sup> (4.01 kg) was found in sole cropping of tomato (T<sub>0</sub>), respectively. Tomato yield was differ significantly due to the effect of two production systems (Figure 2).

The highest yield (29.41 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) was found in T<sub>1</sub> treatment (tomato- *Albizia lebbbeck* agroforestry) and the lowest yield (25.95 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) was recorded in sole cropping of tomato (T<sub>0</sub>).

The effect of two production technique on the fruit quality (reducing sugar%, soluble sugar%, vitamin-C, organic acid ratio%) of tomato was recorded significantly varied and the result was showed in the table 4. Significantly the maximum soluble sugar (4.49%) was noted in sole cropping of tomato (T<sub>0</sub>) and the minimum soluble sugar (4.22%) was considered in T<sub>1</sub> treatment (tomato- *Albizia lebbbeck* agroforestry). The maximum amount vitamin-C (12.36 mg/100g of tomato fruit) was found in T<sub>1</sub> treatment (tomato- *Albizia lebbbeck* agroforestry) and the minimum vitamin-C (9.90 mg/100g of tomato fruit) in sole cropping of tomato (T<sub>0</sub>). The height organic acid% (0.388) was measured in tomato- *Albizia lebbbeck* agroforestry (T<sub>1</sub>) and the lowest organic acid% (0.348) was found in sole cropping of tomato (T<sub>0</sub>). The maximum sugar-acid ratio (11.37%) was found in tomato- *Albizia lebbbeck* agroforestry (T<sub>1</sub>) and the minimum sugar-acid ratio (10.31%) was found in sole cropping of tomato (T<sub>0</sub>).



**Figure 2:** Effect of production system on tomato fruit yield ton/ha. Bars with the same letter are not significantly different; bars with dissimilar letters indicate treatments which significantly differ based on DMRT

## Interaction Effect of Organic Mulch and Production System on Growth, Yield, and Quality of Tomato

The interaction effect of organic mulch and production system had significant differences on the plant height, number of branches plant<sup>-1</sup>, number of fruits plant<sup>-1</sup>, individual fruit weight, fruit yield plant<sup>-1</sup> and the result was exposed in Table 5. The highest plant (146.60 cm) was observed in T<sub>1</sub>M<sub>2</sub> treatment combination and the lowest plant height (106.70 cm) was found in T<sub>0</sub>M<sub>0</sub> treatment combination, respectively. Significantly the highest branch plant<sup>-1</sup> (15.75) was found in T<sub>1</sub>M<sub>1</sub> treatment combination and the lowest number of branch plant<sup>-1</sup> (7.20) was in T<sub>0</sub>M<sub>0</sub> treatment combination. Significantly the highest number of fruit plant<sup>-1</sup> (50.53) was found in T<sub>1</sub>M<sub>3</sub> treatment combination. On the other hand, the lowest number of fruit plant<sup>-1</sup> (24.33) was recorded in T<sub>0</sub>M<sub>0</sub> treatment combination. The highest individual fruit weight (135.40 g) was found in T<sub>1</sub>M<sub>1</sub> treatment combination and the lowest individual fruit weight (104.20 g) was recorded in T<sub>0</sub>M<sub>0</sub> treatment combination. The highest fruit yield plant<sup>-1</sup> (6.85 kg) was observed in T<sub>0</sub>M<sub>3</sub> treatment combination and the lowest fruit yield plant<sup>-1</sup> (2.54 kg) was recorded in T<sub>0</sub>M<sub>0</sub> treatment combinations, respectively. Yield (tha<sup>-1</sup>) was found significantly different due to interaction effect of organic mulch and production system which was presented in Figure 3. Significantly the highest fruit

