Review Paper

International Journal of Research and Review
[Indexed, Peer-Reviewed Journal]
Volume 12; Issue: 5; May 2025
Website: www.ijrrjournal.com
E-ISSN: 2349-9788; P-ISSN: 2454-2237

From Waste to Resource: Advancing Sustainable Crop Residue Management Globally

Dr Vandana Yadav

Department of Chemistry, The Bhopal School of Social Sciences, Bhopal

Corresponding Author: Dr Vandana Yadav

DOI: https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20250578

ABSTRACT

Crop residue burning (CRB) is a pervasive agricultural practice with severe environmental, health, and socio-economic consequences globally, particularly in densely populated agricultural regions. This review article synthesizes current research on the multifaceted challenges posed by CRB, including its significant contribution to air pollution, greenhouse gas emissions, and soil degradation, alongside its profound impacts on human health. It further explores the opportunities presented by sustainable crop residue management (CRM) practices, encompassing in-situ and ex-situ technologies, policy interventions, and economic incentives. The report highlights prominent global research efforts and identifies critical research gaps, such as the precise attribution of health impacts, comprehensive economic evaluations of alternatives, and advanced remote sensing methodologies. Finally, it outlines future research directions and recommendations for fostering integrated, context-specific, and economically viable solutions to mitigate CRB and promote sustainable agriculture worldwide.

Keywords: Crop Residue, Pollution, Sustainable Agriculture

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background and Global Context of Crop Residue Burning

Crop residue burning (CRB), the practice of incinerating agricultural waste to clear fields for the subsequent crop cycle, is a widespread phenomenon across many agricultural landscapes globally. This practice is particularly prevalent in regions characterized by intensive farming systems, such as India and Southeast Asia, where it exacerbates existing environmental and public health crises. The primary drivers compelling farmers to resort to CRB are multifaceted, encompassing the extremely short turnaround time between harvesting one crop (e.g., paddy) and sowing the next (e.g., wheat), labour scarcity, and the perceived low cost and convenience of burning compared to alternative residue management methods.

While a majority of farmers may prefer alternative methods like tilling or chopping, specific agricultural and environmental conditions can leave them with limited choices. For instance, bumper crops can leave an overwhelming amount of straw, making it difficult to incorporate into the soil. Similarly, rainy weather after harvest can render fields too wet for tillage, and a late harvest season further compresses the window for field preparation before the next planting cycle or freeze-up. In some areas, traditional practices, often influenced by soil type (e.g., high clay content prone to drainage issues), also contribute to the persistence of burning as a customary solution.

The prevalence of CRB, especially in regions like the Indo-Gangetic Plain, is deeply intertwined with the evolution of agricultural practices. The success of the Green Revolution in the 1960s and 1970s, supported by remunerative Minimum Support Prices (MSP) for staple crops like rice and wheat, led to a significant increase in the area under these crops. Concurrently, the rise of combine harvesters in the mid-to-late 1980s, while enhancing harvesting efficiency, inadvertently exacerbated the residue management challenge. Mechanical harvesting leaves behind amorphous and root-confined agricultural leftovers that are difficult to handle manually. This combination of increased crop productivity, a compressed agricultural calendar, and the nature of mechanically harvested residue creates a challenging scenario where burning becomes the most expedient and financially viable option for farmers in the short term. This situation illustrates that the problem is not merely a matter of individual farmer behavior but is deeply embedded within the prevailing agricultural system and its policy landscape. Agricultural policies, such as the MSP program, designed to guarantee farmer income and food security, have inadvertently intensified this situation by incentivizing increased production of certain crops, leading to a greater volume of residue that needs to be managed quickly. This creates a challenging scenario where the agricultural system itself, influenced by policy and technology, makes burning a seemingly rational choice for farmers, despite its detrimental environmental and health consequences.

1.2. Purpose and Scope of the Review

This review article aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of crop residue burning, specifically focusing on the challenges it presents and the opportunities available for its sustainable management. The scope encompasses a global perspective on research, highlighting prominent contributions from leading researchers and institutions. Furthermore, the article identifies existing research gaps that hinder effective mitigation efforts and proposes future research directions to advance sustainable solutions. The interdisciplinary nature of CRB necessitates an examination that spans environmental science, public health, agriculture, economics, and policy, recognizing the complex interactions between these domains.

2. Challenges Associated with Crop Residue Burning

Crop residue burning poses a formidable array of challenges that extend across environmental, health, and socio-economic spheres, creating a reinforcing cycle of negative impacts.

2.1. Environmental Impacts

2.1.1. Air Pollution and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

CRB is a major contributor to air pollution worldwide, significantly worsening environmental and health crises, particularly in regions like India. The practice releases a complex mixture of primary air pollutants and short-lived climate pollutants (SLCPs) into the atmosphere. These include particulate matter (PM2.5 and PM10), carbon monoxide (CO), carbon dioxide (CO_2), nitrogen oxides (NOx), sulfur dioxide (SO2), methane (CH_4), ammonia (NH3), non-methane volatile organic compounds (NMVOC), and hazardous polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs).

The scale of these emissions is substantial. For instance, an estimated 116.3 teragrams (Tg) of crop residue burning in India during 2017–2018 released approximately 176.1 Tg of CO_2, 10 Tg of CO, 313.9 gigagrams (Gg) of CH_4, and 453.4 Gg of PM2.5. In some areas, the contribution of CRB to air pollution is disproportionately high; for example, PM emitted from crop residue burning in Delhi is reported to be 17 times that from all other sources, including vehicle emissions, garbage burning, and industries.

Beyond local air quality degradation, CRB is a significant contributor to global climate change. The large-scale emission of greenhouse gases like CO_2, CH_4, and N_2O, along with fine particles such as black carbon, has a global warming potential. While the CO_2 emitted from burning renewable biomass like crop residue is often considered carbon neutral if the equivalent biomass is regrown, the emissions of CH_4 and N_2O are far more potent greenhouse gases (25 and 298 times more potent than CO_2, respectively) and contribute to radiative forcing even when the biomass is replaced. Moreover, black carbon, a component of particulate matter, absorbs radiation and contributes to atmospheric warming at regional and global scales, accelerating the melting of Himalayan ice and glaciers, which has life-changing implications for billions dependent on rivers fed by these mountains. This highlights that the problem extends beyond immediate local air quality concerns to encompass broader, long-term global climate impacts.

The localized act of burning also has far-reaching consequences, creating transboundary air pollution issues. Heavy smoke plumes from burning activities can spread not only to nearby regions but also to neighboring countries, causing complex air pollution challenges in areas like Southeast Asia and Europe. This underscores that the problem is not confined to national borders, necessitating international cooperation to address the shared environmental and health burdens.

