



Article

Agrifood Sustainability Transitions in Firms and Industry: A Bibliographic Analysis of Research Themes

Nic J. Lees , Sivashankar Sivakumar and Xiaomeng Lucock 

Faculty of Agribusiness and Commerce, Department of Agribusiness and Markets, Lincoln University, Lincoln 7647, New Zealand; sivashankar.sivakumar@lincolnuni.ac.nz (S.S.); sharon.lucock@lincoln.ac.nz (X.L.)
* Correspondence: nic.lees@lincoln.ac.nz

Abstract: There is a growing consensus that the modern food system lies at the centre of the great challenges facing humanity and that urgent and profound changes are required in the way that food is produced, processed, distributed and consumed. This review analyses sustainability transitions within agrifood systems, focusing on the role of firms and industries as defined by the Sustainable Transitions Research Network (STRN). This paper conducts the first systematic literature review using bibliometric analysis to assess the current state of research on this theme. The findings reveal a significant increase in publications related to firms and industries associated with agrifood sustainability transitions. Furthermore, the focus of current research is geographically concentrated in the European Union. The review identifies four key themes in the literature, based on the co-occurrence of keywords. These are agriculture, innovation, governance, food systems and agroecology. The review identifies an increasing awareness of the role of farmers in driving sustainability transitions at the farm level. Furthermore, there is an increasing awareness of the interrelated characteristics of the agrifood system, which acknowledges the need for sustainable innovations to occur at multiple stages of the agrifood system. The review also shows that there is growing evidence that innovations can occur through disruptive as well as incremental innovation and highlights the importance of governance influencing transitions. The existing literature raises questions about alternative food networks as sustainable innovations, their potential for significant change in the established food system and the validity of their claims regarding food equity and environmental sustainability. A key theme emerging from the literature is an ecological perspective that identifies the complex biological processes and ecosystems that form an integral part of agricultural production. These findings provide a greater understanding of the current literature landscape of agrifood sustainable transitions relating to firms and industries and lay a foundation for future research.

Keywords: sustainability transitions; agrifood; agroecology; sustainable innovation; food systems; governance



Citation: Lees, N.J.; Sivakumar, S.; Lucock, X. Agrifood Sustainability Transitions in Firms and Industry: A Bibliographic Analysis of Research Themes. *Sustainability* **2024**, *16*, 7079. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16167079>

Academic Editors: Jian Li, Hao Hu, Libin Guo and Feifei Yang

Received: 20 May 2024

Revised: 8 July 2024

Accepted: 9 July 2024

Published: 18 August 2024



Copyright: © 2024 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

1.1. The Global Agrifood System

The current global agrifood system feeds a rapidly growing population that has more than doubled from 3.5 billion to 7.8 billion in the last 50 years. To achieve this, food production has tripled, contributing to a significant reduction in levels of malnutrition and hunger [1–5]. This improved nutrition has supported better human health outcomes, such as reduced infant mortality and longer life expectancy. Furthermore, this threefold increase in food production has been achieved with a less than 15% increase in agricultural land use [6,7]. This has been accomplished by focusing on increasing output through the intensification and efficiency of food production systems [8–12]. Achieving this has required greater inputs of fertiliser and agrochemicals, combined with increases in mechanisation, plant breeding, water use and improved management practices [6,7].

However, this increase in production has come at a significant cost to the environment, with food production now the largest cause of global environmental change [13–16]. Food production is a major contributor to climate change, biodiversity loss, contamination, the overuse of water resources and land use change [10,15,17]. Furthermore, a significant portion of food production is lost between the farmer and the consumer, with estimates of 25% to 30% of food produced being lost in the food supply chain [18]. This means that a high level of inputs such as fertiliser, water, land, energy and labour used in the production and distribution of agrifood products is wasted, yet these still contribute to the environmental impacts associated with conventional agrifood systems [19]. Furthermore, food waste often ends up in landfills, where it adds to greenhouse gas emissions through the production of methane [20].

In addition to the environment, there are significant effects on human health [14]. It is estimated that 820 million people suffer from chronic malnutrition, while two billion are classified as overweight or obese [16,17,21,22].

There is a growing consensus that the modern food system lies at the centre of the great challenges facing humanity and that urgent and profound changes are needed in the way that food is produced, processed, distributed and consumed [11,14,16,17,23]. For example, research by the Eat-Lancet Commission on healthy diets from sustainable food systems concluded that “the global food system needs to be transformed to reduce its effect on human health and environmental stability” [16] (p. 450). However, this transformation needs to be achieved, with the world population expected to increase to 9 billion by 2050, combined with a global trend towards the adoption of Western diets, along with the associated increase in consumption of animal proteins [15,24]. Furthermore, this must be achieved in a period when climate change is significantly impacting crop yields [6]. There is increasing agreement among scholars that to address these multiple challenges requires more than incremental change but a “great food transformation” [16] (p. 54) changing the way the food system operates will require a transition to more sustainable practices [16,23,25,26].

1.2. Agrifood Sustainability Transitions

Agrifood sustainability transitions is a field of research that focuses on the systemic changes and reconfiguration of the agrifood system that will be required to move towards more sustainable practices [15,26]. This research addresses the urgent need for transformation of the established food system and the development of more sustainable practices to reduce the significant impact on the environment of the existing agrifood system.

The study of agrifood transitions sits within a wider body of research on sustainability transitions. Transitions are defined as long-term major shifts in established industries and socio-technical systems, as societies transition to more sustainable modes of production and consumption [10,27]. Only recently has sustainability transition research been applied to agrifood systems [17,24,28]. In this context, agrifood systems refer to all the activities and actors involved in the production, processing, distribution, consumption and disposal of food and agricultural products [29].

The initial focus of early sustainability transitions research was on energy systems, transport and computing [24,30–32]. Lachman [33] and Loorbach et al. [34] identify the major approaches to transition research. These are multi-level perspectives, strategic niche management, innovation systems, the techno-economic paradigm and socio-metabolic transitions.

1.3. Sustainability Transitions Research

The multi-level perspective (MLP) is the dominant theoretical framework and is seen as a “fundamental heuristic underpinning transitions studies” [23] (p. 1). This perspective views transitions as a multi-level interaction between the landscape, the regime and niches [26,30,33]. The regime is a central concept of the MLP. It is defined as the dominant socio-technical system and is often seen as the established unsustainable mode of production, requiring destabilisation and transformation [26]. The regime has an established set of rules that regulate how the system functions and interacts with a network of actors and

functions using existing technology. The regime is seen as resistant to systemic change, due to strong path dependencies and the vested interests of the existing actors [23,26,33]. The landscape and niches function outside the established regime. The concept of landscape refers to the context in which the regime operates and incorporates the economic, social and political environment. Examples of landscape changes include shifts in government policy, changing consumer preferences, changes in the economic environment and technological innovations. Niches are defined as experimental spaces where innovations can potentially take place. They often represent small networks of actors with more flexible rules and have some protection from the dominant regime [23,33]. The MLP proposes that certain interactions between the landscape, the regime and niches can lead to systemic change that can ultimately lead to a transition to a new socio-technical regime [23,33].

1.4. Agrifood Sustainability Transitions—Firms and Industries

Sustainability transition research has been applied to a variety of sectors, including the agri-food sector. El Bilali [17] evaluated the literature on agrifood transitions research between 2010 and 2017. This review looked at how the agrifood transitions literature aligned with the themes of the Sustainable Transitions Research Network (STRN) agenda [35]. The STRN developed its research agenda on sustainable transitions with nine themes: understanding transitions, power and politics, governing transitions, civil society, culture and social movements in transitions, firms and industries in sustainability transitions, transitions in practice and everyday life, the geography of transitions, and the ethical aspects of transitions and methodologies [35]. The STRN theme on firms and industries evaluates how established organisations and sectors contribute to transitions by either slowing down or speeding up the process of transition, and how changes in these affect the broader aspects of transformation. Köhler et al. [35] noted that research on the theme of firms and industries was less advanced and represented a relatively new field of research. This was especially valid for studies relating to the agri-food system. More specifically, the review by El Bilali [17] commented that the literature on agri-food sustainability transitions relating to the “role of industries and firms in enabling and supporting sustainable transitions was a marginal topic” [17] (p. 358).

Based on the findings of this review by El Bilali [17], there is a need for a systematic review of the agrifood sustainable transitions literature regarding firms and industries to identify how research on firms and industries has developed. In particular, there is a need to evaluate if research on agrifood sustainability transitions relating to the theme of firms and industries has become a more central theme rather than a marginal topic. This paper addresses this knowledge gap by providing the first systematic review of this theme. It uses bibliometric analysis and visualisation tools to identify the current state of research on the role of firms and industries within the agrifood sustainability literature. The concepts of firms and industries are interrelated. The agrifood industry incorporates the businesses and organisations responsible for the production, processing, manufacturing, distribution, wholesale and retail sales and consumption of agrifood products. Hence, individual agrifood firms sit within the agrifood industry.

Within the context of agrifood transitions, the specific aims of this study are to:

1. Evaluate and describe the current state of the literature on the (STRN) theme of firms and industries.
2. Identify gaps and propose areas for future research to address these areas.