**Table 3:** Effects of tomato sole cropping and tomato- *Albizia lebbbeck* agroforestry on yield contributing characters of tomato

| Treatments            | Plant height (cm) | Number of branches plant <sup>-1</sup> | Number of fruits plant <sup>-1</sup> | Individual fruit weight (g) | Fruit yield (kg plant <sup>-1</sup> ) |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| T <sub>0</sub>        | 122.2 b           | 10.84 b                                | 34.07 b                              | 106.9 b                     | 4.01 b                                |
| T <sub>1</sub>        | 132.2 a           | 12.57 a                                | 35.81 a                              | 120.8 a                     | 4.44 a                                |
| Level of Significance | **                | *                                      | *                                    | **                          | *                                     |
| CV (%)                | 1.11              | 3.33                                   | 0.96                                 | 2.97                        | 1.84                                  |

T<sub>0</sub> implies control, sole cropping of tomato; T<sub>1</sub> indicates tomato grown under *Albizia lebbbeck* woodlot.

Columns with the same letter or without letter (s) are not significantly different. Columns with dissimilar letters indicate treatments which differ significantly based on DMRT

ns: Not significant; \* significant at  $p \leq 0.05$ ; \*\* significant at  $p \leq 0.01$ .

The CV indicates the ratio of the SD to the mean

**Table 4:** Effects of tomato sole cropping and tomato- *Albizia lebbbeck* agroforestry on fruit quality of tomato


| Treatments            | Reducing sugar (%) | Soluble sugar (%) | Vitamin C (mg 100 g <sup>-1</sup> ) | Organic acid (%) | Sugar-acid ratio (%) |
|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| T <sub>0</sub>        | 2.85               | 4.49 a            | 9.90 b                              | 0.348            | 10.31 b              |
| T <sub>1</sub>        | 2.73               | 4.22 b            | 12.36 a                             | 0.388            | 11.37 a              |
| Level of Significance | ns                 | *                 | *                                   | ns               | *                    |
| CV (%)                | 0.73               | 0.60              | 1.79                                | 1.73             | 0.60                 |

T<sub>0</sub> implies control, sole cropping of tomato; T<sub>1</sub> indicates tomato grown under *Albizia lebbbeck* woodlot.

Columns with the same letter or without letter (s) are not significantly different. Columns with dissimilar letters indicate treatments which differ significantly based on DMRT

ns: Not significant; \* significant at  $p \leq 0.05$ ; \*\* significant at  $p \leq 0.01$ .

The CV indicates the ratio of the SD to the mean



**Figure 3:** Interaction effect of organic mulch and production system on tomato fruit yield ton/ha. Bars with the same letter are not significantly different; bars with dissimilar letters indicate treatments which significantly differ based on DMRT.

yield (35.01 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) was recorded in T<sub>1</sub>M<sub>3</sub> treatment combination. Conversely, the lowest fruit yield (22.47 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) was recorded in T<sub>0</sub>M<sub>0</sub> treatment combination, respectively.

The interaction effect of organic mulch two production system on the fruit quality (reducing sugar%, soluble sugar%, vitamin-C, organic acid ratio%) of tomato was noted significantly and the result was exhibited in the table 6. The maximum soluble sugar (4.62%) was found in T<sub>0</sub>M<sub>0</sub> treatment combination whereas the minimum soluble sugar (4.10%) was measured in T<sub>1</sub>M<sub>3</sub> treatment combination. The maximum amount vitamin-C (16.63 mg/100g of tomato fruit) was observed in T<sub>1</sub>M<sub>3</sub> treatment combination and the minimum vitamin-C (5.10 mg/100g of tomato fruit) was observed in T<sub>0</sub>M<sub>0</sub> treatment combination. Again, the height organic acid% (0.450) was recorded in T<sub>1</sub>M<sub>1</sub> treatment combination which was statistically identical to T<sub>1</sub>M<sub>3</sub> treatment combination. The lowest organic acid% (0.317) was found in T<sub>0</sub>M<sub>0</sub> treatment combination. The maximum sugar-acid ratio (12.44%) was found in T<sub>1</sub>M<sub>3</sub> treatment combination whereas the minimum sugar-acid ratio (9.02%) was found in T<sub>0</sub>M<sub>0</sub> treatment combination, respectively.

