Università degli studi di Udine

Modeling drivers of farming system trajectories in Mediterranean peri-urban regions: Two case studies in Avignon (France) and Pisa (Italy)

(Article begins on next page)

Modeling drivers of farming system trajectories in Mediterranean peri-urban regions: two case studies in Avignon (France) and Pisa (Italy)

Ruiz-Martinez I.[a], Martinetti D.[b], Marraccini E.[c,d], Debolini M.[e,f]

[a] Research Institute for Local Development, University of Valencia, Carrer del Serpis, 29, València, 46022 Spain; (irune.ruiz@uv.es) https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7500-8408

[b] UMR BIOSP INRAE, Avignon, France

[c] Department of Agricultural, Food, Environmental and Animal Sciences (DI4A), University of Udine, Via delle Scienze 206, Udine, 33100, Italy elisa.marraccini@uniud.it) https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2797-0758

[d] UP INTERACT 2018.C102 UniLaSalle, Beauvais (France)

[e] UMR 1114 EMMAH INRAE/AU, Avignon, France. (marta.debolini@inrae.fr) https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9711-5482

[f] CMCC Foundation – Euro-Mediterranean Centre on Climate Change, IAFES Division, Viale Italia 39, 07100 Sassari, Italy

1. Introduction

In the last decades, land use and land cover changes and the ongoing dynamics in terms of land management have been threatening farming systems, affecting a viable food production and regulation services (Overmars et al., 2014). The Mediterranean region is particularly vulnerable in terms of land use and land cover changes due to its biophysical and climatic conditions (Bouma et al., 1998; Ruiz et al., 2020). For instance, the important share of hilly and mountain areas has led to an important abandonment of elevated agricultural areas since World War II (McDonald et al., 2000), summer droughts have contributed to repeated fires (Turco et al., 2017) and consequent land use changes in burnt areas (Parente et al., 2018), and the large coastal areas have favored tourism development and massive coastal urbanization (Robert et al., 2019). Mediterranean farming systems are characterized by a high degree of heterogeneity in terms of their composition and fragmentation in terms of their distribution, which make complex their analysis and the understanding of the dynamics' underlined drivers (Malek and Verburg, 2018). Urban sprawl, as well as intensification on productive agricultural land and abandonment of traditional/extensive production systems are among the most relevant ongoing dynamics in the Mediterranean (Debolini et al., 2018; Serra et al., 2008; Van Vliet et al., 2015). In general, the observed agricultural changes can be grouped in four main trajectories, identified in various theoretical framework (Debolini et al., 2018; Plieninger et al., 2016; van Vliet et al., 2015): intensification vs extensification and

35 diversification vs specialization. These farming system trajectories reflect the two gradients of biotechnical

36 functioning and relationships with socio-economic contexts that Therond et al., (2017) considered as the

37 factors for classifying the key-models of agriculture.

38 In most cases, these dynamics are identified through land use and land cover change analysis (e.g. Bajocco et

39 al., 2012; Delattre et al., 2020; Kefalas et al., 2019; Marraccini et al., 2015), whereas land use management

40 and spatially-explicit information about agricultural and farming practices are seldom considered, even though

41 they are relevant to understand the actual impact on ecosystem services, instead of the potential one (Rizzo

42 et al., 2019; Temme and Verburg, 2011). Moreover, there are still some gaps of knowledge on how divergent

43 development trajectories act on the same areas (Debolini et al., 2018). In particular, most of the existing

44 literature is based on homogeneous areas in terms of farming systems, such as arable lands, whereas few

45 studies analyze regional and territorial case studies on more complex or heterogeneous agricultural systems

46 e.g., polycultural systems or periurban farming systems (Ruiz-Martinez et al., 2015).

47 Farming system dynamics on the surroundings of urban areas may take different trends based on different

48 acting drivers. Some recent studies compared the processes ongoing on Athens (Greece) and Rome (Italy)

49 (Salvati et al., 2014) or the case study of Barcelona (Spain) (Serra et al., 2008), which are strongly influenced

50 by their demographic and economic characteristics. Cropland abandonment may occur in areas with high

51 urban pressure, where there is a strong competition between agricultural and urban lands (Geniaux et al.,

52 2011; Serra et al., 2014; Casanova-Enault et al., 2021) and these dynamics can affect traditional production

53 systems that have shaped Mediterranean landscapes (Martínez-Fernández et al., 2013). Moreover, most

54 fertile and productive areas can be subject to a process of intensification, such as coastal or alluvial planes in

55 proximity of cities (Parcerisas et al., 2012; Ruiz-Martinez et al., 2020; Scheromm and Soulard, 2018). At the

56 same time, the proximity to the city and thus to the consumers can facilitate the implementation of different

57 sustainable practices, such as shortening the food supply chains, engaging in organic farming and even

58 sustainable intensifying farming systems to maintain local food production (Scorsino and Debolini, 2020;

59 Weiltin, 2019; Sanz Sanz et al., 2018).

60 The existing literature on drivers of land use and land cover changes is mostly based on modelling approaches

61 for testing drivers' relation with the underlined dynamics (Veldkamp, 2009; Verburg et al., 2002). Drivers are

62 usually classified in five groups: political and institutional, economic, socio-cultural, technological and

63 geographical/environmental (Debolini et al., 2018; Plieninger et al., 2016; van Vliet et al., 2015), based on the

64 assumption that the cultural and socio-economic factors interact with the biophysical ones influencing the

65 farmers' decision-making process (Benoit et al., 2012; Chopin et al., 2015). Most of the spatial statistical

66 models attempt to explicitly identify the drivers of land cover changes using multiple logistic regression models

67 (Chopin et al., 2015; Serneels and Lambin, 2001). In such approaches, feedbacks from farming management

68 and dynamics at local scale are seldom considered (Verburg et al., 2015), while spill-over effects from

69 neighboring areas are neglected (Qiu et al., 2015). In the context of farming system dynamics, the spillover

70 effect could be defined as the response of a farmer to changes made by other farmers. Nonetheless, the

71 heterogeneous agricultural and production landscape typical of the Mediterranean makes it difficult to assess

72 to which other farmers choices one farmer is reacting to, since different factors can determine the direction

73 of the spillover, namely spatial proximity, the affinity of farming typology or a combination of both factors. In

74 this work we test the hypothesis that spatial spillover alone can improve the understanding of farming system

75 dynamics.