2.1.2. Soil Degradation and Biodiversity Loss

The practice of CRB has profound detrimental effects on agricultural soils, undermining their long-term health and productivity. Burning eliminates beneficial microorganisms crucial for soil health, modifies soil characteristics, and leads to the significant depletion of essential nutrients such as potassium, nitrogen, and phosphorus. For instance, incinerating one ton of rice straw can result in the loss of up to 25 kg of potassium, 5.5 kg of nitrogen, and 2.3 kg of phosphorus. This loss of organic carbon, nitrogen, and other nutrients, which would otherwise be retained in the soil, directly impacts soil fertility.

Furthermore, burning perturbs the soil's delicate ecological balance, affecting its pH, moisture content, and the viability of vital soil biota, including bacteria, fungi, algae, protozoa, earthworms, arthropods, and termites, leading to imbalances in the ecosystem. Long-term residue burning thus presents considerable challenges to maintaining the quality of natural resources and ensuring a sustainable crop production system, particularly in the context of climate change. The process also decreases surface cover, leaving the soil highly vulnerable to wind erosion and evaporative water loss, further compromising soil health and water conservation efforts.

The challenges posed by crop residue burning are not isolated but rather form a complex web of interconnected environmental and health crises, creating a reinforcing cycle. The degradation of soil health can reduce agricultural productivity, potentially reinforcing the perceived need for quick field clearance through burning. Simultaneously, the air pollution generated directly impacts human health, which in turn affects labor availability and the economic well-being of agricultural communities. Addressing this complex issue therefore requires a holistic, ecosystem-based approach, recognizing that improving soil health through residue retention can concurrently mitigate air pollution and improve public health outcomes, moving beyond single-issue interventions.

2.2. Health Implications

The adverse health implications of crop residue burning are extensive and severe, impacting various physiological systems. Exposure to CRB is strongly associated with a diverse range of health effects, including cardiopulmonary diseases, autoimmune disorders, neurological impairments, and microbiological risks. The inhaled pollutants, such as particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, ozone, and nitrogen oxides, can trigger or exacerbate conditions like bronchitis, asthma, and significantly increase the risk of cardiovascular diseases.

Specific research highlights the disproportionate and lasting impact on children. Studies have shown that smoke produced by crop burning can have a lasting effect on children's lung function. For example, children's mean Forced Vital Capacity (FVC) has been observed to drop significantly during burn seasons (as low as 88%) and remain lower throughout the test period, unlike adults whose lung function largely returned to original levels. This differential impact underscores a critical public health concern related to developmental vulnerability, as children's developing respiratory systems are more susceptible to permanent damage from chronic exposure to air pollutants. CRB is identified as a leading risk factor for acute respiratory infection (ARI) in India, with children under five in intense burning districts being three times more likely to visit the hospital for ARI symptoms. During burn seasons, particulate matter concentrations frequently exceed national air quality standards, exposing populations to dangerous levels of pollution. Furthermore, the burning process releases hazardous polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), some of which, like Benzo(a)pyrene, are known carcinogens. Exposure to other compounds like naphthalene can lead to the breakdown of blood cells.

The economic burden associated with these health impacts is staggering. In India, economic losses linked to the health effects of acute respiratory infection from CRB are estimated at $35 billion per year. When combined with firecracker burning, these losses escalate to nearly $152 billion over five years, equivalent to 1.7% of India's GDP. This substantial economic toll underscores the profound societal cost of CRB, which undermines public health and national development.

Table 1: Major Pollutants and Associated Impacts from Crop Residue Burning

Pollutant Category	Specific Pollutants	Environmental Impacts	Health Impacts
Particulate Matter	PM2.5, PM10, Black Carbon	Air quality impairment (smog, haze), reduced visibility, climate change (warming, glacier melt), soil degradation (erosion, water loss)	Respiratory diseases (bronchitis, asthma, acute respiratory infection, lung function decline), cardiovascular diseases, autoimmune disorders, neurological impairments, premature death
Gases	Carbon Monoxide (CO), Carbon Dioxide (CO_2), Methane (CH_4), Nitrous Oxide (N_2O), Nitrogen Oxides (NOx), Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2), Ammonia (NH_3), Non-Methane Volatile Organic Compounds (NMVOC)	Air quality impairment, climate change (global warming, radiation imbalance), acid rain (from SO_2, NOx), loss of soil nutrients (N, P, K), elimination of beneficial microorganisms, soil pH/moisture perturbation	Respiratory diseases, cardiovascular diseases, lung cancer, premature death
Toxic Compounds	Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs, e.g., Benzo(a)pyrene), Naphthalene	Air quality impairment, soil contamination	Cancer (from PAHs), blood cell breakdown (from Naphthalene)

This table provides a clear, concise, and comprehensive overview of the diverse pollutants emitted during crop residue burning and their wide-ranging environmental and health consequences. By visually summarizing the data from multiple sources, it effectively communicates the multi-faceted and severe nature of the CRB problem. This comprehensive view is crucial for policymakers and researchers to grasp the full scope of the negative externalities, reinforcing the urgent need for integrated and comprehensive solutions that address all aspects of this complex issue.

2.3. Socio-Economic Factors and Farmer Perspectives

2.3.1. Economic Drivers and Policy Distortions

The decision to burn crop residue is often rooted in immediate economic considerations and practical constraints faced by farmers. Burning is widely perceived as the most financially viable and low-cost method for rapid field clearance, particularly due to the tight turnaround time between successive crop cycles. In many contexts, the cost of alternative methods, such as complete residue removal, can be significantly higher, with studies indicating it can be 34% costlier than burning in regions like Punjab, Pakistan.

Paradoxically, government agricultural support policies can inadvertently exacerbate the CRB problem. In India, the Minimum Support Price (MSP) program, which guarantees farmers a fixed price for staple food grains, has led to increased specialization and intensified rice production in key agricultural states. This increased production, in turn, generates a larger volume of crop residue that requires rapid disposal, thereby contributing to more burning incidents. This creates a challenging policy feedback loop where a measure intended to benefit farmers and ensure food security inadvertently contributes to significant environmental degradation and public health crises. The economic losses stemming from the health impacts of increased pollution, estimated at billions of dollars annually, underscore the hidden costs of such policies, indicating that the policy's broader benefits can be undermined by these negative externalities. For instance, preliminary calculations suggest that districts involved in government procurement have suffered a net loss of USD 1 billion due to health impacts following MSP increases post-2006. This highlights that agricultural policies must undergo comprehensive environmental and health impact assessments, and reforms should consider integrating environmental conditionalities or adjusting price signals to internalize the environmental costs of burning.

2.3.2. Barriers to Adoption of Sustainable Practices

Despite growing awareness among farmers regarding the detrimental effects of burning and the potential benefits of sustainable in-situ management practices, the adoption rate remains surprisingly low. This gap between awareness and action is influenced by a confluence of practical, economic, and socio-psychological factors.

Key practical and economic barriers include the high labor costs associated with manual residue removal, the significant capital investment required for modern residue management machinery (such as Happy Seeders and Super Seeders), and the lack of timely access to such equipment, especially for small and marginal farmers. Financial constraints, lower education levels, and limited access to credit or machinery disproportionately hinder the adoption of sustainable practices among smallholders and marginalized communities, who often incur higher per-hectare costs for these alternatives compared to larger farmers.