### Cost and Benefit Evaluation of Tomato-*Albizia Lebbek* Agroforestry Compare to Sole Cropping of Tomato Production

The cost of production, gross and net return and benefit-cost ratio of tomato-*Albizia lebbek* agroforestry and sole cropping of tomato was calculated on local market prices during the experimental time and the results was presented in table 7. The maximum cost of production (160500 Tk/ha) was calculated from T<sub>1</sub> treatment (tomato-*Albizia lebbek* agroforestry), while the least production cost (130500 Tk/ha) was measured from sole cropping of tomato (T<sub>0</sub>). The maximum return of gross money (79300 Tk per ha) was achieved from the T<sub>1</sub> treatment (tomato-*Albizia lebbek* agroforestry) and the minimum return of gross currency (519000 Tk per ha) was taken from the sole cropping of tomato (T<sub>0</sub>). Net return was maximum in tomato-*Albizia lebbek* agroforestry (T<sub>1</sub>) compared to sole

**Table 5:** Interaction effects of organic mulch and tomato production systems on yield contributing characters of tomato

| Treatments                    | Plant height (cm) | Number of branch plant <sup>-1</sup> | Number of fruits plant <sup>-1</sup> | Individual fruit weight (g) | Yield (kg plant <sup>-1</sup> ) |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| T <sub>0</sub> M <sub>0</sub> | 106.70 f          | 7.20 f                               | 24.33 g                              | 104.2 h                     | 2.54 g                          |
| T <sub>0</sub> M <sub>1</sub> | 113.20 e          | 12.57 c                              | 36.40 d                              | 116.8 e                     | 4.25 d                          |
| T <sub>0</sub> M <sub>2</sub> | 116.80 d          | 11.25 d                              | 29.23 f                              | 112.50 f                    | 3.24 f                          |
| T <sub>0</sub> M <sub>3</sub> | 112.30 e          | 12.34 c                              | 46.30 b                              | 129.0 b                     | 5.97 b                          |
| T <sub>1</sub> M <sub>0</sub> | 124.70 c          | 8.317 e                              | 19.77 h                              | 106.7 g                     | 2.11 g                          |
| T <sub>1</sub> M <sub>1</sub> | 133.50 b          | 15.75 a                              | 41.10 c                              | 122.7 c                     | 5.04 c                          |
| T <sub>1</sub> M <sub>2</sub> | 146.60 a          | 12.33 c                              | 31.83 e                              | 118.5 d                     | 3.77 e                          |
| T <sub>1</sub> M <sub>3</sub> | 123.90 c          | 13.90 b                              | 50.53 a                              | 135.4 a                     | 6.85 a                          |
| Level of Significance         | **                | *                                    | *                                    | **                          | *                               |
| CV (%)                        | 1.11              | 3.33                                 | 0.96                                 | 2.97                        | 1.84                            |

Columns with the same letter or without letter (s) are not significantly different. Columns with dissimilar letters indicate treatments which differ significantly based on DMRT.

<sup>ns</sup>Not significant; \* significant at p ≤ 0.05; \*\* significant at p ≤ 0.01. The CV indicates the ratio of the SD to the mean