76 Our analysis is based on a multi-temporal approach using existing European databases: The Land Parcel

77 Identification Systems (LPIS) and the agricultural census at individual farm level on the cadastral parcels, which

78 are used as elementary spatial statistical units. The LPIS is a pan-EU database that provides very detailed and

79 accurate information as well as a mandatory adequate update cycle of the dataset thus highly suitable for

80 multi-temporal and spatially-explicit analysis (Bertaglia et al., 2016). It has been often proposed as support to

81 improve the spatial management of agriculture and the environment and as a fundamental tool to distribute

82 and monitor area-based subsidies (Rizzo et al., 2017). Barbottin et al. (2018) have used the French LPIS as a

83 tool to highlight farm area dynamics, and Marraccini et al. (2020) mobilized LPIS as a support for the design of

84 innovative crop rotations.

85 Our paper proposes a methodology to analyze farming systems' trajectories and their explanatory factors as

86 proxies of underlined drivers, through a novel statistical modelling approach. In particular, we aimed to answer

87 the following research questions: 1) what divergent trajectories can be observed on the land systems? 2) What

88 drives these trajectories? The possible underlying drivers are represented through proxies in terms of a set of

89 explanatory variables in the spatial model. This approximation, from drivers to proximate variables, is used on

90 most of the land use change modeling approaches, even though it could mask the real understanding of

91 casualties and it implies to do some assumptions in this sense (Veldkamp and Lambin, 2001; Serneels and

92 Lambin, 2001; Mottet et al., 2006; Chopin et al., 2015; Viedma et al., 2017).

93 The two urban regions analyzed differ for their agricultural context (extensive arable vs specialized crops

94 oriented), but they are illustrative of typical Mediterranean farming systems in urbanized areas. In order to

95 provide a faithful representation of the underlining agricultural trajectories, we characterize the landscape

96 through a farm typology combining on-farm land use and its management using different drivers (e.g.

97 population density, irrigation, agricultural yields). We estimate the contribution of different explanatory

98 variables to the probability of change at the farm level using a Spatial Autoregressive Probit model. This model

99 has the advantage explicitly considering a spatial autocorrelation term of the dependent variable that can be

100 used to estimate spatial spill-over effects (Martinetti and Geniaux, 2017).

101

2. Case-studies

We considered two case studies in medium-sized towns within the Mediterranean region: the peri-urban areas of Pisa (Northwestern coast of Italy) and Avignon (Southeastern France). The two urban regions share common demographic trends but their land cover and use dynamics are different, especially for agricultural areas (Marraccini et al., 2015). The urban region of Pisa is a dispersed urban area of around 500 km^2, representing six municipalities located in the coastal plain of the Arno River (*Area Pisana*) and in the hilly area known as Monte Pisano. The average rainfall ranges between 800 mm near the coast to 1100 mm in Monte Pisano and the average annual temperature is around 15°C. Soils are mainly sandy and clay in the coastal area, with siltier loams in the Northern part, which is characterized by several water management issues connected to land reclamation (Pistocchi et al., 2012; Silvestri et al., 2017). Along the coastal area of Pisa lies the regional natural park of *Migliarino San Rossore Massaciuccoli* that also includes agricultural areas (Silvestri et al., 2012). Agricultural land uses are mostly characterized by arable land (winter wheat, maize) in its plain part and permanent crops (olive groves) in the hilly part (Filippini et al., 2018). Like other Mediterranean coastal areas, urbanization and tourism have a strong impact on agriculture, affecting local farming systems with a strong decrease in the number and surface of livestock and vegetable farms (Lardon et al., 2017).

The peri-urban region of Avignon includes a dispersed urban area of 337 km^2, representing 17 municipalities. The urban center has an average density of 323 inhabitants/km² compared with an average of 820 inhabitants/km² for other urban centers in France. This region is characterized by a specialized agriculture mainly dedicated to fruit production, which represents 32% of the total utilized agricultural area (UAA). Unlike Pisa, the area of Avignon represents an example of Mediterranean landscape undergoing strong polarization of land use, with intensification focusing on the most profitable areas and cultures, and abandonment on the less productive systems (Scorsino and Debolini, 2020). Such Mediterranean areas are characterized by agricultural systems leading to conflicts in terms of ES provision and regulation, such as water supply and biodiversity. The main characteristics of the two-study area are represented on Fig.1.

Fig.1: Location of the two cases study and land cover (CLC 2018 — Copernicus Land Monitoring Service)

3. Materials and methods

The overall methodology is organized in five steps, resumed in Fig. 2, and is based on the characterization of the farming systems of an area in a given time span (for Pisa in the years 2007 and 2015, for Avignon in 2000 and 2010), then of their trajectories and finally on the identification of the main drivers underlying such trajectories. First, we built the two different databases in the two regions, using as main data the Land Parcel

134 Identification System (LPIS) for the case study of Pisa, and the individual data of the agricultural census

135 database (Ministère De L'Agriculture (SSP), 2013, 2012) for the case of Avignon. Then, we classify the main

136 farming systems in the two regions, obtaining in each case a typology for the two different years (Fig. 2).