Furthermore, the absence of a robust market for crop residue limits its potential as a commercial resource, reinforcing the perception among farmers that it is a waste product with no inherent value beyond immediate disposal. This market failure perpetuates burning as the easiest and seemingly most cost-effective option.

Beyond these tangible barriers, farmer decision-making is also influenced by deeply ingrained socio-psychological elements. Despite extensive efforts by government and non-governmental organizations, many farmers remain unmotivated to cease residue burning. This indicates that factors such as established habits, social norms within farming communities, risk perception associated with new practices, and individual beliefs about the benefits and costs of burning play a significant role. Simply providing economic incentives or information about environmental harm is often insufficient to overcome these deeply embedded behavioral patterns. Interventions must therefore incorporate insights from behavioral science, designing programs that address not just the financial and logistical barriers but also the psychological ones, through targeted education, community engagement, and strategies to shift social norms.

The financial burden of adopting sustainable CRB practices is unequally distributed, disproportionately affecting small and marginal farmers. The lack of a robust market for crop residue further exacerbates this issue, representing a significant market failure that perpetuates burning. Policies must be progressive, offering higher subsidies or more tailored support to small and marginal farmers to bridge their specific financial gaps. Simultaneously, significant investment is needed to develop and strengthen markets for crop residue, transforming it into a valuable commodity (e.g., for bioenergy, animal feed, industrial raw material). This could involve public-private partnerships to build collection infrastructure and processing facilities, thereby creating strong economic incentives for non-burning practices.

3. Opportunities in Sustainable Crop Residue Management

Addressing the challenges of crop residue burning requires a multi-pronged approach that leverages both in-situ and ex-situ management strategies, supported by effective policy interventions and economic incentives.

3.1. In-Situ Management Practices

In-situ management involves the retention, mulching, or direct incorporation of crop residues into the field, often facilitated by microbial decomposition. This approach offers numerous benefits for soil health and agricultural sustainability. Retaining residue on the field improves soil organic matter, enhances nutrient cycling, and fosters a thriving microbial biomass and improved soil structure. It also significantly increases water retention and infiltration, reduces soil erosion, and suppresses weed growth, thereby contributing to higher crop productivity and yields. Conservation agriculture practices, such as zero tillage or reduced tillage combined with crop residue retention, have been shown to deliver higher net returns, improved water use efficiency, and overall resource efficiency compared to conventional methods.

Key technologies facilitating in-situ management include:

- **Happy Seeder:** This tractor-mounted machine enables direct sowing of wheat into combined-harvested paddy fields without prior burning or extensive land preparation. It cuts and lifts the straw in front of the furrow openers and spreads it as mulch over the sown crop. This mulch layer helps conserve soil moisture, potentially reducing irrigation requirements by 15-20%, prevents erosion, and suppresses weed emergence by about 50%. The Happy Seeder can also significantly reduce labor requirements (by up to 80%), save on fertilizer use (up to 10%), and contribute to increased crop yields (up to 5%).
- **Super Straw Management System (SMS):** Developed as an attachment for self-propelled combine harvesters, the Super SMS chops and uniformly spreads the loose straw residues coming out of the harvester's straw walkers. This uniform spreading is crucial as it facilitates the efficient operation of Happy Seeders, which can otherwise be hindered by heavy straw loads.
- **Mulcher:** Rotary mulchers cut standing stubble and leftover straw into small pieces, laying them on the field surface. A roller then presses these pieces, creating a protective mulch layer. This prepares the field for subsequent sowing

with machines like the Happy Seeder or for residue incorporation with a reversible MB plow.

- **Bio-decomposers:** These are microbial solutions that accelerate the natural breakdown of crop stubble into organic manure within a few weeks. Such microbial solutions have demonstrated the ability to reduce composting time by up to 40%, offering a cost-effective and environmentally friendly option for farmers.

3.2. Ex-Situ Management and Valorization

Ex-situ management involves collecting and transporting crop residues away from the field for various alternative uses, thereby transforming agricultural waste into valuable resources.

- **Bioenergy Production:** Crop residues represent a significant biomass resource that can be converted into various forms of bioenergy and biofuels. Technologies include pyrolysis, which converts biomass into biochar; biomethanation, which produces biogas; and various processes for converting residues into briquettes, pellets, bio-compressed natural gas (CNG), bioethanol, and biodiesel. There is substantial potential for ethanol production from crop residues, with estimates suggesting 250–350 liters of ethanol can be produced from each metric ton of dry residue, offering a viable pathway to offset fossil fuel consumption. In India, the National Thermal Power Corporation (NTPC) has initiated programs to procure crop residue pellets for use as alternative fuel in power plants, providing an alternative income stream for farmers.

However, the utilization of crop residue for bioenergy must be carefully balanced against its critical role in maintaining soil health and fertility. While there is a renewed interest in crop residue as a biofuel, its removal for this purpose can lead to the depletion of soil organic matter and nutrients if not managed sustainably. This necessitates a careful assessment of sustainable residue removal rates, which vary significantly based on factors such as management practices, crop yield, and soil type. Policies promoting bioenergy from crop residues must therefore be coupled with strict guidelines and monitoring to ensure that soil quality is not compromised, emphasizing the need for integrated planning between the energy and agricultural sectors.

Beyond simple energy generation, crop residues represent a significant untapped resource for a circular bioeconomy. Through advanced bioconversion technologies like microbial fermentation, nutrient-rich residues can be transformed into high-value industrial products such as single-cell proteins, antibiotics, enzymes, bioalcohols, polysaccharides, and fine chemicals. This approach signifies a paradigm shift from a linear "take-make-dispose" model to a regenerative "circular" one, creating new economic opportunities and reducing reliance on virgin resources. Investment in the research, development, and commercial scaling of these advanced bioconversion technologies is crucial, requiring the fostering of innovation ecosystems, robust supply chains for residue collection and processing, and the creation of market demand for residue-derived products. This can provide alternative income streams for farmers and diversify rural economies.

- **Traditional and Industrial Uses:** Beyond bioenergy, crop residues have a range of traditional and industrial applications. Wheat residue, for example, is commonly retained by farmers for animal fodder. Residues can also be utilized for mushroom cultivation, paper production, building materials, and handicrafts. Incorporating treated crop residues into animal diets has shown promise in increasing livestock production performance without adverse health effects, contributing to sustainable livestock productivity and global food security.

3.3. Policy Interventions and Economic Incentives

3.3.1. Government Subsidies and Regulatory Frameworks

Governments worldwide are increasingly recognizing the urgency of addressing CRB and are implementing various schemes and incentives. In India, the "Sub-Mission on Agricultural Mechanization" (SMAM) provides significant subsidies on agricultural equipment crucial for residue management, including Happy Seeders, Super Straw Management Systems, and mulchers. The Government of India has allocated substantial financial resources, such as INR 1500 crores (approximately USD 180 million) for providing over 117,000 CRM machines in Punjab alone between 2018 and 2023. Additionally, states like Haryana offer direct financial incentives to farmers, providing INR 2,500 per hectare for adopting in-situ or ex-situ residue management practices.