**Table 6:** Interaction effects of organic mulch and tomato production systems on fruit quality of tomato

| Treatments                    | Reducing sugar (%) | Soluble sugar (%) | Vitamin C (mg 100 g <sup>-1</sup> ) | Organic acid (%) | Sugar-acid ratio (%) |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| T <sub>0</sub> M <sub>0</sub> | 2.94               | 4.62 a            | 5.10 f                              | 0.317 bc         | 9.02 h               |
| T <sub>0</sub> M <sub>1</sub> | 2.84               | 4.52 ab           | 10.57 d                             | 0.357 abc        | 10.41 e              |
| T <sub>0</sub> M <sub>2</sub> | 2.81               | 4.43 b            | 11.40 cd                            | 0.340 bc         | 10.19 f              |
| T <sub>0</sub> M <sub>3</sub> | 2.81               | 4.38 bc           | 12.53 bc                            | 0.377 abc        | 11.64 c              |
| T <sub>1</sub> M <sub>0</sub> | 2.82               | 4.33 bc           | 6.67 e                              | 0.300 c          | 9.81 g               |
| T <sub>1</sub> M <sub>1</sub> | 2.74               | 4.23 cd           | 13.47 b                             | 0.450 a          | 12.20 b              |
| T <sub>1</sub> M <sub>2</sub> | 2.70               | 4.20 cd           | 12.67 bc                            | 0.383 abc        | 11.05 d              |
| T <sub>1</sub> M <sub>3</sub> | 2.67               | 4.10 d            | 16.63 a                             | 0.417 ab         | 12.44 a              |
| Level of Significance         | ns                 | *                 | *                                   | *                | **                   |
| CV (%)                        | 0.73               | 0.60              | 1.79                                | 1.73             | 0.60                 |

Columns with the same letter or without letter (s) are not significantly different. Columns with dissimilar letters indicate treatments which differ significantly based on DMRT.

<sup>ns</sup>Not significant; \* significant at p ≤ 0.05; \*\* significant at p ≤ 0.01. The CV indicates the ratio of the SD to the mean

**Table 7:** Economic return of tomato-*Albizia lebbek* agroforestry compare to sole cropping of tomato production (one year)

| Production system  | Outcome (Tk/ha) | Gross Return (Tk/ha) | Total cost of Production (Tk/ha) | Net Return (Tk/ha) | BCR  |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|------|
| Tomato sole cropping (T <sub>0</sub> )                       | 519000          | 519000               | 130500                           | 388500             | 3.98 |
| Tomato- <i>Albizia lebbek</i> agroforestry (T <sub>1</sub> ) | 588200          | 793000               | 160500                           | 632500             | 4.94 |

Tomato price 20 Tk/kg and the price of *Albizia lebbek* wood 500 Tk/tree

cropping of tomato (T<sub>0</sub>). It was observed that tomato-*Albizia lebbek* agroforestry (T<sub>1</sub>) gave the maximum net return (632500 Tk per ha). At the same time, the minimum net return (388500 Tk per ha) was received from the sole cropping of tomato (T<sub>0</sub>).

Table 7 indicated that the maximum benefit-cost ratio (4.94) was gained from the T<sub>1</sub> treatment (tomato- *Albizia lebbbeck* agroforestry), whereas the minimum benefit-cost ratio (3.98) was taken from sole cropping of tomato (T<sub>0</sub>).

## CONCLUSION

Smart agroforestry practice makes it possible to ensure balanced crop production by growing soil organic matter, ensuring careful maintenance, reducing the likelihood of crop losses, and verifying the maximum use of natural resources. It provides a healthy and sustainable method of production. The findings from the experimental results reveal that tomato- *Albizia lebbbeck* agroforestry combined with organic mulch has given a significant outcome in terms of yield, quality, and economic benefits. In conclusion, the research finding indicates the benefit-cost ratio (4.94) from the tomato- *Albizia lebbbeck* agroforestry as the organic mulch enhance the production and quality which was 20 % higher than tomato was grown in sole cropping. This production technique ensures not only the food safety, but also increases the income of the farmers and ensures the long-term sustainability.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to express sincere gratitude to the department of Agroforestry and Environment of Hajee Mohammad Danesh Science and Technology University, Dinajpur-5200, Bangladesh.

## CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No conflict of interests for publication of this research paper.