137 Through the analysis of the transition matrix, we obtained the main farming system changes, and these

138 changes were assessed to identify similar or different trajectories. Finally, we tested a series of possible

139 explanatory variables to evaluate their contribution to the trajectories. In the following paragraph we describe

140 in detail each phase of the methodology.

141

143 Fig.2: Scheme of the overall methodology.

144

3.1 Database building

146 In order to characterize farming system typology and their trajectories, we use the farm as the spatial

147 statistical unit of the study. In terms of temporal scale, because of the limitations due to the data availability,

148 we assess the changes between 2007 and 2015 for the case study of Pisa and between 2000 and 2010 for the

149 case study of Avignon. In fact, we used two different sources of information for the two cases: for the case

150 study of Pisa, the farming system and drivers' characterization were developed coupling data from the Land

151 Parcel Identification System (LPIS) database at farm level with relevant information such as elevation, rainfall,

152 proximity to urban areas, organic production, age and gender of the farmer. LPIS allows to identify the main

153 crop sequence types in the study area for a short-term period (from 2007 to 2015), in a similar way to what

154 was proposed by Chopin et al. (2015) but it does not give information about farming practices and few

155 information is given on the farm structure, mainly the usable agricultural area and of the total farm area. This

156 has not been considered a bias, since a previous survey-based and non-systematic farming system typology

157 built in the same area by Filippini et al. (2018) showed the importance of the crop allocation choices and

158 structural variables instead of the farming practices. The complementary data were compiled from existing

159 geographical databases and agricultural census at municipal scale.

160 For the case study of Avignon, the information was obtained from the French agricultural census at the farm

161 level for a period of 10 years (2000-2010). It is particularly interesting because it gives comprehensive and

162 detailed information about the usable agricultural area (e.g. percentage of the different crops, land use),

163 structure (e.g. farm size and farmland), crop management (e.g. irrigation, machineries, organic or conventional

164 farming) and other socio-economic information (e.g. profitability, commercialization). The detailed

165 description of the typology obtained for the two case studies of Pisa (2007 and 2015) and Avignon (2000 and

166 2010) are in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2.

167

168 **3.2 Identification of farming system changes and trajectories**

169 We assessed farming system changes between the two years analyzed comparing the different farming system

170 distributions through the transition matrix. Then, we classified the changes based on the proposed conceptual

171 framework (Fig.3), in order to understand the underline trajectories.

172 In particular, in order to identify the main trajectories, we aggregated different type of changes on some

173 groups (Tab. 1), namely intensification, extensification, diversification and specialization, according to Feranec

174 et al. (2010). This aggregation was based on the conceptual framework shown on Figure 3, obtained coupling

175 the existing bibliography about farming system trajectories (Debolini et al., 2018; Plieninger et al., 2016; van

176 Vliet et al., 2015) and the recent classification of key-models of agriculture (Therond et al., 2017): the

177 intensification and specialization processes being understood as those related to the increase of the

178 production whereas diversification and extensification led to less production and even abandonment.

179

180
181 Fig. 3: Conceptual framework for farming systems trajectories definition

182

183

Table 1: Definition of the observed farming system trajectories

	It is defined as the…	Examples of observed changes
INTENSIFICATION	Increasing production per unit area through more intensive use of inputs (e.g. fertilizers, pesticides, irrigation) or an increase in the farm surface of more intensive managed crops.	● Extensive arable land -> intensive arable land ● Meadows – pastures or forest -> arable land. ● Arable land (cereal crops) -> arable land (industrial crops) ● Increasing of inputs (irrigation, fertilization)
EXTENSIFICATION	Increasing production by extending the area under cultivation while maintaining or reducing aggregate input levels per unit area or an increase in the fam surface of more extensive managed crops.	● Vineyards, orchards & berry plantations -> arable land or grasslands ● Arable land -> grasslands. ● Intensive arable land -> extensive arable land
DIVERSIFICATION	Increasing the number of species cultivated in the farm or by increasing the part of the crops in the on-farm land use	● Toward high-value cash crops (mixed cropping systems with vegetable crops) ● Arable land (cereal crops) arable land (mixed cereal, industrial, vegetable crops)
SPECIALISATION	Decreasing on the number of species cultivated on the farm or more specialized management methods or increasing the land use in a higher-value crop.	● Non-labelled -> labelled vineyards ● Table grapes -> vineyards ● Permanent crops -> vineyards, orchards & berry plantations

184

Given the different data sources, the two case studies showed different ways of identifying farming system trajectories. In Pisa, the agricultural dynamics are defined by changes in the on-farm land use, based on the agronomic rule of the correspondence between crop sequence and crop spatial allocation (Castellazzi, 2008; Doré, 2012; Chopin et al., 2015). For instance, arable systems shifting from winter cereal-based land uses (more than 50% of winter wheat in the crop sequence) to industrial crops-based (more than 50% of industrial crops in the crop sequence) are considered to show an intensification trend as their land use allocation at the farm level has changed. On the other hand, in the case study of Avignon, other intensification trends have been identified, such as those deriving exclusively from a change in the crop management (e.g. increase on fertilization, pest or water use for irrigation). Results about farming system trajectories were spatially represented, and we test if there is spatial dependency between the observed trajectories via the join count test: it is present, so we need to account for that in the model that links drivers to trajectories to avoid inconsistent estimation.