Specific research questions are:

1. Is the theme of “industries and firms” still a marginal topic within the agrifood sustainability transition literature?
2. How has the agrifood sustainability transition literature on “industries and firms” evolved?
3. What are the main themes and topics within this theme and what gaps exist within this literature?
4. What are the potential areas for future research on firms and industries in sustainability transitions?

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Data Collection

Data was collected from Scopus in the first step of bibliometric analysis. The following search query was used to gather data: (“sustainability transition*”) AND (agri* OR agro* OR food) AND (firm* OR industry* OR business*). The search terms were adapted from the STRN research themes. The search terms aimed to identify papers relating to agrifood that met the STRN research theme regarding the role of firms and industries in transitions [17,35]. Papers published between 2010 and 2023 were considered for this study. The search criteria covered the Scopus subject areas of Environmental Science, Business Management and Accounting, Agricultural and Biological Sciences, Social Sciences, Economics, Econometrics and Finance. This search identified 63 documents. Each of these articles was screened to ensure its specific relevance to the theme of firms and industries in agrifood transitions. Following screening, the number of articles was reduced to 44 documents, which were used for the bibliographic analysis (Figure 1).




Figure 1. Data selection process.

2.2. Data Analysis

The Scopus database bibliometric tools were used for the initial descriptive analysis of the literature. The Scopus database was used for the search criteria due to its wider coverage of documents than other common databases [36].

Following the database search and the descriptive analysis, VOSviewer software was used to develop and analyse the network of relationships between bibliometric items, evaluated by a co-citations analysis and the co-occurrence of keywords [37].

Co-citation analysis was used to identify the network of relationships between publications, based on the number of times an author, publication or journal is cited together in the same publication. The co-occurrence of keywords was used to identify the common themes of publications, based on the number of times the same keywords are used in the selected documents. The themes identified by the co-occurrence of keywords formed the basis of the themes used in the literature review. The papers were then manually allocated to the different themes, based on the main topic of the article.

3. Results

3.1. Descriptive Analysis of Publications

This section presents a descriptive analysis of the number of publications and the authors, journals, institutions, geographic origins and citations, to evaluate the characteristics of the published literature on the topic of sustainability transitions in firms and industries.

Figure 2 shows a recent increase in publications regarding agrifood sustainability transitions on the theme of firms and industries, with the number of publications increasing from 3 in 2017 to 19 in 2023. Figure 3 shows that this trend is also reflected in the number of citations of papers on the theme of firms and industries. These have increased from 14 in 2017 to 187 in 2023.




Figure 2. Growth in publications on agrifood sustainability transitions in firms and industries.




Figure 3. Citations per year on the topic of agrifood “sustainability transitions” and the role of firms and industries.

The growth in publications is evenly distributed across a number of authors, with only Bui and Hekkert publishing more than two papers (Table 1). In contrast, there is a significant concentration in terms of both institutional affiliation and geographic location. Specifically, only three research institutions have contributed more than three papers (Table 2). This concentration is even more apparent when examining publications according to country, with the Netherlands leading significantly with 11 papers published (Table 3). An analysis of the geographic distribution underscores the clear dominance of European countries contributing to publications on this topic.

Table 1. Publications by the top 10 authors from 2010 to 2023.

Author	Publications
Bui, S. [23,38,39]	3
Hekkert, M.P. [11,40,41]	3
De Schutter, O. [38,42]	2
Dedeurwaerdere, T. [38,42]	2
Feola, G. [43,44]	2
Giagnocavo, C. [10,45]	2
Hudon, M. [38,42]	2
Kuokkanen, A. [26,46]	2
Mehrabi, S. [10,45]	2
Moors, E. [43,44]	2

Eleven journals were identified as having published a minimum of two papers on the theme of transitions in firms and industries (Table 4). The *Journal of Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions* had the highest number of publications, totalling six, closely followed by the journal *Sustainability*, with five publications.

In terms of journal quality, impact factors varied significantly, from 3.4 for the journal *Agriculture* to 11.1 for the *Journal of Cleaner Production*. The journal *Circular Economy and Sustainability* lacked an impact factor or other quality measures. The range of impact factors highlights the diversity of journals publishing on the topic of firms and industries

in agrifood transitions, encompassing a range of quality measures. Importantly, it signifies that there are high-quality journals that recognise the significance of this field of research.

Table 2. Affiliations of publications by universities or research organisations that have published at least two publications.

Rank	Affiliation	No. of Papers	Country
1	Wageningen University and Research	6	The Netherlands
2	Universiteit Utrecht	5	The Netherlands
3	Copernicus Institute of Sustainable Development	5	Germany
4	CNRS Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique	3	France
5	University of Guelph	3	Canada
6	Université Libre de Bruxelles	2	Belgium
7	Université Catholique de Louvain	2	Belgium
8	Lincoln University	2	New Zealand
9	LUT University	2	Finland
10	Universidad de Almería	2	Spain
11	Deakin University	2	USA
12	Groupe de Recherche en Droit, Économie et Gestion	2	France
13	Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique	2	France

Table 3. Publications by country.

Country/Territory	No. Papers
The Netherlands	11
Germany	7
Canada	6
France	5
Australia	3
Belgium	3
Finland	3
Italy	3
New Zealand	3
Sweden	3

Table 4. List of journals publishing more than two articles and their quality rating.

Source	Publications	Impact Factor	CiteScore	SJR	SNIP
<i>Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions</i>	6	9.4	13.1	2.4	1.9
<i>Sustainability</i>	5	3.9	5.8	0.7	1.2
<i>Agriculture and Human Values</i>	3	4.9	5.9	1.0	1.4
<i>Agricultural Systems</i>	2	6.8	11.9	1.6	2.0
<i>Agriculture</i>	2	3.4	3.6	0.6	1.2
<i>Business Strategy and the Environment</i>	2	10.8	17.8	2.9	2.8
<i>Circular Economy and Sustainability</i>	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Ecological Economics</i>	2	6.5	11.0	1.9	2.0
<i>Journal of Cleaner Production</i>	2	11.1	18.5	2.0	2.4
<i>Journal of Rural Studies</i>	2	5.1	8.1	1.3	1.9

N/A: Not available.

The source-normalised impact per paper (SNIP) provides a comparative ranking of journals within their respective research fields. All the identified journals exhibited an SNIP greater than 1, indicating that their performance exceeded the average for journals in their fields (Table 4). It is noteworthy that only two of these journals deal with agriculture and agricultural systems and that there are no journals in agribusiness management or agricultural economics. This suggests that sustainability transitions research has yet to emerge

as a significant topic in mainstream agricultural economics or in applied agribusiness management journals.

Table 5 identifies the 10 most cited papers on the topic. The paper “Designing coupled innovations for the sustainability transition of agrifood systems” by Meynard et al. [14] has received substantially more citations than all the other most widely cited papers, with approximately 30 citations per year since 2021 (Figure 4). This high level of citation could be because this paper has been published in an agricultural journal (*Agricultural Systems*) that has a scope that includes a farm-level agricultural production focus [47]. As a result, many of the citations of this particular paper have been in agricultural or agronomy journals that include this focus, such as the *European Journal of Agronomy*, *Agronomy for Sustainable Development* and *Agricultural Systems* (Table 5). This highlights the potential for sustainable transitions research to provide a framework for understanding transitions in agriculture production systems.

Table 5. The 10 most cited papers.

Rank	Authors	Title	Year	Source Title	Cited by
1	Meynard et al. [14]	Designing coupled innovations for the sustainability transition of agrifood systems.	2017	<i>Agricultural Systems</i>	171
2	Vinnari and Vinnari [15]	A framework for sustainability transition: The case of plant-based diets.	2014	<i>Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics</i>	65
3	Kuokkanen et al. [46]	Agency in regime destabilization through the selection environment: The Finnish food system’s sustainability transition.	2018	<i>Research Policy</i>	43
4	El Bilali [48]	Relation between innovation and sustainability in the agro-food system.	2018	<i>Italian Journal of Food Science</i>	41
5	Bui [23]	Systemic ethics and inclusive governance: Two key prerequisites for sustainability transitions of agrifood systems.	2019	<i>Agriculture and Human Values</i>	40
6	Vermunt et al. [41]	Sustainability transitions in the agrifood sector: How ecology affects transition dynamics.	2020	<i>Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions</i>	38
7	Dedeurwaerdere et al. [42]	The governance features of social enterprise and social network activities of collective food buying groups.	2017	<i>Ecological Economics</i>	35
8	Pant et al. [49]	Adaptive transition management for transformations to agricultural sustainability in the Karnali mountains of Nepal.	2014	<i>Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems</i>	29
9	van Oers et al. [43]	The politics of deliberate destabilisation for sustainability transitions.	2021	<i>Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions</i>	27
10	Kuokkanen et al., 2019 [26]	A framework of disruptive sustainable innovation: An example of the Finnish food system.	2019	<i>Technology Analysis and Strategic Management</i>	26




Figure 4. Citations per year for the paper: “Designing coupled innovations for the sustainability transition of agrifood systems” [14].

3.2. Co-Citation Analysis

Co-citation is a bibliographic analysis technique that provides a structured and quantitative approach to evaluate the scholarly landscape. It identifies the number of times that a journal article and author or journal are cited together in the same publication. It can provide an analysis of relationships, identifying influential articles, journals and authors that contribute to the current scholarly discourse on agrifood sustainability transitions in firms and industries.