## REFERENCES

- Akinnifesi, F. K., Ajayi, O. C., Sileshi, G., Chirwa, P. W., & Chianu, J. (2010). Fertiliser trees for sustainable food security in the maize-based production systems of East and Southern Africa. A review. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*, 30(3), 615-629. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0394-0\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0394-0_9)
- Amin, M. H. A., Roy, J. P., Rahman, M. S., & Kaja, M. (2017b). Economic performance of onion under *Albizia lebbbeck*, *Melia azedarach* and *Leucaena leucocephala* based agroforestry systems. *Journal of Innovation and Development Strategy*, 11, 1-8.
- BBS (Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics). (2018). Population Census. Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics. Ministry of Planning, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, Dhaka, Bangladesh.
- Biswas, S. K., Akanda, A. R., Rahman, M. S., & Hossain, M. A. (2015). Effect of drip irrigation and mulching on yield, water-use efficiency and economics of tomato. *Plant, Soil and Environment*, 61(3), 97-102. <https://doi.org/10.17221/804/2014-PSE>
- Bommarco, R., Kleijn, D., & Potts, S. G. (2013). Ecological intensification: harnessing ecosystem services for food security. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 28(4), 230-238. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2012.10.012>
- Campbell, B. M., Thornton, P., Zougmore, R., Van Asten, P., & Lipper, L. (2014). Sustainable intensification: What is its role in climate smart agriculture?. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 8, 39-43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2014.07.002>
- Chakraborty, M., Haider, M. Z., & Rahaman, M. M. (2015). Socio-economic impact of cropland agroforestry: evidence from Jessore district of Bangladesh. *International Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry*, 2(1), 11-20.
- Coulibaly, J. Y., Chiputwa, B., Nakelase, T., & Kundhlande, G. (2017). Adoption of agroforestry and the impact on household food security among farmers in Malawi. *Agricultural systems*, 155, 52-69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2017.03.017>
- Díaz-Pérez, J. C. (2009). Root zone temperature, plant growth and yield of broccoli [Brassica oleracea (Plenck) var. italica] as affected by plastic film mulches. *Scientia Horticulturae*, 123(2), 156-163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scienta.2009.08.014>
- Dlamini, P., Ukoh, I. B., Van Rensburg, L. D., & Du Preez, C. C. (2017). Reduction of evaporation from bare soil using plastic and gravel mulches and assessment of gravel mulch for partitioning evapotranspiration under irrigated canola. *Soil Research*, 55(3), 222-233. <https://doi.org/10.1071/SR16098>
- Fan, Y., Ding, R., Kang, S., Hao, X., Du, T., Tong, L., & Li, S. (2017). Plastic mulch decreases available energy and evapotranspiration and improves yield and water use efficiency in an irrigated maize cropland. *Agricultural Water Management*, 179, 122-131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2016.08.019>
- FAO (Food and Agricultural Organization) (2011). Forests for improved food security and nutrition report. Rome, Italy.
- FAO (Food and Agricultural Organization). (2013). Synthesis of guiding principles on agriculture programming for nutrition. Rome, Italy