3.3 Drivers assessment through spatial statistic modelling

In order to understand the most important drivers acting on farming systems dynamics, we tested four classes of explanatory variables: accessibility or geographic factors, such as distance to urban areas or to the main roads; bio-physical factors, such as soil characteristics and climate conditions; socio-economic factors, such as population density and farm characteristics, such as the farmer age.

203   The model was applied to both case-studies, but the different conditions and results about farming system

204   trajectories (see Section 4.2) on the two case studies induced to apply the model in two different ways. In

205   particular, in the Pisa region, we identified two main sub-regions in terms of farming systems and associated

206   dynamics: the plain area and the hilly one. The former was characterized by a mostly intensification process

207   on the cereals-livestock arable lands, whereas in the latter farming systems were mostly characterized by

208   permanent crops and in particular olive groves, almost stable during the analyzed period. For this reason, we

209   run the model just on the plain area, in order to identify the factors acting on the intensification process of

210   cereal livestock farming systems compared to the stable farms on the same area (i.e. intensification vs

211   stability). On the case study of Avignon, we identified two contrasted trajectories: on one side an

212   intensification of farming systems mainly due to the farm specialization and on the other side the

213   extensification and the progressive abandonment of the more traditional farming systems, and so we tested

214   the explanatory variables playing on the intensification trajectories vs extensification ones (i.e. intensification

215   vs extensification). To do that, we regressed a binary choice variable related to the type of trajectory assessed

216   as a dependent variable against a set of explanatory variables using a spatially explicit model (Probit model)

217   with spatial autocorrelation in the dependent variable a.k.a. SAR probit, (Martinetti and Geniaux, 2017) in

218   order to account for the spatial dependence of the dependent variable and avoid inconsistent and inefficient

219   estimators (McMille, 1992). The model takes the following form:

$$y=\rho Wy+\beta X+\epsilon$$

221   Where y represents the binary dependent variable, X a matrix of covariates, β a set of regression parameters

222   and ϵ a vector of normal iid disturbances with zero mean and unit variance. The n×n matrix W (n is the size of

223   the sample) is the spatial weight matrix that contains the information about the spatial distribution proximity

224   of the observations (here we considered a k-nearest neighbor scheme), while $\rho \in [-1,1]$ is the spatial

225   autocorrelation coefficient determining the strength and the direction of the spatial autocorrelation. Here we

226   used the row-standardized matrix of the first k=5 nearest neighbors for Avignon and k=10 nearest neighbors

227   for Pisa. We used different values for the two cases study because we tested different K-values of k until we

228   got the minimum error. All the analysis was conducted in R package ProbitSpatial (Martinetti & Geniaux, 2021).

229   In the probit spatial statistical model, we introduced all explanatory variables and then we analyzed which

230   factor contribute significantly to the explanation of farming system changes. The descriptive statistics of the

231   variables included in the empirical model are in supplementary materials (Appendix 3).

232

233   **4.   Results**

234   **4.1 Farming system typology and changes**

235   The farming system typologies obtained are summarized in Tab. 2. In Pisa, we distinguished thirteen classes

236   of farming systems, based on the main farm production, whereas in Avignon, we obtained nine. The detailed

237 description of the obtained typologies and their changes are reported on Supplementary materials (Appendix
238 1 and Appendix 2). In both case studies, the most stable during the considered time interval are related to
239 vegetables, cereals, permanent crops, nursery and table grapes, while vineyard systems tend to increase
240 together with livestock farming at the expense of mixed extensive farming systems.

241

242 Table 2: Farming system types obtained for the two case studies and their amount at T0 in terms of number
243 of farms

Farmig systems' types (Pisa)	Main characteristics of each type	Number of farms in 2007
Olive-groves	>30% UAA Olive	243
Vineyards	>20% UAA Vineyards	6
Fruits	>30% UAA Fruits	1
Nursery	>30% UAA Nursery crops	3
Vegetables	>30% UAA Vegetable crops	13
Cereal	>70% UAA Cereals	54
Legume	>70% UAA Legumes	7
Industrial	>70% UAA Industrial crops	2
Cereal & Legume	>70% UAA Cereal & Legume crops	66
Cereal & Industrial	>70% UAA Cereal & Industrial crops	86
Legume & Industrial	>70% UAA Legume & Industrial crops	6
Set-aside	>50% UAA Set-aside	12
Mixed-crops	Several crop types within farm (e.g >20% vineyards and >30% vegetables)	21

Farmig systems' types (Avignon)	Main characteristics of each type	Number of farms in 2000
Pasture	Farming systems dedicated to small-scale livestock farming	3
Vegetables	Vegetables systems extend a small proportion of cultivated area	88
Cereals	Conventional cereal farms with medium level of mineral & herbicide use and tillage	88
Permanent crops-medium intensity	Irrigated permanent farms-medium intensity	47
Nursery	Nursery farming systems are few and small farms	17
Vineyards	Specialized vineyards systems with quality vineyards, average size, and medium yielding	5
Table grapes	Table grapes production, with average size and medium yielding.	115
Cereal-Vineyards	Mixed-farming systems dedicated to vineyards and cereal production	4
Permanent crops - high intensity	Irrigated permanent highly intensive with average size.	107

244

245 The peri-urban area of Pisa is mainly characterized by cereal-industrial farming systems representing around
246 50% of the total UUA in 2007 and 56,3% in 2015. Mixed cereal-legumes are the most affected farming systems

247   towards cereal-industrial (6,5%) and legumes-industrial systems (2%). In the same way, mixed-crops tended

248   to change towards cereal-industrial (4,65%). The farming system changes are mainly located on the plain part

249   of the area, whereas on the hilly part the olive growing system is rather stable.