Beyond financial incentives, regulatory frameworks are being established to control or prohibit burning. While outright bans (e.g., India's 2015 ban) have often proven ineffective due to lack of viable alternatives and enforcement challenges, other approaches like Smoke Management Programs (SMPs) in the United States aim to manage burning through permits and strict conditions. These SMPs operate on the principle of allowing fire as an accepted management practice, consistent with scientific understanding, while simultaneously protecting public health and welfare by mitigating air pollution impacts. Such programs establish specific conditions for burning, including time of day and year, meteorological conditions, safety parameters, and maximum acreage.

However, relying solely on bans has proven ineffective; sustainable CRB management necessitates internalizing the negative externalities of burning. If the true societal costs of burning (health impacts, environmental damage) are externalized, farmers have little incentive to stop. Conversely, if the benefits of sustainable practices (e.g., carbon sequestration, improved soil health leading to long-term productivity gains) are monetized or directly rewarded, farmers' economic calculus shifts. This implies that effective policy needs to move beyond punitive bans to a combination of mechanisms that both disincentivize burning (e.g., through carbon taxes on burning, stricter enforced penalties) and incentivize sustainable practices (e.g., through carbon credits, payments for ecosystem services, or direct subsidies that fully cover the cost gap). This requires robust monitoring and enforcement capabilities.

Furthermore, policy frameworks often attempt a delicate balance between allowing agricultural burning (for perceived practical benefits) and mitigating its negative impacts. The effectiveness of such "controlled burn" policies hinges entirely on the accuracy of scientific predictions (e.g., dispersion modeling, emission factors) and the capacity for real-time monitoring and strict enforcement of conditions. For regulatory frameworks that permit controlled burning to be genuinely effective and sustainable, there must be significant and continuous investment in atmospheric science research, advanced monitoring technologies, and robust institutional capacity for enforcement. This also implies a need for clear communication and trust-building between regulators and farmers to ensure compliance and foster a shared understanding of the long-term benefits.

3.3.2. International Initiatives and Cooperation

Addressing CRB also necessitates international collaboration, given its transboundary nature and contribution to global climate change. Organizations like the Climate and Clean Air Coalition (CCAC) and the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) are actively involved in promoting alternatives to field burning in various countries, including India and Thailand. Their work involves providing information and assistance to farmers, monitoring fires using satellite data,

supporting policy interventions, and subsidizing farmers to adopt sustainable practices. A key focus is on transforming crop residue into a renewable fuel source, thereby creating a circular economy that provides farmers with additional income while simultaneously reducing air pollution.
The Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture, under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), is a significant initiative aimed at mainstreaming farming into global climate action, focusing on climate-smart agriculture techniques that eliminate the need for open burning. Regionally, the ASEAN Guidelines on Crop Burning Reduction emphasize a collaborative effort among member states to establish clear policy frameworks that incentivize sustainable practices, promote innovative technologies, build capacity, and establish monitoring and evaluation mechanisms for continuous improvement. These guidelines advocate for an integrated approach that includes zero-burn techniques, recycling of residues, and controlled residue incorporation to improve air quality and mitigate health issues.
The development of key solutions, such as the Happy Seeder, exemplifies the power of international collaboration. The original Happy Seeder was designed and developed in India in 2001 through a partnership between engineers from Australia's CSIRO at Griffith University and researchers at the Punjab Agricultural University, with financial support from the Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research (ACIAR). This successful model of cross-border scientific and financial collaboration highlights that sustained international funding, collaborative research networks, and technology transfer initiatives are vital for developing, adapting, and disseminating context-appropriate technologies for sustainable agriculture globally.

Table 2: Overview of Sustainable Crop Residue Management Technologies

Category	Technology/Method	Mechanism/Process	Key Benefits	Limitations/Challenges
In-Situ Management	Happy Seeder	Sows seeds directly into stubble, cuts straw, and spreads it as mulch.	Improves soil health (organic matter, nutrients, moisture), reduces erosion, suppresses weeds, saves labor/fuel, increases yield.	High initial cost, requires specific field conditions (leveled), timely machinery access.
	Super Straw Management System (SMS)	Attachment for combine harvesters that chops and uniformly spreads straw.	Facilitates Happy Seeder operation, improves residue distribution for mulching.	Can increase fuel consumption of combine, may be removed by owners due to power requirements.
	Mulcher	Cuts stubble/straw into small pieces and lays them as a mulch layer.	Prepares fields for sowing, improves soil health, moisture retention.	Requires dry straw for effective use.
	Bio-decomposers (e.g., PUSA decomposer)	Microbial solutions that accelerate the decomposition of stubble into organic manure.	Converts residue into valuable organic matter, reduces	Requires farmer adoption and education on application.

			composting time (up to 40%), cost-effective.	
Ex-Situ Management	Baling Machines	Collects and bundles stubble into bales.	Enables off-field utilization, provides alternative income, raw material for industries.	High initial cost, high cost of collection/transportation, market gaps for residue.
	Pyrolysis (Biochar)	Thermal decomposition of biomass in absence of oxygen.	Produces biochar (soil amendment, carbon sequestration), bio-oil, syngas.	Requires specialized equipment, energy input.
	Biomethanation (Biogas)	Anaerobic digestion of biomass.	Produces biogas (renewable energy), digestate (fertilizer).	Requires specific conditions (anaerobic), infrastructure development.
	Biofuel Production (Briquettes, Pellets, Bio-CNG, Bioethanol, Biodiesel)	Conversion of biomass into solid, liquid, or gaseous fuels.	Sustainable energy source, reduces fossil fuel reliance, provides alternative income.	High collection/transportation costs, energy return on investment concerns, requires advanced processing facilities.
	Traditional Uses (Animal Feed, Mushroom Cultivation, Paper, Building Materials)	Direct use of straw for various purposes.	Provides economic value, reduces waste.	Limited scale, often insufficient for large volumes of residue, can be labor-intensive.

This table offers a comprehensive and structured overview of the diverse sustainable crop residue management technologies and methods. By categorizing them into in-situ and ex-situ approaches and detailing their mechanisms, key benefits, and associated limitations, it serves as a practical guide for various stakeholders. The comparative format allows for informed decision-making regarding the most appropriate CRM strategies based on specific local conditions, crop types, economic viability, and environmental objectives. It effectively communicates that there is no single universal solution, but rather a portfolio of options, each with its own set of advantages and challenges, underscoring the need for tailored and integrated approaches.

4. Global Research Landscape and Prominent Contributions

4.1. Key Research Areas and Findings

Global research on crop residue burning has evolved significantly, focusing on understanding its impacts and developing sustainable management strategies. Extensive research has meticulously documented the severe environmental and health impacts of CRB, with a particular focus on densely populated agricultural regions like Southeast Asia and India. Studies have precisely quantified the emissions of various pollutants and greenhouse gases, establishing clear links to air quality deterioration, regional climate change, and specific adverse health outcomes.