- FAO (Food and Agricultural Organization). (2014). State of the world's forests: enhancing the socioeconomic benefits from the forests. Rome, Italy.
- Garrity, D. P. (2004). Agroforestry and the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. *Agroforestry Systems*, 61(1), 5-17.
- Gomez, K. A., & Gomez, A. A. (1984). Statistical procedures for agricultural research. John Wiley and Sons. Inc. New York, 641.
- Hanif, M. A., & Bari, M. S. (2013). Potentiality of potato based agrisilvicultural land use system in the northern part of Bangladesh. *Science Secure Journal of Biotechnology*, 2, 61-65.
- Hasan, M. N., Hossain, M. S., Islam, M. R., Bari, M. A., Karim, D., & Rahman, M. Z. (2013). Trends in the availability of agricultural land in Bangladesh. *Soil Resource Development Institute (SERDI), Ministry of Agriculture, Bangladesh, Dhaka. Retrieved from URL: http://www.nfpcsp.org/agridrupal/sites/default/files/Trends-in-the-availability-of-agricultural-land-in-Bangladesh-SRDI-Supported-by-NFPCSP-FAO.pdf*
- Hassan, M. M. (2017). Monitoring land use/land cover change, urban growth dynamics and landscape pattern analysis in five fastest urbanized cities in Bangladesh. *Remote Sensing Applications: Society and Environment*, 7, 69-83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rsase.2017.07.001>
- Hillman, J. R. (1984). Apical Dominance. In M. B. Wilkins (Ed.), *Advanced Plant Physiology* (pp. 127-148). London: Pitman.
- Hossain, J., Ahmed, T., Hasnat, M. Z., & Karim, D. (2014). Screening of tomato varieties for fruit tree based agroforestry system. *International Journal of Agricultural Research, Innovation and Technology*, 4(2), 61-69.
- Hossain, M. M. (1997). *Effect of different levels of nitrogen and potash on the growth and yield of garlic* (Doctoral dissertation, MS Thesis. Dept. of Hort., Bangladesh Agril. Univ., Mymensingh).
- Islam, M. A., Sharfuddin, A. F. M., & Islam, N. (2004). A study on production technology and disease management of ginger and turmeric in selected areas of Bangladesh. *Bangladesh Journal of Crop Science*, (13-15), 103-110.
- Kader, M. A., Senge, M., Mojid, M. A., & Ito, K. (2017). Recent advances in mulching materials and methods for modifying soil environment. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 168, 155-166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2017.01.001>
- Leakey, R. R., & Simons, A. J. (1998). The domestication and commercialization of indigenous trees in agroforestry for the alleviation of poverty. In *Directions in Tropical Agroforestry Research* (pp. 165-176).
- Libik, A., & Wojtaszek, T. (1971, September). The effect of mulching on the behaviour of some nutrient compounds in the soil. In *Symposium on Nutrition and Fertilization of Vegetables* 29 (pp. 395-404).
- Mah, C. L., Hamill, C., Rondeau, K., & McIntyre, L. (2014). A frame-critical policy analysis of Canada's response to the World Food Summit 1998-2008. *Archives of Public Health*, 72(1), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2049-3258-72-41>
- Matin, M. A., Huq, A. S. M. A., Karim, M. R., & Baksha, E. (1996). Farm level yield analysis of tomato cultivation in selected areas of Bangladesh: An economic profile. *Bangladesh Journal of Agricultural Research*, 21(1), 50-57.