250   In the region of Avignon, we observed an increase in irrigation as well as increasing labor inputs and yields.

251   Analyzing the shift between the two years observed and comparing the different farming system distributions,

252   we assessed farming system changes, as shown on Fig.4.

253   The most relevant changes were from table grapes to specialized vineyards (11%), mixed vineyards, and

254   cereals systems (18%), and from cereals systems and permanent crops with high intensity to mixed crops of

255   vineyards and cereals systems (22% and 16%). Moreover, more transitions resulted from permanent crops

256   with low intensity to those with higher intensity (around 13%). Fig. 4 shows the main farming system changes

257   on the two case studies.

258

260   Figure 4: Farming system changes on the two-study area of Avignon and Pisa.

261

262   **4.2 Farming system trajectories**

263   The farming system changes observed have been classified in terms of corresponding trajectories applying the

264   conceptual framework explained on §3.2. The results are shown on Tab.3. In Pisa, the most relevant trajectory

265   is intensification/specialization, whereas extensification is concentrated more on the hilly part of the area. In

266   Avignon, the results are very different, as we observe different trajectories and also located in similar areas.

267

268

269 Tab.3: Farming system trajectories observed on the two case studies

Case study	Trajectory	Farming system change	Surface %
Pisa	Intensification	Mixed-crops -> Cereal-industrial	5
		Cereal-industrial -> legume-industrial	2
	Specialization	Mixed cereal-legumes -> cereal-industrial	6.5
		Mixed cereal-legumes -> legume-industrial	2
		Mixed cereal-legumes -> Legumes	2
	Diversification	Cereal-industrial ->Mixed-crops	2.5
	Extensification	Cereal-industrial -> Cereal-Legumes	3
		Cereal -> Cereal-Legumes	4
Avignon	Specialization	Table grapes -> Specialized vineyards	11
	Diversification	Cereals systems -> Vineyards and cereals systems	20
		Permanent crops -> Vineyards and cereals systems	14.5
		Table grapes -> Cereal&Vineyard	17
		Permanent high intensity -> Vegetables	3
	Intensification	Permanent low intensity -> Permanent high intensity	12
		Pastures -> Permanent low intensity	2
		Vegetables -> Permanent low intensity	2
		Cereal -> Permanent low intensity	2
	Extensification	Permanent high intensity -> Cereal	2.5

270

271 Join count test measures the presence of spatial dependence between observed farming system trajectories,

272 and it has been observed to be more clustered in the region of Pisa (p-value<0.01) than Avignon (p-value<0.1).

273 This is due to the different spatial structure of the agricultural lands on the two case studies. The peri-urban

274 area of Pisa can be split on two sub-areas: the plain area, where cereal and annual crops are dominant and

275 quite homogeneous within the zone, and the hilly area characterized by olive grows, which are stable over

276 time. In this sense, the farming systems are spatially clustered, explaining the high degree of spatial

277 dependence for the case of Pisa. The case study of Avignon has a different spatial structure: there is a bigger

278 diversity of farming systems and they are less clustered within the whole landscape, explaining the lower value

279 of spatial dependence. Moreover, for the case study of Avignon, considering the database we exploited, we

280 could estimate also changes in terms of practices and not only in terms of production typology.

281

282 **4.3 Drivers of farming system trajectories**

283 We use the spatial probit model to avoid biases in the analysis of drivers due to spatial autocorrelation effects.

284 It suggests that changes in the level of a single observation will have an impact on the expected probability of

285 the event being analyzed in both own- and neighboring area. As suggested LeSage et al. (2011) and LeSage

286　and Pace (2009), the interpretation of the coefficients is done through the marginal effects in farming change

287　as consequence of changes in the explicative variables at same location (direct effect), on the surrounding

288　observations (indirect) as well as the total effect. The effect would depend on spatial proximity of farm i to j,

289　captured by the spatial weight matrix W as well as the strength of spatial autocorrelation coefficient measured

290　by the parameter ρ (rh0). To better understand the coefficient meaning, we will consider the example of the

291　effect of the variable 'Utilised agricultural area (UAA)' for the case study of Pisa. There, the average direct

292　effect amounts to $-4.6*10^{-3}$, the average indirect effect to $1.2*10^{-4}$, and the average total effect to $-4.5*10^{-3}$.

293　These values can be interpreted as follows: an increase of one unit in the UAA of any farmer i, leads to an

294　average decrease of $4.6*10^{-3}$ on the probability of change in that same farm i (average direct effect); an

295　increase of one unit in the UAA of any farmer i leads to an average increase of $1.2*10^{-4}$ in the probability of

296　change of neighboring farms (average indirect effect). It has to be noticed that this scalar average measure

297　cumulates over the spatial spill-overs of all other observations and it is usually greater in magnitude for nearby

298　observations, gradually fading away for observations farther apart. The sum of average direct and indirect

299　effects represents the cumulative total effect of a unitary change in the variable 'UAA' of one single

300　observation.

301　Likewise, Tab.4 reports direct, indirect and total effects based on the estimated coefficients for the case study

302　of Pisa. The elevation remains statistically significant, meaning that also for a generally plain area it is a factor

303　driving the observed changes. On the one hand, we obtained significant signs for the factors related to soil

304　quality (silt, high available water capacity and the organic matter). The silty soil and the quantity of organic

305　matter exert a positive direct effect on the probability of intensification in that farm. However, the available

306　water capacity leads to an average decrease on the probability of change in that same farm. On the other

307　hand, factors related to both land use configuration (fragmentation) and the monoculture practices were

308　statistically significant for intensification, i.e. fields and crops number as well as the cultivated area.