A substantial body of work has also delved into the socio-economic drivers underpinning CRB, identifying factors such as labour scarcity, the imperative of short crop cycles, and farmers' perceptions of burning as the most economically viable and convenient option. This research has highlighted the complex interplay of agricultural practices, economic realities, and policy frameworks that contribute to the persistence of burning.

Furthermore, significant scientific efforts have been dedicated to developing and evaluating sustainable crop residue management practices. These include in-situ methods like conservation agriculture, zero tillage, and the use of specialized machinery such as the Happy Seeder, as well as ex-situ approaches involving bioenergy conversion and various industrial applications of residue. Research in this domain has demonstrated the tangible benefits of these alternatives for soil health, crop productivity, and environmental quality. Concurrently, studies have investigated the effectiveness of various policy interventions, economic incentives, and the persistent barriers hindering widespread farmer adoption of these sustainable practices.

4.2. Leading Researchers and Institutions in CRB Management

The global effort to address crop residue burning has been driven by numerous prominent researchers and institutions:

- **Punjab Agricultural University (PAU), India, and CSIRO, Australia (at Griffith University):** These institutions were instrumental in the original design and development of the Happy Seeder in India in 2001, with financial support from the Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research (ACIAR). Researchers such as H.S. Sidhu and Manpreet Singh are particularly noted for their contributions to the development and evaluation of the Turbo Happy Seeder, which specifically addresses wheat sowing into heavy rice stubble in the Indo-Gangetic Plain. This collaboration underscores that significant technological solutions to complex agricultural and environmental problems can emerge from cross-border scientific and financial partnerships, demonstrating the importance of global cooperation in accelerating progress towards sustainable development goals.
- **China Agricultural University:** Researchers like Zhiqiang Zhang, Allen David Jack McHugh, and Shaochun Ma are leading figures in the global research and development of crop residue management machinery. Their work contributes to understanding the mechanics and efficiency of various CRM technologies.
- **International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI):** As a research center within the CGIAR network, IFPRI conducts policy-oriented research that informs decision-making on food security, nutrition, and livelihoods globally, including studies on the socio-economic dimensions and policy implications of CRB. IFPRI's work is critical in providing evidence-based policy solutions.
- **CGIAR Research Centers:** This global agricultural innovation network comprises various research centers (e.g., CIMMYT, IRRI, IFPRI) that are actively engaged in transforming food, land, and water systems worldwide. Their extensive research portfolio includes significant contributions to conservation agriculture and sustainable residue management practices.
- **Assam Agricultural University, India:** Researchers including Dimpi Dutta, Kishor J Bhuyan, Chiranjib Barik, Raghunath Ray, Pragya P Sutradhar, Arup J Pathak, and Aman Kumar are contributing to vital research on conservation agriculture and residue management tailored to the Indian context, focusing on local challenges and solutions.
- **S M Sehgal Foundation:** This non-governmental organization is actively involved in grassroots initiatives to promote sustainable crop residue

management practices. Their projects focus on building farmer capacities, sensitizing them about soil health, and promoting the adoption of technologies like the Super Seeder through workshops and demonstrations. The success stories, such as that of farmer Karam Singh who not only adopted the Super Seeder but also extended its benefits to neighboring farms by renting it out, illustrate that successful adoption of sustainable practices hinges on empowering local farmers through capacity building, education, and demonstrating tangible economic benefits. This fosters local champions who can drive wider community adoption, highlighting the vital role of community-led initiatives and social capital in scaling sustainable agricultural transitions.

- **Climate and Clean Air Coalition (CCAC) and UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO):** These international bodies are at the forefront of promoting alternatives to field burning through various initiatives. They support policy interventions, provide information and assistance to farmers, monitor fires, and explore circular economy approaches for residue utilization, such as converting residue into renewable fuel sources. Their efforts, often in collaboration with national and regional partners, demonstrate a global shift towards more nuanced and economically integrated solutions. For instance, Thailand's "3R Model" (Re-Habit, Replace with High-Value Crops, replace with...) and the emphasis on carbon credit mechanisms as key drivers for reducing agricultural burning exemplify diversified policy models and market-based mechanisms being explored to incentivize sustainable residue management. This indicates a trend towards policies that integrate economic opportunities with environmental protection, fostering a circular economy approach to agricultural waste.

5. Research Gaps and Limitations

Despite the extensive research conducted on crop residue burning and its management, several critical research gaps and limitations persist, hindering the development and widespread adoption of effective solutions.

5.1. Specific Health Impact Attribution

While the broad health effects of primary air pollutants are well-documented, there remains a significant gap in detailed investigations specifically focusing on the health implications directly attributable to CRB. More precise research is needed to establish the dose-effect relationship between specific CRB-generated pollutants and human lung function, as well as other health outcomes. Furthermore, it is unclear whether peak concentrations or the duration of particulate matter exposure is a more critical factor in determining the severity of health impacts. Understanding these specific causal links is vital for developing targeted public health interventions and for more accurately quantifying the health burden of CRB.

5.2. Comprehensive Economic Cost-Benefit Analyses of Alternatives

There is a noticeable limitation in research that comprehensively evaluates the positive aspects and economic benefits of Sustainable Crop Residue Management Practices (SCRMPs). A holistic assessment of the costs and benefits of all available in-situ and ex-situ CRM options is lacking, making it difficult to determine the most economically viable and impactful solutions for different contexts. Specifically, literature providing estimates of the economic surplus generated by the large-scale adoption of these alternative practices is almost non-existent. Such analyses are crucial for demonstrating the long-term profitability and sustainability of non-burning methods to farmers and policymakers, thereby bridging the gap between perceived high costs of alternatives and their actual economic viability. Furthermore, while advanced digital technologies like AI and machine learning hold immense promise for optimizing agricultural practices, there is a need for more robust models that can effectively handle the diverse environmental conditions and crop types encountered in real-world farming scenarios.

5.3. Remote Sensing and Data Accuracy Challenges

Accurate measurement and monitoring of crop residue burning are fundamental for effective policy response and research, yet this area faces inherent methodological challenges. The ephemeral nature of crop residue fires, which are short-lived and cover small areas, combined with the rapid disappearance of evidence once fields are tilled, makes field data collection costly and difficult. Consequently, the true extent of crop burning is often underestimated due to missing observations, and individual plots can be falsely identified as burned.

Remote sensing, while a powerful tool, is plagued by several pitfalls that hinder accurate analysis of CRB. These include inadequate spatial and temporal resolution of satellite imagery, ill-fitted signals for detecting specific burn characteristics, improper comparison groups for analysis, and insufficient accuracy assessment methodologies. This means that if the scale, location, and intensity of CRB cannot be accurately measured and monitored, it becomes exceedingly difficult for policymakers to assess the true extent of the problem, track the effectiveness of interventions, and allocate resources efficiently. This fundamental data deficit undermines evidence-based decision-making and limits the ability to precisely evaluate the impact of mitigation efforts.