- Mbow, C., Smith, P., Skole, D., Duguma, L., & Bustamante, M. (2014). Achieving mitigation and adaptation to climate change through sustainable agroforestry practices in Africa. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 6, 8-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2013.09.002>
- Medina, Y., Gosselin, A., Desjardins, Y., Gauthier, L., Harnois, R., & Khanizadeh, S. (2009, June). Effect of plastic mulches on yield and fruit quality of strawberry plants grown under high tunnels. In *International Symposium on High Technology for Greenhouse Systems: GreenSys2009 893* (pp. 1327-1332).
- Moreno, M. M., Cirujeda, A., Aibar, J., & Moreno, C. (2016). Soil thermal and productive responses of biodegradable mulch materials in a processing tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.) crop. *Soil Research*, 54(2), 207-215. <https://doi.org/10.1071/SR15065>
- Moreno, M. M., Moreno, C., & Tarquis, A. M. (2013). Mulch materials in processing tomato: a multivariate approach. *Scientia Agricola*, 70(4), 250-256. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0103-90162013000400005>
- Olasautan, F. O. (1985). Effect of inter cropping, mulching and staking on growth and yield of tomatoes. *Experimental Agriculture*, 21, 135-144.
- Rahman, M. A., Tani, M., Asahiro, K., & Ullah, S. A. (2017). Species composition, diversity and productivity of homesteads in southeastern Bangladesh. *Small-scale Forestry*, 16(3), 295-309. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11842-016-9356-8>
- Rahman, M. M., Yasmine, F., Rahman, M. A., Ferdous, Z., & Kar, P. S. (2011). Performance of poultry bio-slurry as a source of organic manure on potato production. *Journal of Agroforestry and Environment*, 5, 81-84.
- Reith, E., Gosling, E., Knoke, T., & Paul, C. (2020). How Much Agroforestry Is Needed to Achieve Multifunctional Landscapes at the Forest Frontier?—Coupling Expert Opinion with Robust Goal Programming. *Sustainability*, 12(15), 6077. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12156077>
- Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin, F. S., Lambin, E. F., & Foley, J. A. (2009). A safe operating space for humanity. *nature*, 461(7263), 472-475.
- Rosenstock, T. S., Lamanna, C., Chesterman, S., Bell, P., Arslan, A., Richards, M., & Zhou, W. (2016). The scientific basis of climate-smart agriculture: A systematic review protocol. CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security. Working Paper No. 136.
- Sharmin, A., & Rabbi, S. A. (2016). Assessment of farmers' perception of agroforestry practices in Jhenaidah district of Bangladesh. *Journal of agriculture and Ecology Research International*, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.9734/JAERI/2016/21760>
- Sheppard, J. P., Bohn Reckziegel, R., Borrass, L., Chirwa, P. W., Cuaranhua, C. J., Hassler, S. K., & Kahle, H. P. (2020). Agroforestry: An Appropriate and Sustainable Response to a Changing Climate in Southern Africa?. *Sustainability*, 12(17), 6796. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12176796>
- Shrivastava, B. K., Singh, N. P., & Singh, M. Y. (1981). Effect of mulches on growth, weed density and yield of summer tomato. *South Indian Horticulture*, 29(4), 182-186.
- Sileshi, G., Akinnifesi, F. K., Ajayi, O. C., & Place, F. (2008). Meta-analysis of maize yield response to woody and herbaceous legumes in sub-Saharan Africa. *Plant and Soil*, 307(1), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-008-9547-y>
- Stolz, H., Stolze, M., Janssen, M., & Hamm, U. (2011). Preferences and determinants for organic, conventional and conventional-plus products—The case of occasional organic consumers. *Food Quality and Preference*, 22(8), 772-779. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodqual.2011.06.011>
- van Noordwijk, M., Bizard, V., Wangpakapattanawong, P., Tata, H. L., Villamor, G. B., & Leimona, B. (2014). Tree cover transitions and food security in Southeast Asia. *Global Food Security*, 3(3-4), 200-208. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfs.2014.10.005>
- van Noordwijk, M., Leimona, B., Jindal, R., Villamor, G. B., Vardhan, M., Namirembe, S., & Tomich, T. P. (2012). Payments for environmental services: evolution toward efficient and fair incentives for multifunctional landscapes. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 37, 389-420. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-042511-150526>
- Vinceti, B., Termote, C., Ickowitz, A., Powell, B., Kehlenbeck, K., & Hunter, D. (2013). The contribution of forests and trees to sustainable diets. *Sustainability*, 5(11), 4797-4824. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su5114797>
- World Bank. (2015). Gender in climate smart agriculture: Module 18 The gender and agriculture Sourcebook agriculture global practice. Washington, DC.
- World Bank. (2016). Annual report of World Bank. Washington D.C., USA.
- Yasmin, R., Wadud, M. A., Mandol, M. M. A., & Sharif, M. O. (2010). Tree diversity in the homestead and cropland areas of Madhupur Upazila under Tangail District. *Journal of Agroforestry and Environment*, 4(1), 89-92.
- Zaman, M. M., Huq, A. S. M. A., & Chowdhury, M. J. A. (2006). Production potentiality of summer tomato in Jamalpur region. *International Journal of Sustainable Crop Production*, 1(2), 12-15.