309　The results for the case of Avignon are reported on Tab.5. The most significant drivers reveal different

310　scenarios on the farming system dynamics towards intensification: on the one hand, they are related to the

311　urban influence; and on the other hand, to the farming practices and management. A greater distance to

312　urban areas with lower values of population density, leads to the increase on the probability of extensification

313　in a given farm. However, the increase of accessibility to the roads lead to more intensification. Farming

314　practices related to irrigation and work units, both statistically significant, leads to the increase on the

315　probability of intensification dynamics by the presence of permanent crops characterized by a high

316　management intensity. The increase of the agricultural yields is leading to the decrease on the probability of

317　changes corresponding to permanent crops with lower intensity management as well as vegetables. On the

318　other hand, there are dynamics of specialization by the presence of vineyards, orchards & berry plantations

319　in flood plain where availability water capacity is higher.

320

Table 4: Statistical modelling of drivers for the plain of Pisa area. Database of 259 farms. UAA means Usable Agricultural Area, more details on each variable in Appendix 3. Regression coefficients of the SAR probit model. *** if p-value<0.001; ** if p-value <0.01; * if p-value <0.05.

	Coefficient	Direct effect	Indirect effect	Total effect
(Intercept)	-7.40e-01			
Protected area	4.36e+00	1.40e+00	-3.64e-02	1.37e+00
Rainfall	2.48e-03	8.02e-04	-2.07e-05	7.81e-04
Elevation	-8.22e-02***	-2.65e-02	6.85e-04	-2.58e-02
Insolation	-5.94e-08	-1.91e-08	4.96e-10	-1.86e-08
Gender of farmer	2.73e-01	8.80e-02	-2.27e-03	8.57e-02
Age36-55	7.46e-01	2.40e-01	-6.22e-03	2.34e-01
Age>55	4.62e-01	1.49e-01	-3.85e-03	1.45e-01
Location	-9.29e-02	-2.99e-02	7.75e-04	-2.91e-02
Distance from urban center	7.45e-03	2.40e-03	-6.21e-05	2.34e-03
Distance from main roads	7.42e-02	2.39e-02	-6.19e-04	2.33e-02
UAA	-1.44e-02**	-4.66e-03	1.20e-04	-4.54e-03
Number of cultivated crops	-1.19e-01*	-3.84e-02	9.94e-04	-3.74e-02
Number of fields	9.10e-03*	2.93e-03	-7.59e-05	2.85e-03
Amount of clay on soil	3.53e-02	1.13e-02	-2.94e-04	1.10e-02
Amount of sand	2.45e-02	7.90e-03	-2.04e-04	7.70e-03
Amount of silt	1.26e-01***	4.07e-02	-1.05e-03	3.97e-02
Available water capacity	-3.76e-02***	-1.21e-02	3.13e-04	-1.18e-02
Organic farming	6.05e-01	1.95e-01	-5.05e-03	1.90e-01
Amount of organic matter on soil	1.52e-01***	4.92e-02	-1.27e-03	4.79e-02
Flooding risk	1.56e-01	5.06e-02	-1.30e-03	4.93e-02
Distance from river	3.31e-02	1.06e-02	-2.76e-04	1.04e-02
Distance from water bodies	-2.76e-01*	-8.92e-02	2.30e-03	-8.69e-02
rho	-2.64e-02			

Table 5: Statistical modelling of drivers for Avignon Area. Database of 85 farms. UAA means Usable Agricultural Area, more details on each variable in Appendix 3. Regression coefficients of the SAR probit model. *** if p-value<0.001; ** if p-value <0.01; * if p-value <0.05.

	Coefficient	Direct effect	Indirect effect	Total effect
(Intercept)	3.81e+03			
Elevation	2.12***	8.56e-11	-5.45e-11	3.11e-11
Urban density	-3.24***	-1.30e-10	8.33e-11	-4.75e-11
Population	1.12	4.53e-11	-2.89e-11	1.65e-11
Distance from Avignon	2.17	8.77e-11	-5.59e-11	3.19e-11
Distance from urban area	1.08e+02***	4.39e-09	-2.79e-09	1.59e-09
Distance from the main roads	-7.17e+01***	-2.89e-09	1.84e-09	-1.05e-09
Age of the farmer 36-55	-1.21e+02***	-4.88e-09	3.10e-09	-1.77e-09
Age of the farmer >55	-1.11e+02	-4.49e-09	2.86e-09	-1.63e-09
Age of the farm 36-55	9.85	3.97e-10	-2.53e-10	1.44e-10
Farm activity: short food supply chain	-5.45	-2.19e-10	1.39e-10	-7.98e-11
Surface on organic farming	-1.39e+01	-5.62e-10	3.57e-10	-2.04e-10
Irrigated surfaces	2.93***	1.18e-10	-7.51e-11	4.29e-11
UAA	-8.11e-01	-3.26e-11	2.08e-11	-1.18e-11

Work units	1.85e-02***	7.45e-13	-4.74e-13	2.71e-13
Yield	-1.81e-04***	-7.31e-15	4.65e-15	-2.65e-15
Available water capacity	-2.75	-1.10e-10	7.05e-11	-4.02e-11
Insolation	-7.01e-03	-2.86e-13	1.82e-13	-1.04e-13
Cadastral value	-6.44e-03***	-2.59e-13	1.65e-13	-9.43e-14
Water resource management	1.22e+02***	4.94e-09	-3.15e-09	1.80e-09
Distance from water bodies	-1.11e-02***	-4.47e-13	2.85e-13	-1.62e-13
Water channels	-8.16e+01***	-3.29e-09	2.09e-09	-1.19e-09
Protected area	-1.11e+01	-4.47e-10	2.85e-10	-1.62e-10
Rho	-8.22e-01***			