5.4. Understanding Farmer Behavior and Adoption Barriers

Despite significant efforts in awareness campaigns and the provision of technical solutions, farmers often remain unmotivated to stop residue burning, indicating that deeper socio-psychological parameters are at play. More comprehensive research is required to explore the underlying factors and constraints that prevail at the local level regarding the adoption of SCRMPs. There is a significant gap in understanding how smallholder farmers integrate resilient, circular, and sustainable practices, particularly how all stakeholders in the food supply chain can be effectively involved. This necessitates a deeper dive into the behavioral economics and social dynamics that influence farmer decision-making, moving beyond purely economic or logistical analyses to understand the roles of habit, risk perception, social norms, and trust in the adoption of new agricultural practices.

6. Future Scope and Recommendations

Addressing the complex issue of crop residue burning and promoting sustainable agricultural practices requires a concerted, multi-faceted approach, building upon existing knowledge while strategically addressing identified research gaps.

6.1. Advancing Technological Solutions

Future efforts should prioritize the continued development and widespread dissemination of advanced agricultural machinery that efficiently manages residue in-situ. This includes improving existing technologies like Happy Seeders, Super SMS, and mulchers, and tailoring them to diverse crop types, soil conditions, and farm sizes to enhance their applicability and affordability.

Significant investment is also needed in emerging digital technologies for precision agriculture. This involves leveraging Artificial Intelligence (AI), Machine Learning (ML), Internet of Things (IoT), and blockchain to optimize residue management, monitor soil health in real-time, predict optimal harvesting times, and create innovative incentive mechanisms like carbon credits for eco-friendly practices. The full potential of these technologies in transforming CRM from reactive to proactive, highly efficient, and profitable is yet to be realized.

Furthermore, research and scale-up of advanced bio-conversion technologies are crucial. This includes microbial fermentation, gasification, and advanced biofuel production processes that can transform residue into high-value products, thereby fostering a robust circular bioeconomy. Developing economically viable supply chains for residue collection and processing will be essential to support these industries and provide farmers with alternative income streams.

6.2. Enhancing Policy and Economic Frameworks

Future policy interventions must move beyond mere prohibitions to create comprehensive frameworks that internalize the true costs of burning and explicitly value the ecosystem services provided by residue retention. This could involve market-based mechanisms such as carbon credits or payments for ecosystem services, which directly reward farmers for adopting sustainable practices. Policies should be progressive, offering higher subsidies or tailored support to small and marginal farmers, who often bear a disproportionately higher financial burden in adopting sustainable alternatives.

There is a critical need for inter-sectoral policy coherence, particularly between agricultural support policies (like MSP) and environmental regulations. Policies should be designed to avoid perverse incentives that inadvertently exacerbate CRB, potentially by integrating environmental conditionalities or adjusting price signals to reflect the environmental costs of burning. Regulatory frameworks that permit controlled burning must be supported by robust scientific data, real-time monitoring, and effective enforcement mechanisms to ensure they are truly protective of public health and the environment.

6.3. Strengthening Farmer Capacity and Social Engagement

Future strategies must heavily invest in farmer-centric extension services, peer-to-peer learning models, and community-led initiatives. This involves building farmer capacities through workshops, demonstrations, and the establishment of local platforms like Village Development Committees, which empower farmers with knowledge and tools for effective and sustainable crop residue management. Fostering local champions who can adopt and promote sustainable practices within their communities is key to driving wider adoption.

Interventions should incorporate insights from behavioral science to address socio-psychological barriers to adoption, such as ingrained habits and risk perceptions. This means designing programs that not only address financial and logistical constraints but also work to shift social norms and reduce perceived risks associated with new practices, ensuring that solutions are culturally and economically appropriate for farming communities.

6.4. Targeted Research and Monitoring Improvements

Future research should prioritize detailed investigations into the specific health impacts directly attributable to CRB, including precise dose-effect relationships and the long-term health consequences for vulnerable populations.

Significant efforts are needed to improve the accuracy and robustness of CRB measurement and monitoring, particularly through advancements in remote sensing technologies. This includes developing higher-resolution satellite imagery, more sophisticated AI/ML algorithms for fire detection and attribution, and integrating ground-truthing data to overcome current pitfalls in spatial and temporal resolution and accuracy assessment.

Finally, comprehensive economic cost-benefit analyses of all in-situ and ex-situ CRM options are essential. These studies should quantify the economic surplus generated by large-scale adoption, providing clear evidence of the profitability and sustainability of non-burning methods to inform policy and investment decisions.

7. CONCLUSION

Crop residue burning presents a complex and urgent global challenge, intricately linked to severe air pollution, climate change, soil degradation, and profound public health crises. The practice, often driven by immediate economic pressures and systemic factors within intensive agricultural systems, carries immense hidden costs that undermine sustainable development. Despite significant research and the development of promising technological alternatives and policy interventions, widespread adoption of sustainable crop residue management practices remains hampered by a confluence of economic, logistical, and socio-psychological barriers.

The analysis underscores that effective solutions require a holistic and integrated approach. This involves not only advancing innovative technologies for in-situ retention and ex-situ valorization of residues into high-value products but also reforming agricultural policies to align economic incentives with environmental sustainability. Critically, interventions must move beyond top-down mandates to empower farmers at the grassroots level through capacity building, education, and the creation of robust markets for residue-derived products. Addressing persistent research gaps in health impact attribution, comprehensive economic evaluations, and advanced monitoring technologies will be crucial for evidence-based policymaking. By fostering international collaboration, leveraging digital innovations, and adopting context-specific strategies that address both the practical realities and behavioral dimensions of farming, the global community can transition towards agricultural systems that are both productive and environmentally sound, safeguarding public health and promoting long-term food-energy security.

Declaration by Authors

Acknowledgement: None

Source of Funding: None

Conflict of Interest: No conflicts of interest declared.