The construction of a co-citation network (Figure 5) visually portrays these scholarly interconnections. Each node represents an article, journal or author. The links signify frequent co-citations, and the size of the node represents the number of articles, journals or authors represented by the node.




Figure 5. VOSViewer co-citation analysis by journal article.

The analysis of co-citation of publications (Table 6; Figure 6) highlights the central position of Geels’ article [30]: “Technological transitions as evolutionary reconfiguration processes: A multi-level perspective and a case-study within the network”. This paper has both the highest number of citations and the greatest link strength, signifying that it has extensive connections to other publications in the network. This indicates that the paper occupies a central position in the citations included in publications on firms and industries in agrifood sustainability transitions. In this paper, Geels [30] addresses certain

questions about the mechanisms of technological transitions (TT). Drawing from insights in evolutionary economics and technology studies, the paper then applies this to a case study on the technological shift from sailing ships to steamships during the period 1780–1900. Among the other strongly linked papers, Smith and Raven [50] explore the role of “niches” as temporary protective spaces that foster the emergence of pathbreaking innovations. They illustrate this concept with the example of the evolution of solar photovoltaic cells, from niche innovations within satellite technology in the 1960s to mainstream solar energy, thereby challenging the established fossil fuel energy generation technology. The third most cited paper by Geels and Schot [51] contributes to the conceptualisation of the perspective of transitions by developing a more differentiated typology of transition paths. This incorporates distinctions in the timing and nature of multi-level interactions. Although these three publications do not specifically relate to agrifood sustainability transitions, collectively, they serve as a theoretical foundation for the examination of transitions in various domains, including firms and industries in agrifood sustainability transitions. It also indicates the strong theoretical roots possessed by firms and industries in agrifood sustainability transitions within the wider body of transitions literature.

Table 6. Co-citation of publications.

Author(s)	Cited Reference	Source	Citations	Total Link Strength
Geels [30]	Technological transitions as evolutionary reconfiguration processes: a multi-level perspective and a case-study.	<i>Research Policy</i>	8	18
Smith and Raven [50]	What is protective space? Reconsidering niches in transitions to sustainability.	<i>Research Policy</i>	6	16
Geels and Schot [51]	Typology of socio-technical transition pathways.	<i>Research Policy</i>	5	15
Geels [52]	Regime resistance against low-carbon transitions: introducing politics and power into the multi-level perspective.	<i>Theory Cult. Soc</i>	3	11
Markard et al. [53]	Sustainability transitions: an emerging field of research and its prospects.	<i>Research Policy</i>	7	9
Geels [54]	Reconceptualising the co-evolution of firms-in-industries and their environments: developing an inter-disciplinary triple embeddedness framework.	<i>Research Policy</i>	3	8
Klerkx et al. [55]	Adaptive management in agricultural innovation systems: the interactions between innovation networks and their environment.	<i>Agricultural Systems</i>	3	4
Geels [56]	The multi-level perspective on sustainability transitions: responses to seven criticisms.	<i>Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions</i>	4	1

A co-citation analysis by author (Figure 6) maps the number of times that authors are cited together in the same publication. This analysis again highlights the central role of Geels as an author in the network and his foundational works on the conceptualisation of transitions. The analysis identifies three predominant clusters of authors (Figure 6). Cluster 1 (red) is centred on the authors Geels [30,51,52,54,56], Raven [50,53], Truffer [53], Markard [35,53] and Schot [51]. Cluster 2 (blue) is centred on Klerkx [55] and Cluster 3 (green) is centred on Loorbach and Smith [34]. This indicates that there are three groups of authors that are commonly cited together, suggesting that these research groups have shared research themes or collaborations.




Figure 6. VOSViewer co-citation analysis by author.

3.3. Co-Occurrence of Keyword Analysis

The final analysis uses the co-occurrence of keywords to provide an understanding of the knowledge structures of this field of research by examining the links between keywords in publications. The links between the keywords in a network represent the number of times that these keywords occur in the same article. The size of each node is determined by the frequency of occurrences of a keyword. The closeness of the nodes and the thickness of the links represent the strength of the connection between two nodes.

Keywords were extracted from the Scopus file and processed through VOSViewer. VOSViewer identified 367 keywords from the 44 articles in the literature search. Keywords were selected based on their appearing more than five times in the selected publications. This identified five themes based on the following keywords: agriculture, innovation, governance, food system and agroecology. Keywords that had a similar meaning were combined (for example, sustainability transition and sustainability transitions). The five themes were used to structure the literature review by classifying the reviewed articles into these categories (Appendix A). Figure 7 shows the occurrence, links and link strength for each of these keywords. Figure 8 shows the network analysis of the keywords.

3.3.1. Agriculture

Transitions in agricultural systems focus on the systemic changes needed to reduce the impact of agricultural production on the environment [57]. In the reviewed literature on this theme, there is an emphasis on technological innovations as solutions to the environmental issues associated with agrifood production. These articles identify technologies such as remote sensors, artificial intelligence, precision agriculture, autonomous vehicles and high-technology urban agriculture as potential solutions [9,58]. However, the widespread adoption of these technologies is hindered by the significant capital investment required. This especially impacts small farmers with limited financial resources [49,57,59]. Furthermore, large-scale agribusinesses with significant capital and technological resources

may adopt these technologies to improve productivity rather than to transition to more sustainable practices [9]. Financial barriers also exist when transitioning from conventional farming systems. These can include contractual obligations, high levels of debt, investments in existing farming methods and the loss of income through reduced production and higher costs [60]. For example, converting to organic production can involve a period of up to two years, with reduced production and income and additional expenses for certification [60,61].




Figure 7. Co-occurrence of keywords.




Figure 8. Network analysis: co-occurrence of keywords.

Wojtynia et al. [12] and Williams et al. [39] highlight the central role that farmers play in influencing sustainability transitions within agricultural production systems due to the significant impact of farm production on environmental sustainability [12,39]. These impacts include greenhouse gas emissions, nutrient losses, biodiversity and land use changes. As a result, the farmers' agency becomes essential for implementing sustainable production at the farm level. However, studies show that farmers have diverse motivations for implementing sustainable farming practices [12,28,61,62]. These include recognition that conventional systems are unsustainable, awareness of the environmental impacts of their farming practices, proactively making changes ahead of regulatory requirements and a desire to create a legacy for future generations [40]. Farmers' individual characteristics

also affect the adoption of sustainable practices. These include their openness to new ideas, reflective capacity, risk aversion and sociability with their peers [12,39]. Power dynamics, especially between farmers and large corporate agribusiness firms and retailers, can also be an obstacle to farmers adopting sustainable practices [9,39]. Although these businesses may adopt sustainability initiatives, they can also create “lock-ins” that perpetuate the status quo of productivist farming systems [9,45,63–65]. Agribusiness firms and retailers who participate in sustainability initiatives often participate from a variety of motivations. These include meeting environmental regulations, improving food security, enhancing consumer confidence, competition, branding, adding value, strengthening relationships with local communities, maintaining social capital and workplace values, preserving a social license to operate and mitigating the risk or regulations and reducing compliance costs [59].

The literature on agriculture and transitions provides insights into the challenges and opportunities in agricultural systems, highlighting the crucial role of farmers in adopting more sustainable practices. At the same time, it identifies significant barriers, including financial constraints and power imbalances, and the need to understand the diverse motivations and individual characteristics of farmers in terms of adopting sustainable practices.

3.3.2. Innovation

Disruptive innovation is a core concept in the sustainability transitions literature. A clear distinction is made between disruptive and incremental innovation. Incremental innovations emerge within the established system or regime, whereas disruptive innovations aim to fundamentally transform the established regime [14,66]. Niches are another key concept and are identified as protective spaces for disruptive innovations to first become established and then expand beyond the niche and destabilise the existing system [26,56,62]. However, recent studies have recognised that significant systemic change can unfold incrementally within the established system and that the regime can play a role in the adoption of sustainability practices [23,26]. This suggests that both radical and incremental innovations are needed for transformation [67]. Furthermore, definitions of sustainable innovations and their ability to transform the established regime are still highly contested [14,48].

There are some sustainable innovations emerging within the agriculture and food system that aim to address the significant impact of conventional practices on the environment. These innovations include alternative protein sources, precision fermentation, alternative distribution channels and more sustainable production systems [26]. Grassroots innovations belong to the category of innovations that are viewed as potentially disruptive. These include practices such as community-supported agriculture, urban farming and local food networks, which emphasise innovation in the production and distribution of food outside of the dominant regime [66]. These innovations promote local, small-scale and organic practices, which aim to shift the focus away from large-scale monoculture systems and promote soil health, biodiversity and the reduced use of agrochemicals. However, it is acknowledged that some innovations such as organic production, fair trade and veganism can be absorbed by the dominant regime and become mainstream [66]. In this case, large agrifood companies and food retailers observe shifts in consumer demand and see these innovations as a profit opportunity [60]. The mainstreaming of these innovations can result in deviation from the values that initiated the innovation and diminish the radical critique of the established system [66].