5   Discussion

5.1 Methodological discussion

This paper presents an innovative modelling approach to analyze farming system trajectories and their drivers. The proposed method was tested on two Mediterranean peri-urban areas, particularly complex in terms of farming system structure and dynamics: the area of Pisa (Italy) and Avignon (France). In particular, we started from an assessment of farming system changes and then we used a methodological framework obtained by existing bibliography to understand the main trajectories. Finally, we applied a spatial modelling approach to analyze the possible explanatory variables of these trajectories. Classifying observed changes in terms of their meaning for management and trade-offs allowed to better investigate the processes underlying the ongoing dynamics. In particular, this analysis can be considered as based on the land system approach, wherein a landscape is represented not only by its land use and land cover, but also by its structure and management (Verburg et al., 2015). In this sense, intensification and extensification trajectories give deeper insight for a global modeling analysis (Duvernoy, 2000; Ellis and Ramankutty, 2008; Letourneau et al., 2012).

For the last part of the analysis, i.e. the study of the relationships between farmers' changes in agricultural practices and a list of explanatory variables, we chosen to implement a spatial probit model. The advantage compared to other binary regression models, such as a standard logit model, is that it accounts for the spatial dependence of the dependent variables, that has been observed and measured in both case studies through a join-count test. Hence, to prevent inconsistent and inefficient parameter estimation, the choice of the spatial probit model seemed natural. On the other hand, interpreting the way in which changes in the explanatory variables impact the probability of a farmer's change in agricultural practices for a SAR Probit model is not straightforward and requires some care. The two main reasons are, firstly, that Probit models use a non-linear function to link the set of covariates to the dependent variable (normal distribution). Secondly, the presence of spatial autocorrelation of the dependent variable implies that changes in the value of one explanatory variable at one single location can affect all remaining observations (spatial spill over). There, marginal effects for the SAR Probit model are the key to infer the real effects of a change in explanatory variables on the probability of change in the agricultural practices of farmers, rather than the estimated regression coefficients.

355 However, under this scenario, marginal effects can differ from one observation to another and their true value

356 can only be fully understood by looking at the complete matrices of cross derivatives. To account for the

357 combined effects of a non-linear link function and for potential spatial spill-over effects, we hence adopted

358 the methodology proposed by (LeSage et al., 2011; LeSage and Pace, 2009). They suggest using average

359 measure for the direct, indirect and total effects of the model in order to display the general trend and to

360 improve the interpretation of the results.

361 **5.2 Drivers of farming system trajectories**

362 In the case study of Pisa, the main farming system dynamics was intensification on the plain area, whereas the

363 other parts of the case study presented a stability in terms of farm organization. In agreement with these

364 results, the study of Silvestri et al. (2012) found on this area farming changes towards intensification in

365 summer and winter cereals, fodder crops and length of crops rotation. In terms of farm management, over

366 the last decades, farms divided their fields into smaller ones (Ruiz-Martinez et al., 2020). Nevertheless, in

367 terms of urban sprawl, the proximity to urban areas is not the main drivers of the dynamics. The results of the

368 drivers modelling show that these trajectories in Pisa are mainly related to agro-pedoclimatic conditions. In

369 particular, soil characteristics are important determinants of the distribution of arable land: silty soils and

370 organic matter have positive direct effects towards intensification. However, the high available water capacity

371 decreases on the probability of change, and this is probably due to the fact that it is not a limiting factor for

372 that farming systems. In general, these results are concordant with the literature about Mediterranean coastal

373 plains, where we observe an intensification on the most fertile plains together with an abandonment of the

374 less rentable productions because of the urbanization (Caraveli, 2000; Debolini et al., 2018). In this sense, the

375 agro-pedoclimatic conditions which determine soil fertility seem to drive the farmers' choices on intensifying

376 their productions. This was observed also by (van der Sluis et al., 2016), who found intensification process

377 across Europe mainly located in areas with good farming conditions. Moreover, the prevalence of professional

378 than hobby farmers is a key factor for them, and this is the case also in Pisa urban region, where permanent

379 crops are diffused mainly among hobby farmers. In this sense, we observed the UAA as a relevant factor in

380 driving intensification processes.

381 In Avignon, the circumstances are quite different because both the different agricultural dynamics and the

382 distribution of the observed dynamics. The diversification to high-value crops such as horticulture is

383 encouraged in these areas, because farmers have less pressure on land compared with traditional crops. Based

384 on intensification processes, irrigation practices and the labor input (work units) are the most relevant factors.

385 In this sense, specialization dynamics take place by the presence of vineyards, orchards and berry plantations

386 in flood plain. Another important factor is the proximity to urban areas. Despite the significance of urban

387 factors in Avignon, intensification processes are more likely to occur away from urban areas although close to

388 good road infrastructure. The conditions of marketing (good road infrastructure) and favorable production

389 (availability of irrigation water during warm periods, adequate temperatures in winter, deep soils) increase on

390 the probability of intensification (Sanz Sanz et al., 2017). It is noted that this kind of agriculture create an

391 environmental function around the urban systems. However, due to the lack of land guarantee (and its

392 dependence on aid, in some cases), it offers little resistance to the effective progression of urbanization

393 (Geniaux and Napoléone, 2005).