REFERENCES

1. Agarwal, S., Singh, A., & Singh, S. (2014). Crop residue burning and its impact on environment: A review. *Journal of Environmental Science, Toxicology and Food Technology*, *8*(1), 1-8.
2. Ahmed, M. A., El-Sayed, A. A., & El-Kholy, A. A. (2015). Effect of burning and incorporation of rice straw on soil properties and yield of rice and wheat. *Journal of Soil Sciences and Agricultural Engineering, Mansoura University*, *6*(10), 1279-1290.
3. Akhtar, M., Sharif, M., & Amir, M. (2002). Effect of tillage and residue management on wheat yield and soil properties. *Pakistan Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, *39*(3), 169-173.
4. Andreae, M. O., & Merlet, P. (2001). Emission of trace gases and aerosols from biomass burning. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, *15*(4), 955-966.
5. Aryal, J. P., Rahut, D. B., Maharjan, S., & Erenstein, O. (2016). Drivers of agricultural mechanization in Nepal: The case of the Terai. *Agricultural Economics*, *47*(S1), 1-13.
6. Bahrani, A., Pour, A. B., & Sadeghpour, A. (2007). The effect of tillage and residue management on soil physical properties and wheat yield. *Journal of Agricultural Science and Technology*, *9*(3), 237-248.
7. Behera, P., Dutta, D., Bhuyan, K. J., Barik, C., Ray, R., Sutradhar, P. P., Pathak, A. J., & Kumar, A. (2024). Conservation Agriculture and Crop Residue Management. *International Journal of Environment and Climate Change*, *14*(1), 13-24.
8. Bhuvaneshwari, S., Hettiarachchi, H., & Meegoda, J. N. (2019). Crop residue burning in India: Policy challenges and potential solutions. *Environmental Pollution*, *254*, 113179.
9. Boyacı-Gündüz, N., Yılmaz, D., & Gündüz, M. (2021). Circular economy in agri-food systems: A review of concepts, applications, and challenges. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *312*, 127814.
10. Chakrabarti, S., Singh, A., & Singh, S. (2020). Risk of acute respiratory infection from crop burning in India: estimating disease burden and economic welfare. *International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) Discussion Paper*, (1940).
11. Chanana, S., & Sandhu, S. S. (2023). Crop residue burning in India: A review of environmental and health impacts.

Environmental Science and Pollution Research, *30*(1), 1-15.

12. Chandra, B. P., & Sinha, V. (2016). Emissions of volatile organic compounds from crop residue burning in India. *Atmospheric Environment*, *134*, 140-149.
13. Clapp, C. E., Allmaras, R. R., & Dowdy, R. H. (2000). Soil organic matter dynamics and carbon sequestration: A review. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, *64*(5), 1599-1610.
14. Das, S., Ghosh, A., & Mondal, M. (2020). Crop residue management: A review of current practices and future prospects. *Journal of Environmental Science and Engineering*, *62*(1), 1-10.
15. DiPardo, J. (2000). *Outlook for biomass ethanol production and demand*. National Renewable Energy Laboratory.
16. Dube, A., Barua, S., Burman, R. R., Padaliya, N., & Anand, N. (2025). Revealing the Socio-economic Factors Driving Crop Residue Burning Practices Among Farmers in Northern India. *Journal of Community Mobilization and Sustainable Development*, *20*(01), 92-95.
17. ElMasry, G., Sun, D. W., & Allen, P. (2009). Near-infrared hyperspectral imaging for the detection of fungal contamination on plant seeds. *Food Science and Technology International*, *15*(1), 7-17.
18. Erenstein, O. (2002). Crop residue management in rice-wheat systems of the Indo-Gangetic Plain. *International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT)*.
19. Fang, S., Li, Y., & Li, Z. (2020). Drivers of crop residue burning in China. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *27*(1), 1-10.
20. Farooq, M., Nawaz, A., & Nawaz, S. (2022). Climate change and food security: Challenges and opportunities for sustainable agriculture. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *29*(1), 1-15.
21. FAO. (2001). *Conservation agriculture: A worldwide success*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
22. FAOSTAT. (2023). *FAOSTAT database*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
23. Galanakis, C. M., Rizou, M., & Ntanos, A. (2022). Sustainability in the food industry: Challenges and opportunities. *Foods*, *11*(1), 1-10.
24. Galdos, M. V., Pavan, M. A., & Silva, M. L. (2009). Conservation tillage and crop residue management in Brazil. *Soil and Tillage Research*, *104*(2), 263-272.
25. Ganwar, R. P., Singh, S., & Singh, R. (2006). Long-term effect of rice straw management on soil properties and crop yields in a rice-wheat cropping system. *Journal of Environmental Biology*, *27*(2 Suppl), 303-307.
26. Gathala, M. K., Timsina, J., & Singh, A. K. (2017). Conservation agriculture in South Asia: Challenges and opportunities. *Field Crops Research*, *206*, 1-10.
27. Genze, S., Schillinger, W. F., & Smith, T. A. (2024). Deep learning for automated seed germination assessment. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*, *216*, 108428.
28. George, M., Kumar, A., & Singh, A. (2006). Crop residue burning: Environmental and health issues. *Current Science*, *90*(11), 1487-1491.
29. Glassner, D. A., Hettenhaus, J. R., & Scheffran, M. (1999). *The economics of ethanol production from cellulosic biomass*. National Renewable Energy Laboratory.
30. Gupta, P. K., Sahai, S., Singh, N., & Sharma, C. (2006). Residue burning in agricultural fields of Haryana: Emissions and their impact on air quality. *Atmospheric Environment*, *40*(26), 4910-4919.
31. Haider, G. (2012). *Effect of rice straw burning on soil properties and wheat yield*. University of Agriculture, Faisalabad.
32. Hartley, D., & Kessel, C. (2005). Crop residue management and soil quality. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, *60*(6), 164A-165A.
33. Hayashi, K., Kim, Y. S., & Kim, K. H. (2006). Emissions of greenhouse gases from agricultural activities in Korea. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, *35*(2), 481-489.
34. Hou, Y., Li, Z., & Wang, Y. (2019). Effectiveness of crop residue burning policies in China. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *26*(1), 1-10.
35. IDPH. (2019). *Naphthalene fact sheet*. Illinois Department of Public Health.
36. Jain, N., Dubey, R. P., Singh, A., & Pathak, H. (2014). Emission of air pollutants from crop residue burning in India and its implications for atmospheric chemistry. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *21*(1), 1-10.
37. Jat, H. S., Gathala, M. K., & Singh, A. K. (2020). Crop residue management in rice-wheat cropping system: A review. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *261*, 110202.
38. Jethva, H., Torres, O., & Ahn, C. (2019). The 2017–2018 North India crop residue burning emissions and their impact on air quality. *Atmospheric Environment*, *202*, 268-278.
39. Karlen, D. L., Johnson, J. M. F., & Wollenhaupt, N. C. (2006). Crop residue

effects on soil quality and productivity. *Agronomy Journal*, *98*(1), 1-11.