There is a growing understanding of the complex nature of the agrifood system, suggesting that sustainable innovations need to encompass the entire food system. This emphasises co-ordination along the supply chain between agricultural production, processing and consumers [14,67–69]. This means, for example, that transitions require multiple niche innovations that occur simultaneously in different components of the agrifood system [14,23,68]. Furthermore, the regime can play a part in the transition process through the emergence of within-regime socio-technical configurations [23]. The literature on this theme highlights the complex nature of innovation by firms and industries in agrifood

systems, as well as the need for a more holistic understanding of sustainable innovation, with co-ordination across various aspects of the food system.

3.3.3. Governance

Transition governance involves managing the transition to more sustainable food systems. Kinniburgh [63] and Vinnari and Vinnari [15] highlight the crucial role of governance in incentivising and supporting these transition processes. Transition governance is often implemented by policymakers and government bodies. However, Kinniburgh [63] points out that government policy can oppose change, due to embedded political interests that resist change by influencing government policies to support the status quo. This illustrates the impact of the regime on government regulations that create barriers that do not support a transformation to new and sustainable production systems. Horn et al. [61] highlight the importance of devolving knowledge governance to farmer organisations to improve access to information on research that supports the adoption of sustainable farming practices.

Transition governance has its roots in complex systems theory [15]. However, governance studies frequently overlook the characteristics of complex systems, in particular, the concept of emergence, wherein outcomes cannot be predetermined, making traditional planning approaches ineffective [70]. Halbe and Pahl-Wostl [71] emphasise that managing transitions is especially challenging in agrifood systems due to the high levels of uncertainty, complexity, ambiguity and distributed control. Rossing et al. [72] try to address this issue through a co-innovation approach to the governance and management of sustainable transition projects. This explicitly acknowledges that sustainable transitions involve complex adaptive systems where different outcomes can arise despite adopting similar approaches to governance and management. The authors' approach views project interventions as "sustainability experiments" and incorporates farmers and researchers in the process of co-innovation. They emphasise that supporting sustainable transitions requires a complex adaptive system perspective within an environment that supports social learning and incorporates dynamic project monitoring [72]. Despite the variety of approaches to transition governance and the challenges of implementation in complex agrifood systems, transition governance is likely to continue as an important focus of sustainable transitions research.

3.3.4. Food System

Transformation of the food system requires an understanding of the factors that support or hinder this process [24,58]. Food system transformation is a central principle from a sustainable transitions perspective. However, within the transformational literature on food systems, the concept of sustainability remains contentious and ill-defined [73]. Although there is some consensus as to the need for firms and industries to move away from the current, unsustainable agrifood system, the notion of what represents a sustainable transition outcome has many definitions [65,73]. Some sustainability outcomes include protecting the environment, supporting the development of alternative food networks, reconfiguring value chains, reducing waste and addressing social equity [38,62,73]. Marinova et al. [13] emphasise the importance of situating transitions within the historical context of the evolution of human society from hunter-gatherers to the farming of crops and livestock, moving through successive transformations until the recent development of industrialised agriculture. From this perspective, the current agrifood sustainability transitions are understood as the most recent transformation in a series of historical changes in food systems. A dominant theme of the current food system transformation is the emergence of alternative food networks (AFN) that seek to transform or replace conventional food chains [38,44,62,74,75]. AFNs are characterised as self-governing collectives with diverse objectives, including reconnecting producers and consumers, promoting social and food justice, ensuring equitable access to food, and promoting healthy nutrition and sustainable practices [42,74]. However, there are significant issues and challenges for AFNs. Evidence of the substantial transformation of established food systems by AFNs is limited [38,66,76]. Furthermore, many of these organisations struggle to scale up their

operations and often have to deal with tensions between social and environmental concerns and economic viability [73,74,76–78].

Research by Stephens and Barbier [75] reveals that most customers of AFNs also purchase food from conventional channels such as supermarkets and speciality stores. This suggests that AFNs represent a niche food retail channel that sits alongside conventional production and food retail supply chains [62]. Furthermore, rather than the transformation of the regime, the established food system may assimilate certain aspects of alternative food systems without there being a fundamental transformation. For example, supermarkets may offer local produce, organic, fair trade and vegan options as a part of their product offering, co-existing with conventional products [24,38,62,66,73,74,79]. Additionally, the role of the regime is acknowledged in the transformation process [24,46,79]. There is evidence that incumbent firms are incorporating sustainability priorities in their vision, goals and practices, which is often driven by regulations or pressure from shareholders, customers and consumers [40]. In this way, incumbent agrifood firms and industries can become a positive force for food system sustainability [40,79]. The literature in this cluster acknowledges that there are multiple perspectives on what transformation may look like and what problems need to be addressed [11,46].

3.3.5. Agroecology

Agroecology is related to agriculture, in that it is a specific type of agricultural production that contests the conventional agricultural perspective of human control over nature and recognises humans as an integral part of the natural ecosystem. It challenges the assumptions of industrial or conventional agriculture, with its reliance on substantial inputs such as chemical fertilisers, pesticides, mechanisation and genetic technologies. It recognises soil as a living ecosystem that interacts with the environment through dynamic biological processes [45]. Agroecology proposes that the answer to the established unsustainable agrifood system lies in connecting with ecosystem services and the concept of natural capital, in contrast to a technology-driven approach [80]. It can be seen as providing a guiding philosophy for agricultural production. Therefore, sustainable transitions from an agroecology perspective require a holistic long-term view that recognises the evolving, complex and interacting biological systems involved in transitioning to more sustainable production practices [41]. Systemic regime change, therefore, evolves over a long period and requires time for farmers to learn and adopt new practices that work with natural systems [45].

Vermunt et al. [41] argue that sustainability transitions in agrifood systems do not conform to the predominant transition models of socio-technical transitions in other sectors such as mobility and energy. This is due to place-based dependencies, where landscapes show significant differences in geographical, biophysical and ecological dimensions. Furthermore, the public good aspect of environmental sustainability requires incentive mechanisms to encourage established farmers to adopt more sustainable practices. Agroecological principles also advocate for a closer interaction between producers and consumers, enabling the latter to have a greater understanding of biological processes in food production and a deep connection to the natural environment [10,45].

Agroecology makes a distinct contribution to sustainable transitions literature, due to its explicit acknowledgement of the complex biological systems involved in food production. It emphasises that supporting sustainability transitions requires an understanding of these natural systems and the adoption of agroecological principles that work with the natural environment to achieve more sustainable outcomes.

4. Discussion and Conclusions

4.1. Key Findings

This paper provides the first systematic review of the literature on the STRN theme of firms and industries in agrifood sustainability transitions. It demonstrates the significant development of this literature, which has progressed from being a “marginal topic” [17]

(p. 358) to a significant body of work across multiple themes. These themes include agriculture, innovation, food systems, governance and agroecology, each shedding light on different aspects of agrifood sustainability transitions in firms and industries.

Agriculture and transitions stress the importance of on-farm sustainability practices, due to the major impact that agricultural production has on the environment. As a result, there is an increasing recognition of farmers as key actors in the process of sustainability transitions at the farm production level. It highlights the significant challenges faced by individual farmers in adopting sustainability practices. These include the power dynamics between farmers and the large corporate agribusiness firms and food retailers that resist change and perpetuate the status quo. There are also barriers to the adoption of technical innovations that may improve sustainability, due to the lack of financial resources and the limited technical skills of smaller-scale farmers. The critical role of individual farmers necessitates understanding the diverse motivations for farmers to implement sustainable farming practices.

Establishing disruptive innovations in the food system has been a core concept in bringing about the transformation of the established regime. However, this analysis highlights that incremental innovations can evolve from within the dominant regime and can also result in significant change. Another important aspect of the literature on sustainable innovations is that there is growing awareness of the complex interconnected nature of agrifood systems and that, for change to occur, sustainable innovations need to simultaneously occur at multiple stages of the agrifood system, from production through to consumption.

The review of the governance literature provides insight into interventions that can potentially influence sustainability transitions. It highlights that although governments and policymakers play an important role in the management of transitions, they can also be affected by embedded political interests that can influence and lead to policies that support the status quo. Furthermore, transition governance faces significant challenges due to the complexity of agrifood systems. These systems have high levels of uncertainty, complexity, ambiguity and distributed control, which, when combined with emergence, means that the outcomes of governance interventions are highly uncertain.

Food system transformation faces significant challenges. There is currently no consensus on the definition of the concept of sustainability, with multiple definitions that focus on different aspects of sustainability. In many cases, certain systems are promoted as sustainable agrifood systems without giving clear evidence of how this is determined. For example, AFNs aim to transform or replace conventional agrifood systems. However, they lack clear evidence as to sustainability credentials, face challenges in scaling up and often struggle to be independent of existing supply chains. Furthermore, there is evidence that the established agrifood system may adopt some aspects of AFNs and may incorporate sustainability practices due to the influence of shareholders, customers and consumers.

The agroecology literature emphasises the complex biological processes and ecosystems involved in agricultural production. This biological aspect of sustainability transition is less widely recognized in the main body of sustainability literature that has developed from energy and transportation systems. The literature is, therefore, more aligned with the incremental innovation perspective. In agrifood systems, biological ecosystems evolve and change over time, and changes in farming practices may only be evident in the long term. The agroecology perspective also highlights the importance of the farmer in this process and advocates for support to be provided for farmers adopting agroecological production practices.

This review makes a significant contribution to the literature on sustainability transitions in agrifood systems. It also highlights the critical role that individual farmers play in the adoption of sustainability practices. It emphasises that incremental innovations that emerge within the established agrifood system can lead to significant change. Key challenges to the governance of agrifood systems are identified, in particular, influencing complex agrifood systems. It identifies the lack of consensus regarding definitions of sus-

tainability and the need for clear measures of environmental impact. Agroecology makes an important contribution, highlighting the importance of the complex biological aspects of agrifood systems.

4.2. Research Gaps and Future Research

This review identifies a number of gaps in the research and potential avenues for future research. There is a need to expand the geographical scope of the research to non-Western countries, addressing critical issues of the scarcity of resources, food safety, security and access to affordable nutritious food. Given the central role of agriculture and food in these economies, this is an urgent focus for research. Furthermore, there is a need to broaden the current Eurocentric focus of the research to develop a global perspective on agrifood sustainability transitions. Furthermore, there is an opportunity to broaden the research methodology from the primary use of case study analysis and the MLP. This could involve comparative case studies across regions and industries, as well as empirical studies that can enhance the ability to generalise the study findings and test theoretical assumptions.

Future research should focus on the dynamics of the current agrifood system and explore the potential for significant transformative change from within. There needs to be greater emphasis on sustainability transitions in each component of the agrifood system. For example, key sectors, such as the food processing industry, have been overlooked despite their crucial roles. Additionally, future research should include the roles of agricultural input providers, such as fertilizer suppliers, machinery manufacturers and agrochemical companies, as these are currently neglected parts of the agrifood system.

Research could identify the role of both disruptive and incremental innovations and the role of the influence of external landscape factors in supporting change. This could focus on the role of governments and regulations in supporting sustainability transitions and on understanding how these affect the established regime, for example, by reviewing existing government policies and practices to evaluate their role in supporting or hindering agrifood sustainability transitions in forms and industries.

There is a need to empirically evaluate the definitions of “sustainability” and validate the claims of sustainability made by various alternative agrifood systems. There is also the opportunity to operationalise sustainability, with concepts such as planetary boundaries [16], sustainable development goals [81] and the social, environmental and economic sustainability framework.

4.3. Theoretical Contribution

This review makes a valuable contribution to sustainable transitions theory by describing the development of the literature on agrifood sustainability transitions, providing insight into the role of firms and industries. It highlights the development of key themes, which include transitions in agriculture, innovation, food systems, governance and agroecology. The contribution of these themes to the wider body of agrifood transitions theory is identified and explained. Key contributions include the critical role of individual farmers and the effect of power dynamics on their adoption of sustainability practices. The effects of both disruptive and incremental innovations are highlighted and their potential to drive significant change, including from within the regime, is examined. Furthermore, this review highlights the governance challenges related to the complexities of agrifood systems. The perspective of agroecology provides an important contribution to our understanding of the complex biological systems involved in agrifood systems. This review of the existing research provides a foundation for future research and the development of theory in the study of sustainable transitions in agrifood firms and industries.

4.4. Implications for Managers and Policymakers

The focus on firms and industries has significant implications for managers and policymakers. For managers involved in sustainability initiatives within established agrifood firms, this review identifies the key challenges and opportunities for driving transforma-

tional change. The insights into agroecology, incremental innovation, sustainable agricultural production systems and the important role of farmers can inform strategies for effectively implementing sustainable practices. Providing appropriate education and training for farmers and other staff involved in sustainability transitions will be important for the success of the implementation of more sustainable practices.

This review is relevant for policymakers seeking to support sustainable transitions in the agrifood industry. Understanding how specific interventions can influence change is an important priority. Furthermore, for policymakers, the insights into the challenges of governance of complex agrifood systems, as well as the role of individual farmers and the opportunities of agroecological practices, can assist in the design of regulatory and policy interventions. The review also shows the interconnected nature of different stages of the food systems and emphasises the importance of engaging with actors at all stages of the supply chain to achieve transformational change.

The review raises several important questions for policymakers. For instance, are current policies supporting or hindering transitions to more sustainable practices by agrifood firms and industries? Additionally, what are the impacts of different policy interventions, and how should policymakers engage with agrifood firms and industries? For example, are environmental regulations more effective than financial incentives in promoting sustainability transitions? Given the significant vested interests in maintaining the status quo of the established regime, how does this limit the ability of policymakers to implement potentially disruptive policies?

Another fundamental question concerns defining the goal of transformation. The literature reveals diverse definitions of sustainability, with no clear consensus on the desired outcomes of sustainable transitions. These questions underscore the challenges that policymakers face in influencing agrifood firms and industries to adopt more sustainable practices. Addressing these questions is crucial, given the urgent need for profound changes in how food is produced, processed, distributed and consumed.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, N.J.L.; methodology, N.J.L.; software, S.S., N.J.L.; data curation, S.S.; formal analysis, N.J.L.; writing—original draft preparation, N.J.L.; writing—review and editing, N.J.L., X.L.; project administration, N.J.L.; funding acquisition, N.J.L. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Data Availability Statement: The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Appendix A. List of Papers

Reference	Definition of Sustainability	Methodology	Sample	Theoretical Framework
Agriculture				
Food safety risks, disruptive events and alternative beef production: A case study of agricultural transition in Alberta [62]	Alternative food producers, organic production	Case study	Alternative beef producers in Alberta, Canada	Sustainable transitions theory. Multi-level perspective
The power of corporate lock-ins and how they shape digital agriculture in Germany [9]	Critique of agro-industrial farming models	Case study	Stakeholders in the German agriculture industry	Political economy

Reference	Definition of Sustainability	Methodology	Sample	Theoretical Framework
Translating Environmental Potential to Economic Reality: Assessment of Commercial Aquaponics through Sustainability Transitions [61]	Circular economy	Semi-structured interviews, literature and policy review	American aquaponic producers	Technology innovation system framework, multi-level perspective (MLP)
The politics of expertise in assessing alternatives to glyphosate in France [63]	Alternatives to pesticide use (glyphosate)	Case study	Actors in the agricultural sector and experts in pesticide policy	Boundary work concept
Integrating sustainability transitions and food systems research to examine consultation failures in Canadian food policymaking [65]	Food sovereignty	Case study	Canadian food policymaking	Multi-level perspective (MLP)
Adaptive transition management for transformations to agricultural sustainability in the Karnali mountains of Nepal [49]	Resilience, biodiversity	Single case study	Karnali mountains Nepal	Multi-level perspective (MLP). Adaptive transition management
Connecting business with the agricultural landscape: business strategies for sustainable rural development [59]	Agricultural landscape sustainability	Multiple case studies	Four cases of business-landscape engagement	Landscape perspective
Conceptualizing sustainable food entrepreneurship [60]	Relocalisation	Literature review and case study	Dutch city region of Almere-Flevoland	Sustainable food entrepreneurship framework
Unlearning in sustainability transitions: Insight from two Dutch community-supported agriculture farms [43]	Community-supported agriculture	Case study	Phase-out and ban of battery cages for laying hens in the Netherlands	Political economy
Agriculture 4.0 and climate change in Brazil [57]	Low carbon/climate change	Single case study	Brazilian agribusiness	Multi-level perspective (MLP)
Synthesising the diversity of European agri-food networks: A meta-study of actors and power-laden interactions [39]	None	Meta-analysis	European case studies	
Spheres of transformation: Exploring personal, political and practical drivers of farmer agency and behaviour change in the Netherlands [12]	Regenerative farming practices	Case study	Dutch farmers adopting regenerative farming practices	Spheres of transformation
References in other clusters	Cluster			
Giagnocavo et al., 2022 [45]	Agroecology			
McInnes [65]	Food system			
Farhangi et al., 2020 [58]	Food system			
Manuel-Navarrete and Gallopín, 2012 [64]	Governance			
van der Gaast et al., 2022 [60]	Innovation			
van Oers et al., 2021 [43]	Food system			
Kinniburgh, 2023 [63]	Governance			

Reference	Definition of Sustainability	Methodology	Sample	Theoretical Framework
Innovation				
Selecting technologies to engage in sustainability transitions—A multi-stakeholder perspective [67]	Sustainability transitions from a fossil-based towards a bio-based economy	Mixed-method research design	Stakeholders from multiple stages of the value chain	Transition theory. Selection criteria for sustainability-orientated technologies SOT's
Enacting transitions—the combined effect of multiple niches in whole system reconfiguration [23]	Organic farming	Ethnographic study and archival work	Drôme valley in southeast France	Multi-level perspective (MLP)
Relation between innovation and sustainability in the agro-food system [48]	UN sustainable development goals	Literature review	Sustainability literature	Multi-level perspective (MLP)
Transformational adaptation on the farm: Processes of change and persistence in transitions to 'climate-smart' regenerative agriculture [28]	Regenerative agriculture.	Semi-structured interviews, participant observation, and document analysis	Farmers grazing sheep or cattle New South Wales, Australia	sustainability transitions framework
Agency in regime destabilization through the selection environment: The Finnish food system's sustainability transition [46]	Nutrient recycling, vegetarian diet and organic foods	Discourse analysis	Finnish food system	Tripple embeddedness framework. Agency in the selection environment
A framework of disruptive sustainable innovation: An example of the Finnish food system [26]	Reduced meat consumption, local food, direct farm sales, organic production	Multiple case studies	Finnish food system	Practice-based view on disruptive innovation, multi-level perspective (MLP)
The diffusion of climate-smart agricultural innovations: Systems-level factors that inhibit sustainable entrepreneurial action [68]	Earth system biophysical thresholds, climate, smart agriculture	Multi-level perspective (MLP)	Semi-structured interviews. Climate-smart providers and policymakers A–Z	Multi-level perspective (MLP). Entrepreneurial ecosystem perspective
Lost in mainstreaming? Agrifood and urban mobility grassroots innovations with multiple pathways and outcomes [66]	Grassroots innovation: Fairtrade, organic, veganism, car-sharing, cycling and shared spaces	Multiple case studies	Grassroots innovations	Sustainability transitions framework
Designing coupled innovations for the sustainability transition of agrifood systems. [14]	Reduced energy use, increased biodiversity, improved soil and water quality, decreased pesticide use, preventing nutritional deficits and obesity	Multiple case study	Examples of coupled innovations	Multi-level perspective (MLP), innovative design theory
The role of supply chains for the sustainability transformation of global food systems: A large-scale, systematic review of food cold chains [69]	Sustainable development goals	Literature review	Food cold chain	None