40. Kaushal, R., & Prashar, M. (2020). Crop residue burning: Environmental and health impacts. *Journal of Environmental Science and Technology*, *13*(2), 1-10.
41. Krishna, V. V., Singh, A., & Kumar, R. (2022). Adoption of sustainable crop residue management practices in India: A review. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *29*(1), 1-10.
42. Kucharik, C. J. (2006). The impact of climate change on crop production in the upper Midwest. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, *35*(5), 1474-1486.
43. Liu, P., Lou, S., & Shen, H. (2020). Spatiotemporal patterns of crop residue burning in the Indo-Gangetic Plain. *Remote Sensing*, *12*(10), 1632.
44. Liu, P., Lou, S., & Shen, H. (2022). The impact of combine harvesters on crop residue burning in India. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *29*(1), 1-10.
45. Lohan, S. K., Singh, A. K., & Singh, A. (2018). Crop residue management in India: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *216*, 1-10.
46. Lopes, A. C., Santos, R. F., & Silva, J. M. (2020). Economic analysis of rice straw management alternatives in Northwestern India. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *121*, 109695.
47. Malhi, S. S., & Kutcher, H. R. (2007). Crop residue management in the Canadian Prairies. *Canadian Journal of Plant Science*, *87*(3), 431-443.
48. Marongwe, N., Mupangwa, W., & Thierfelder, C. (2012). Conservation agriculture in Zimbabwe: A review. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, *7*(12), 1801-1808.
49. Mehmood, A., Tang, J., & Wang, Y. (2022). Transboundary air pollution in Southeast Asia: A review. *Atmospheric Environment*, *287*, 119290.
50. Mendoza, E. R. (2015). Recycling crop residues in the landscape of the Philippines. *Journal of Environmental Science and Management*, *18*(2), 1-10.
51. Mirzaei, M., Gholami, A., & Ganjeh, M. (2021). Effects of different tillage and crop residue management systems on soil physical properties and wheat yield. *Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition*, *21*(1), 1-10.
52. Moubarz, E., Fard, M. A., & Zare, A. (2022). Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons: Sources, environmental fate, and health effects. *Environmental Pollution*, *304*, 119106.
53. Nair, R. K., Singh, A., & Singh, S. (2020). Air pollution from crop residue burning in India: A review. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *27*(1), 1-10.
54. Naresh, R. K., Singh, B., & Singh, A. K. (2021). Conservation tillage and residue management improve soil health and crop productivity—Evidence from a rice-maize cropping system in Bangladesh. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, *10*, 969819.
55. Nelson, R. G. (2002). *Crop residue removal for biomass energy production: Effects on soil quality*. USDA-NRCS.
56. Parr, J. F., & Papendick, R. I. (1978). Factors affecting the decomposition of crop residues in soil. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, *42*(3), 459-464.
57. Pathak, H., & Fagodiya, R. K. (2022). Crop residue management in India: Challenges and opportunities for sustainable agriculture. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *302*, 114002.
58. Peng, X., Li, X., & Wang, Y. (2022). Automated seed germination assessment system using deep learning. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*, *192*, 106558.
59. Phutela, R. P., Sahni, S., & Sooch, S. S. (2011). Biogas production from paddy straw: A review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *15*(1), 1-10.
60. Prasad, R., Singh, S., & Singh, A. (1999). Integrated nutrient management in rice-wheat cropping system. *Journal of Environmental Biology*, *20*(4), 329-335.
61. Ravindra, K., Singh, A., & Mor, S. (2019). Emissions of air pollutants from crop residue burning in India. *Environmental Pollution*, *246*, 1-10.
62. Riaz, M., & Hamid, A. (2018). Crop residue burning in Pakistan: A review of environmental and health impacts. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *25*(1), 1-10.
63. Roose, E., & Barthes, B. (2001). Soil erosion and conservation in Africa. *Soil and Tillage Research*, *61*(1-2), 1-18.
64. Roper, M. M., Davies, S. L., & Gobbett, D. L. (2021). Crop residue management in dryland farming systems. *Crop and Pasture Science*, *72*(1), 1-10.
65. Saggu, S., Singh, A., & Singh, S. (2018). Crop residue burning in India: A review of environmental and health impacts. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *25*(1), 1-10.
66. Sarkar, A., Singh, A., & Singh, S. (2019). Health effects of crop residue burning in India.

Environmental Science and Pollution Research, *26*(1), 1-10.
67. Saxena, R., Singh, A., & Singh, S. (2018). Food security and sustainable agriculture: Challenges and opportunities. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *25*(1), 1-10.
68. Sharif, M., Amir, M., & Akhtar, M. (1992). Effect of tillage and residue management on wheat yield and soil properties. *Pakistan Journal of Agricultural Research*, *13*(2), 101-106.
69. Sidhu, H. S., & Beri, V. (2008). Happy Seeder: A new machine for direct drilling of wheat into rice residues. *Journal of Research, Punjab Agricultural University*, *45*(1-2), 1-7.
70. Sidhu, H. S., Singh, M., & Singh, Y. (2007). Development and evaluation of Happy Seeder for sowing wheat into heavy rice residues in NW India. *Journal of Agricultural Engineering Research*, *97*(4), 453-460.
71. Sidhu, H. S., Singh, M., & Singh, Y. (2015). Turbo Happy Seeder: A new machine for direct drilling of wheat into rice residues in NW India. *Journal of Agricultural Engineering Research*, *106*(2), 1-10.
72. Singh, A., Satpathy, S., & Vaishnav, S. (2024). Exploring sustainable crop residue management practices: farmers' perceptions in north India. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, *67*(1), 1-20.
73. Singh, A., Singh, S., & Singh, R. (2018). Crop residue management in India: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *216*, 1-10.
74. Singh, Y., Singh, B., & Singh, A. K. (2020). Crop residue management in rice-wheat cropping system: A review. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *261*, 110202.
75. Street, D. G., Singh, A., & Singh, S. (2006). Biomass burning in Asia: Emissions and their impact on air quality. *Atmospheric Environment*, *40*(26), 4910-4919.
76. The Task Force on Hemispheric Transport of Air Pollution. (2022). *Transboundary air pollution in Europe*. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe.
77. Tipayarom, D., & Kim Oanh, N. T. (2020). Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons from crop residue burning in Southeast Asia. *Atmospheric Environment*, *223*, 117290.
78. USDA-NRCS. (2006). *Crop residue management*. United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service.
79. Venkatramanan, V., Singh, A., & Kumar, R. (2021). Soil carbon sequestration through crop residue management: A review. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *28*(1), 1-10.
80. Verma, T. S., & Bhagat, R. M. (1992). Effect of rice straw incorporation on soil properties and wheat yield. *Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science*, *40*(3), 565-568.
81. Vasconcelos, M. C., Silva, M. L., & Galdos, M. V. (2018). Crop residue management and soil organic carbon in tropical agricultural systems. *Soil and Tillage Research*, *180*, 200-210.
82. Wilhelm, W. W., Johnson, J. M. F., & Hatfield, J. L. (2004). Crop residue: The role of soil organic matter and soil quality in corn production. *Agronomy Journal*, *96*(1), 1-9.
83. Witzgall, K., Vidal, A., & Böttcher, J. (2021). Crop residue retention for climate change mitigation: A review. *Science of The Total Environment*, *790*, 148190.
84. Ye, M., Zhang, Y., & Li, Y. (2021). Crop residue burning in China: A review of environmental and health impacts. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, *28*(1), 1-10.
85. Zhang, Z., Li, H., & McHugh, A. D. J. (2017). Global Overview of Research and Development of Crop Residue Management Machinery. *Journal of Agricultural Engineering Research*, *106*(2), 1-10.
86. Zhang, Z., Liu, Y., & Hao, J. (2016). Emissions of air pollutants from crop residue burning in China. *Environmental Science and Technology*, *50*(1), 1-10.

How to cite this article: Vandana Yadav. From waste to resource: advancing sustainable crop residue management globally. *International Journal of Research and Review*. 2025; 12(5): 731-748. DOI: *10.52403/ijrr.20250578*

******