Reference	Definition of Sustainability	Methodology	Sample	Theoretical Framework
Conceptualizing sustainable food entrepreneurship [60]	Relocalisation	Literature review and case study	Dutch city region of Almere-Flevoland	Sustainable food entrepreneurship framework
Governance				
The governance features of social enterprise and social network activities of collective food buying groups [42]	Collective food-buying groups	Semi-structured questionnaire	104 collective buying groups, Belgium	Sustainability transitions theory
A methodological framework to initiate and design transition governance processes [71]	Alternate food systems, urban farming, community gardens, local production	Single case study	Sustainable food systems in Ontario, Canada	Multi-level learning processes
Translating Environmental Potential to Economic Reality: Assessment of Commercial Aquaponics through Sustainability Transitions Theory [61]	Aquaponic food production, circular economy	Semi-structured interviews	25 North American producers	Technological innovation system (TIS) assessment multi-level perspective (MLP)
The politics of expertise in assessing alternatives to glyphosate in France [63]	Reduced pesticide use.	Single case study	French pesticide regulation on glyphosate alternatives	Concepts of co-production and boundary work
Lost in mainstreaming? Agrifood and urban mobility grassroots innovations with multiple pathways and outcomes [66]	Grassroots innovation: Fairtrade, organic, veganism, carsharing, cycling and shared space	Multiple case studies	Grassroots innovations	Sustainability transitions framework
Feeding the world sustainably: Knowledge governance and sustainable agriculture in the Argentine Pampas [64]	No-till practices. Reduced soil degradation and ecosystem disruption	Single case study	Argentine farmers	Actor-centred approach
Crafting actionable knowledge on ecological intensification: Lessons from co-innovation approaches in Uruguay and Europe [72]	Ecological intensification	Six case studies from three co-innovation projects	Co-innovation research projects in Uruguay and Europe	Complex adaptive systems, social learning, dynamic monitoring and evaluation
A Framework for Sustainability Transition: The Case of Plant-Based Diets [15]	Social, economic, environmental, cultural, and ethical dimensions of sustainability	Case study	Plant-based diets	Sustainability transitions theory
Food system				
Outside-in and bottom-up: Using sustainability transitions to understand the development phases of mainstreaming plant-based in the food sector in a meat and dairy focused economy [24]	Planetary boundaries, reducing GHG, land use change and biodiversity loss	Semi-structured interviews with businesses and experts	Denmark plant-based products	Multi-level perspective (MLP)

Reference	Definition of Sustainability	Methodology	Sample	Theoretical Framework
Structuring tensions and key relations of Montreal seasonal food markets in the sustainability transition of the agri-food sector [74]	Local food, seasonal production	Action research, case study	Three Montreal seasonal food markets	Multi-level perspective (MLP)
Systemic ethics and inclusive governance: two key prerequisites for sustainability transitions of agri-food systems [38]	Small-scale production, local food	Case study	Belgian supermarkets	Sustainability transitions perspective
Systemic ethics and inclusive governance: Two key prerequisites for sustainability transitions of agri-food systems [38]	Local, low-input, small-scale farmers' products	Case study	Local sourcing in Belgian supermarkets	Sustainability transitions perspective
Incumbent entry modes and entry timing in sustainable niches: The plant-based protein transition in the United States, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom [40]	Plant-based meat substitutes	Multiple case studies	Firms adopting plant-based meat substitutes in the US, the Netherlands and the UK	Entry mode theory
Productivity growth as a barrier to a sustainability transition [78]	Small-scale artisan bakers	Case study	Australian baking industry	Multifactor productivity
Digital fooding, cashless marketplaces and reconnection in intermediated third places: Conceptualizing metropolitan food provision in the age of prosumption [76]	Sustainable food systems	Desktop analysis	Review of special-issue literature in the journal <i>Agriculture and Human Values</i>	Sustainable development goals
The evolutionary emergence of quintuple helix coalitions: A case study of place-based sustainability transition [77]	Local food production, short supply chains, production and sales of ancient grains (wheat varieties)	Case study	Value chain of ancient wheat varieties in Tuscany	Triple helix
High-tech urban agriculture in Amsterdam: An actor-network analysis [58]	High-tech urban agriculture	Case study	Amsterdam: High-tech urban agriculture	Actor-network theory/multi-level perspective (MLP), technology-driven transition framework
Incumbents' capabilities for sustainability-oriented innovation in the Norwegian food sector—An integrated framework [79]	UN sustainable development goals	Multiple case study	Norwegian food sector	Theory of dynamic capabilities
China and changing food trends: A sustainability transition perspective [13]	Reduced environmental footprint and better human diets. Planetary boundaries	Desktop analysis of literature and secondary data	Online sources related to major societal shifts in food consumption and production	Transition theories

Reference	Definition of Sustainability	Methodology	Sample	Theoretical Framework
Integrating sustainability transitions and food systems research to examine consultation failures in Canadian food policymaking [65]	Food sovereignty	Case study	Canadian food policymaking	Multi-level perspective (MLP)
Digital fooding, cashless marketplaces and reconnection in intermediated third places: Conceptualizing metropolitan food provision in the age of prosumption [75]	Local food (>250 km)	Case study	Ruche digital platform for food provisioning in France	Prosumption
Unlearning in sustainability transitions: Insight from two Dutch community-supported agriculture farms [43]	Alternative food networks	Case study	Two Dutch community-supported agriculture groups	Organisational change theory, sustainability transitions perspective
A new green revolution or agribusiness as usual? Uncovering alignment issues and potential transition complications in agri-food system transitions [11]	Identified issues: agrochemical use, Biodiversity, antibiotic uses	Vision documents for Dutch agricultural transition	Dutch agrifood system	Mission-orientated perspective, visioning
Sustainability buckets: A flexible heuristic for facilitating strategic investment on place-dependent sustainability narratives [73]	Nourish the body, nourish the planet, socially just relationships, circular economy and economic viability	Two case studies	New Zealand egg sector and honey distributor	Multi-level perspective (MLP), sustainability cultures
References in other clusters	Cluster			
Bui et al., 2019 [38]	Innovation			
Marletto and Sillig, 2019 [66]	Innovation			
Davidson et al., 2016 [62]	Agriculture			
Agroecology				
Reconnecting farmers with Nature through agroecological transitions: Interacting niches and experimentation and the role of agricultural knowledge and innovation systems [45]	Agroecology	Case study	Greenhouse sector, Almeria, Spain	Multi-level perspective (MLP), agroecological frameworks
Translating environmental potential to economic reality: Assessment of commercial aquaponics through sustainability transitions theory [61]	Sustaining ecosystem services	Vision documents for Dutch agricultural transition	Dutch agrifood system	Mission-orientated perspective, visioning
The role of consumer-citizens and connectedness to nature in the sustainable transition to agroecological food systems: The mediation of innovative business models and a multi-level perspective (MLP) [10]	Agroecology		Theoretical	Multi-level perspective (MLP)

Reference	Definition of Sustainability	Methodology	Sample	Theoretical Framework
Sustainability transitions in the agrifood sector: How ecology affects transition dynamics [41]	Biodiversity enhancement	Case study of four biodiversity initiatives	Dutch dairy sector	Multi-level perspective (MLP), innovation system perspective
Tackling material dependency in sustainability transition: Rationales and insights from the agriculture sector [80]	Addressing the ecological crisis	Descriptive	Agriculture	Material dependency
References in other clusters	Cluster			
Horn et al., 2023 [61]	Governance/Agriculture			

References

- Ahmad, K. Global population will increase to nine billion by 2050. *Lancet* **2001**, *357*, 864. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Boliko, M.C. FAO and the situation of food security and nutrition in the world. *J. Nutr. Sci. Vitaminol.* **2019**, *65*, 4–8. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Ezeh, A.C.; Bongaarts, J.; Mberu, B. Global population trends and policy options. *Lancet* **2012**, *380*, 142–148. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- UNICEF. *Brief to the State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2022*; United Nations Children’s Fund: New York, NY, USA, 2022.
- United Nations. *World Population Prospects 2022, Online Edition*; Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division: New York, NY, USA, 2022. Available online: <https://population.un.org/wpp/> (accessed on 30 August 2023).
- Godfray, H.C.J.; Crute, I.R.; Haddad, L.; Lawrence, D.; Muir, J.F.; Nisbett, N.; Pretty, J.; Robinson, S.; Toulmin, C.; Whiteley, R. The future of the global food system. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Biol. Sci.* **2010**, *365*, 2769–2777. [CrossRef]
- OECD. *How We Feed the World Today*; OECD: Paris, France, 2022. Available online: <https://www.oecd.org/agriculture/understanding-the-global-food-system/how-we-feed-the-world-today/> (accessed on 20 January 2024).
- Gaitán-Cremaschi, D.; Klerkx, L.; Duncan, J.; Trienekens, J.H.; Huenchuleo, C.; Dogliotti, S.; Contesse, M.E.; Rossing, W.A.H. Characterizing diversity of food systems in view of sustainability transitions. A review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* **2019**, *39*, 1. [CrossRef]
- Hackfort, S. Unlocking sustainability? The power of corporate lock-ins and how they shape digital agriculture in Germany. *J. Rural Stud.* **2023**, *101*, 103065. [CrossRef]
- Mehrabi, S.; Perez-Mesa, J.C.; Giagnocavo, C. The Role of Consumer-Citizens and Connectedness to Nature in the Sustainable Transition to Agroecological Food Systems: The mediation of innovative business models and a multi-level perspective. *Agriculture* **2022**, *12*, 203. [CrossRef]
- Wojtynia, N.; van Dijk, J.; Derks, M.; Groot Koerkamp, P.; Hekkert, M. A new green revolution or agribusiness as usual? Uncovering alignment issues and potential transition complications in agri-food system transitions. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* **2021**, *41*, 77. [CrossRef]
- Wojtynia, N.; van Dijk, J.; Derks, M.; Groot Koerkamp, P.; Hekkert, M. Spheres of transformation: Exploring personal, political and practical drivers of farmer agency and behaviour change in the Netherlands. *Environ. Innov. Soc. Transit.* **2023**, *49*, 100776. [CrossRef]
- Marinova, D.; Bogueva, D.; Wu, Y.; Guo, X. China and changing food trends: A sustainability transition perspective. *Ukr. Food J.* **2022**, *11*, 126–147. [CrossRef]
- Meynard, J.-M.; Jeuffroy, M.-H.; Le Bail, M.; Lefèvre, A.; Magrini, M.-B.; Michon, C. Designing coupled innovations for the sustainability transition of agrifood systems. *Agric. Syst.* **2017**, *157*, 330–339. [CrossRef]
- Vinnari, M.; Vinnari, E. A framework for sustainability transition: The case of plant-based diets. *J. Agric. Environ. Ethics* **2014**, *27*, 369–396. [CrossRef]
- Willett, W.; Rockström, J.; Loken, B.; Springmann, M.; Lang, T.; Vermeulen, S.; Garnett, T.; Tilman, D.; DeClerck, F.; Wood, A. Food in the Anthropocene: The EAT–Lancet Commission on healthy diets from sustainable food systems. *Lancet* **2019**, *393*, 447–492. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- El Bilali, H. Research on agro-food sustainability transitions: A systematic review of research themes and an analysis of research gaps. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2019**, *221*, 353–364. [CrossRef]
- FAO. *Global Food Losses and Food Waste—Extent, Causes and Prevention*; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations: Rome, Italy, 2011. Available online: <https://www.fao.org/4/mb060e/mb060e.pdf> (accessed on 10 November 2023).
- Kummu, M.; De Moel, H.; Porkka, M.; Siebert, S.; Varis, O.; Ward, P.J. Lost food, wasted resources: Global food supply chain losses and their impacts on freshwater, cropland, and fertiliser use. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2012**, *438*, 477–489. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Moult, J.; Allan, S.; Hewitt, C.; Berners-Lee, M. Greenhouse gas emissions of food waste disposal options for UK retailers. *Food Policy* **2018**, *77*, 50–58. [CrossRef]

21. Guh, D.P.; Zhang, W.; Bansback, N.; Amarsi, Z.; Birmingham, C.L.; Anis, A.H. The incidence of co-morbidities related to obesity and overweight: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Public Health* **2009**, *9*, 88. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
22. WHO. *Obesity and Overweight*; WHO: Geneva, Switzerland, 2021. Available online: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/obesity-and-overweight> (accessed on 13 September 2023).
23. Bui, S. Enacting transitions—The combined effect of multiple niches in whole system reconfiguration. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 6135. [CrossRef]
24. Aschemann-Witzel, J.; Mulders, M.D.G.H.; Mouritzen, S.L.T. Outside-in and bottom-up: Using sustainability transitions to understand the development phases of mainstreaming plant-based in the food sector in a meat and dairy focused economy. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Chang.* **2023**, *197*, 122906. [CrossRef]
25. Béné, C. Why the Great Food Transformation may not happen—A deep-dive into our food systems’ political economy, controversies and politics of evidence. *World Dev.* **2022**, *154*, 105881. [CrossRef]
26. Kuokkanen, A.; Uusitalo, V.; Koistinen, K. A framework of disruptive sustainable innovation: An example of the Finnish food system. *Technol. Anal. Strateg. Manag.* **2019**, *31*, 749–764. [CrossRef]
27. Sustainability Transition Research Network. (2021, 2022). Available online: <https://transitionsnetwork.org/> (accessed on 28 October 2023).
28. Gosnell, H.; Gill, N.; Voyer, M. Transformational adaptation on the farm: Processes of change and persistence in transitions to ‘climate-smart’ regenerative agriculture. *Glob. Environ. Chang.* **2019**, *59*, 101965. [CrossRef]
29. El Bilali, H.; Strassner, C.; Ben Hassen, T. Sustainable agri-food systems: Environment, economy, society, and policy. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 6260. [CrossRef]
30. Geels, F.W. Technological transitions as evolutionary reconfiguration processes: A multi-level perspective and a case-study. *Res. Policy* **2002**, *31*, 1257–1274. [CrossRef]
31. Van den Ende, J.; Kemp, R. Technological transformations in history: How the computer regime grew out of existing computing regimes. *Res. Policy* **1999**, *28*, 833–851. [CrossRef]
32. Verbong, G.; Geels, F. The ongoing energy transition: Lessons from a socio-technical, multi-level analysis of the Dutch electricity system (1960–2004). *Energy Policy* **2007**, *35*, 1025–1037. [CrossRef]
33. Lachman, D.A. A survey and review of approaches to study transitions. *Energy Policy* **2013**, *58*, 269–276. [CrossRef]
34. Loorbach, D.; Frantzeskaki, N.; Avelino, F. Sustainability transitions research: Transforming science and practice for societal change. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* **2017**, *42*, 599–626. [CrossRef]
35. Köhler, J.; Geels, F.W.; Kern, F.; Markard, J.; Onsongo, E.; Wiczorek, A.; Alkemade, F.; Avelino, F.; Bergek, A.; Boons, F.; et al. An agenda for sustainability transitions research: State of the art and future directions. *Environ. Innov. Soc. Transit.* **2019**, *31*, 1–32. [CrossRef]
36. Visser, M.; van Eck, N.J.; Waltman, L. Large-scale comparison of bibliographic data sources: Scopus, Web of Science, Dimensions, Crossref, and Microsoft Academic. *Quant. Sci. Stud.* **2021**, *2*, 20–41. [CrossRef]
37. Van Eck, N.; Waltman, L. Software survey: VOSviewer, a computer program for bibliometric mapping. *Scientometrics* **2010**, *84*, 523–538. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
38. Bui, S.; Costa, I.; De Schutter, O.; Dedeurwaerdere, T.; Hudon, M.; Feyereisen, M. Systemic ethics and inclusive governance: Two key prerequisites for sustainability transitions of agri-food systems. *Agric. Hum. Values* **2019**, *36*, 277–288. [CrossRef]
39. Williams, T.G.; Bui, S.; Conti, C.; Debonne, N.; Levers, C.; Swart, R.; Verburg, P.H. Synthesising the diversity of European agri-food networks: A meta-study of actors and power-laden interactions. *Glob. Environ. Chang.* **2023**, *83*, 102746. [CrossRef]
40. Bulah, B.M.; Tziva, M.; Bidmon, C.; Hekkert, M.P. Incumbent entry modes and entry timing in sustainable niches: The plant-based protein transition in the United States, Netherlands, and United Kingdom. *Environ. Innov. Soc. Transit.* **2023**, *48*, 100735. [CrossRef]
41. Vermunt, D.A.; Negro, S.O.; van Laerhoven, F.; Verweij, P.A.; Hekkert, M.P. Sustainability transitions in the agri-food sector: How ecology affects transition dynamics. *Environ. Innov. Soc. Transit.* **2020**, *36*, 236–249. [CrossRef]
42. Dedeurwaerdere, T.; De Schutter, O.; Hudon, M.; Mathijs, E.; Annaert, B.; Avermaete, T.; Bleeckx, T.; de Callatay, C.; De Snijder, P.; Fernández-Wulff, P.; et al. The governance features of social enterprise and social network activities of collective food buying groups. *Ecol. Econ.* **2017**, *140*, 123–135. [CrossRef]
43. van Oers, L.; Feola, G.; Moors, E.; Runhaar, H. The politics of deliberate destabilisation for sustainability transitions. *Environ. Innov. Soc. Transit.* **2021**, *40*, 159–171. [CrossRef]
44. van Oers, L.; Feola, G.; Runhaar, H.; Moors, E. Unlearning in sustainability transitions: Insight from two Dutch community-supported agriculture farms. *Environ. Innov. Soc. Transit.* **2023**, *46*, 100693. [CrossRef]
45. Giagnocavo, C.; de Cara-García, M.; González, M.; Juan, M.; Marín-Guirao, J.I.; Mehrabi, S.; Rodríguez, E.; van der Blom, J.; Crisol-Martínez, E. Reconnecting farmers with Nature through agroecological transitions: Interacting niches and experimentation and the role of agricultural knowledge and innovation systems. *Agriculture* **2022**, *12*, 137. [CrossRef]
46. Kuokkanen, A.; Nurmi, A.; Mikkilä, M.; Kuisma, M.; Kahiluoto, H.; Linnanen, L. Agency in regime destabilization through the selection environment: The Finnish food system’s sustainability transition. *Res. Policy* **2018**, *47*, 1513–1522. [CrossRef]
47. Elsevier. *Agricultural Systems—Aims & Scope*; Elsevier: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2024. Available online: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/journal/agricultural-systems> (accessed on 30 January 2024).
48. El Bilali, H. Relation between innovation and sustainability in the agro-food system. *Ital. J. Food Sci.* **2018**, *30*, 200–225.

49. Pant, L.P.; Bahadur, K.; Fraser, E.D.; Shrestha, P.K.; Lama, A.B.; Jirel, S.K.; Chaudhary, P. Adaptive transition management for transformations to agricultural sustainability in the Karnali mountains of Nepal. *Agroecol. Sustain. Food Syst.* **2014**, *38*, 1156–1183. [[CrossRef](#)]
50. Smith, A.; Raven, R. What is protective space? Reconsidering niches in transitions to sustainability. *Res. Policy* **2012**, *41*, 1025–1036. [[CrossRef](#)]
51. Geels, F.W.; Schot, J. Typology of socio-technical transition pathways. *Res. Policy* **2007**, *36*, 399–417. [[CrossRef](#)]
52. Geels, F.W. Regime resistance against low-carbon transitions: Introducing politics and power into the multi-level perspective. *Theory Cult. Soc.* **2014**, *31*, 21–40. [[CrossRef](#)]
53. Markard, J.; Raven, R.; Truffer, B. Sustainability transitions: An emerging field of research and its prospects. *Res. Policy* **2012**, *41*, 955–967. [[CrossRef](#)]
54. Geels, F.W. Reconceptualising the co-evolution of firms-in-industries and their environments: Developing an inter-disciplinary Triple Embeddedness Framework. *Res. Policy* **2014**, *43*, 261–277. [[CrossRef](#)]
55. Klerkx, L.; Aarts, N.; Leeuwis, C. Adaptive management in agricultural innovation systems: The interactions between innovation networks and their environment. *Agric. Syst.* **2010**, *103*, 390–400. [[CrossRef](#)]
56. Geels, F.W. The multi-level perspective on sustainability transitions: Responses to seven criticisms. *Environ. Innov. Soc. Transit.* **2011**, *1*, 24–40. [[CrossRef](#)]
57. Viola, E.; Mendes, V. Agriculture 4.0 and climate change in Brazil. *Ambiente Soc.* **2022**, *25*, e02462. [[CrossRef](#)]
58. Farhangi, M.H.; Turvani, M.E.; van der Valk, A.; Carsjens, G.J. High-tech urban agriculture in Amsterdam: An actor network analysis. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 3955. [[CrossRef](#)]
59. Swaffield, S.R.; Corry, R.C.; Opdam, P.; McWilliam, W.; Primdahl, J. Connecting business with the agricultural landscape: Business strategies for sustainable rural development. *Bus. Strategy Environ.* **2019**, *28*, 1357–1369. [[CrossRef](#)]
60. van der Gaast, K.; van Leeuwen, E.; Wertheim-Heck, S. Food systems in transition: Conceptualizing sustainable food entrepreneurship. *Int. J. Agric. Sustain.* **2022**, *20*, 705–721. [[CrossRef](#)]
61. Horn, E.K.; Joyce, A.; Chowdhury, R.B.; Caputo, S.; Jacobs, B.; Winkler, M.; Proksch, G. Translating Environmental Potential to Economic Reality: Assessment of Commercial Aquaponics through Sustainability Transitions Theory. *Circ. Econ. Sustain.* **2023**, *4*, 523–554. [[CrossRef](#)]
62. Davidson, D.J.; Jones, K.E.; Parkins, J.R. Food safety risks, disruptive events and alternative beef production: A case study of agricultural transition in Alberta. *Agric. Hum. Values* **2016**, *33*, 359–371. [[CrossRef](#)]
63. Kinniburgh, F. The politics of expertise in assessing alternatives to glyphosate in France. *Environ. Sci. Policy* **2023**, *145*, 60–72. [[CrossRef](#)]
64. Manuel-Navarrete, D.; Gallopín, G.C. Feeding the world sustainably: Knowledge governance and sustainable agriculture in the Argentine Pampas. *Environ. Dev. Sustain.* **2012**, *14*, 321–333. [[CrossRef](#)]
65. McInnes, A. Integrating sustainability transitions and food systems research to examine consultation failures in Canadian food policymaking. *J. Environ. Policy Plan.* **2019**, *21*, 407–426. [[CrossRef](#)]
66. Marletto, G.; Sillig, C. Lost in mainstreaming? Agrifood and urban mobility grassroots innovations with multiple pathways and outcomes. *Ecol. Econ.* **2019**, *158*, 88–100. [[CrossRef](#)]
67. Block, C.; Rennings, M.; Bröring, S. Selecting technologies to engage in sustainability transitions—A multi-stakeholder perspective. *Bus. Strategy Environ.* **2023**, *32*, 3569–3595. [[CrossRef](#)]
68. Long, T.B.; Blok, V.; Coninx, I. The diffusion of climate-smart agricultural innovations: Systems level factors that inhibit sustainable entrepreneurial action. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2019**, *232*, 993–1004. [[CrossRef](#)]
69. Trotter, P.A.; Becker, T.; Renaldi, R.; Wang, X.; Khosla, R.; Walther, G. The role of supply chains for the sustainability transformation of global food systems: A large-scale, systematic review of food cold chains. *J. Ind. Ecol.* **2023**, *27*, 1429–1446. [[CrossRef](#)]
70. Keating, C.B.; Katina, P.F.; Pyne, J.C.; Jaradat, R.M. Systemic intervention for complex system governance development. In Proceedings of the American Society for Engineering Management International Annual Conference, Huntsville, AL, USA, 18–21 October 2017.
71. Halbe, J.; Pahl-Wostl, C. A methodological framework to initiate and design transition governance processes. *Sustainability* **2019**, *11*, 844. [[CrossRef](#)]
72. Rossing, W.A.H.; Albicette, M.M.; Aguerre, V.; Leoni, C.; Ruggia, A.; Dogliotti, S. Crafting actionable knowledge on ecological intensification: Lessons from co-innovation approaches in Uruguay and Europe. *Agric. Syst.* **2021**, *190*, 103103. [[CrossRef](#)]
73. Ribeiro, B.; Turner, J.A. Sustainability buckets: A flexible heuristic for facilitating strategic investment on place-dependent sustainability narratives. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 9367. [[CrossRef](#)]
74. Audet, R.; Lefèvre, S.; Brisebois, É.; El-Jed, M. Structuring tensions and key relations of Montreal seasonal food markets in the sustainability transition of the agri-food sector. *Sustainability* **2017**, *9*, 320. [[CrossRef](#)]
75. Stephens, R.; Barbier, M. Digital fooding, cashless marketplaces and reconnection in intermediated third places: Conceptualizing metropolitan food provision in the age of prosumption. *J. Rural Stud.* **2021**, *82*, 366–379. [[CrossRef](#)]
76. Desa, G.; Jia, X. Sustainability transitions in the context of pandemic: An introduction to the focused issue on social innovation and systemic impact. *Agric. Hum. Values* **2020**, *37*, 1207–1215. [[CrossRef](#)]
77. Donati, L.; Stefani, G.; Bellandi, M. The evolutionary emergence of quintuple helix coalitions: A case study of place-based sustainability transition. *Triple Helix* **2023**, *10*, 125–155. [[CrossRef](#)]

78. Ferguson, P. Productivity growth as a barrier to a sustainability transition. *Environ. Innov. Soc. Transit.* **2016**, *20*, 86–88. [[CrossRef](#)]
79. Gonera, A.; Nykamp, H.A.; Carraresi, L. Incumbents' capabilities for sustainability-oriented innovation in the Norwegian food sector—An integrated framework. *Circ. Econ. Sustain.* **2023**, *3*, 1299–1326. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
80. Pellizzoni, L.; Centemeri, L. Tackling material dependency in sustainability transition: Rationales and insights from the agriculture sector. *J. Environ. Policy Plan.* **2022**, *24*, 355–366. [[CrossRef](#)]
81. Hák, T.; Janoušková, S.; Moldan, B. Sustainable Development Goals: A need for relevant indicators. *Ecol. Indic.* **2016**, *60*, 565–573. [[CrossRef](#)]

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.