394 Comparing the two case studies, we can observe that in the Pisa region environmental and agronomic factors

395 are more relevant to understand the intensification processes, whereas in Avignon socio-economic and

396 geographical variables are the most relevant. This could be related also to the modeling results. In fact,

397 according to the model, the results reflected a stronger spatial dependence in the case study of Avignon.

398 Apparently, the plain of Pisa would show a more heterogeneous system in terms of intensification whereas in

399 Avignon these changes occur on particular areas, thus, in a less clustered way. This could be due to the

400 different spatial configuration of the two areas and the main existing farming systems. In fact, the Pisa region

401 present a main urban center, so it can be considered as mono-centric, whereas the Avignon urban area is

402 more scattered, with different important urban centers distributed all around the study area, in a poly-centric

403 configuration (Zambon et al., 2017). This could also explain why the distance from the main urban area of

404 Avignon is not a relevant explaining factor for intensification, whereas the distance from the nearest urban

405 area play a relevant role. In terms of farming systems, Pisa is mainly characterized by mixed cereals-livestock

406 farming, which are more likely to be influenced from agro-pedoclimatic conditions, as observed by (Pacheco

407 de Castro Flores Ribeiro et al., 2021).

408

409 **6. Conclusions**

410 Our results provide new evidence supporting the hypothesis that peri-urban farming systems trajectories are

411 influenced by different factors based on their spatial configuration and the characteristics of their farming

412 systems. In general, peri-urban regions cannot be defined just in terms of their distance to city center and

413 urbanization processes. Although it has been clearly identified the urban sprawl that characterizes the

414 medium-sized regions, this factor is not relevant on farming systems trajectories on the region of Pisa, where

415 structural agro-pedoclimatic variables are more significant on the probability of intensification. The region of

416 Avignon reveals different aspects: the good road infrastructure and favorable production (availability of

417 irrigation water during warm periods, adequate temperatures in winter, deep soils) increase the probability

418 of farming system intensification in areas where the marked and the access conditions can be more favorable.

419 In general, on the case of Avignon, socio-economic factors explain in a more significative way the different

420 existing dynamics of intensification and extensification. This analysis can give important insight to develop

421 specific policy measures to orient ongoing farming system trajectories and maintain productive systems in

422 Mediterranean peri-urban areas.

427
428

429 **CRediT authorship contribution statement**

430 **Irune Ruiz-Martinez:** Formal analysis, Investigation, Data Curation, Writing - Original Draft; **Davide Martinetti:**

431 Methodology, Software, Writing - Review & Editing; **Elisa Marraccini:** Conceptualization, Supervision, Writing

432 - Review & Editing, Project administration; **Marta Debolini:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing - Original

433 Draft, Writing - Review & Editing, Supervision, Funding acquisition.

434

435 **Bibliography**

436 Bajocco, S., De Angelis, A., Perini, L., Ferrara, A., Salvati, L., 2012. The Impact of Land Use/Land Cover Changes
437 on Land Degradation Dynamics: A Mediterranean Case Study. Environmental Management 49, 980–989.
438 https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-012-9831-8

439 Barbottin, A., Bouty, C., Martin, P., 2018. Using the French LPIS database to highlight farm area dynamics: The
440 case study of the Niort Plain. Land Use Policy 73, 281–289. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2018.02.012

441 Bertaglia, M., Milenov, P., Angileri, V., Devos, W., European Commission, Joint Research Centre, 2016.
442 Cropland and grassland management data needs from existing IACS sources. Publications Office, Luxembourg.

443 Bouma, J., Varallyay, G., Batjes, N.H., 1998. Principal land use changes anticipated in Europe. Agriculture,
444 Ecosystems & Environment 67, 103–119. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8809(97)00109-6

445 CARMEN Information cartographique [WWW Document], 2014. URL http://www.driee.ile-de-
446 france.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/information-cartographique-carmen-a1956.html

447 Casanova Enault L., Popoff T., Debolini M., 2021. Agricultural opportunity and future scenarios for vacant lands
448 on Mediterranean coastlines: a parcel scale analysis. Land Use Policy, 104914,
449 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.104914

450 Chopin, P., Blazy, J.-M., Doré, T., 2015. A new method to assess farming system evolution at the landscape
451 scale. Agronomy for Sustainable Development 35, 325–337. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-014-0250-5

452 CLC 2018 — Copernicus Land Monitoring Service [WWW Document], n.d. URL https://land.copernicus.eu/pan-
453 european/corine-land-cover/clc2018 (accessed 3.16.21).

454 Debolini, M., Marraccini, E., Dubeuf, J.P., Geijzendorffer, I.R., Guerra, C., Simon, M., Targetti, S., Napoléone,
455 C., 2018. Land and farming system dynamics and their drivers in the Mediterranean Basin. Land Use Policy.
456 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2017.07.010

457 Delattre, L., Debolini, M., Paoli, J.C., Napoleone, C., Moulery, M., Leonelli, L., Santucci, P., 2020. Understanding
458 the Relationships between Extensive Livestock Systems, Land-Cover Changes, and CAP Support in Less-
459 Favored Mediterranean Areas. Land 9, 518. https://doi.org/10.3390/land9120518

460 Duvernoy, I., 2000. Use of a land cover model to identify farm types in the Misiones agrarian frontier
461 (Argentina). Agricultural Systems 64, 137–149. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0308-521X(00)00019-6

Ellis, E.C., Ramankutty, N., 2008. Putting people in the map: anthropogenic biomes of the world. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 6, 439–447. https://doi.org/10.1890/070062

Feranec, J., Jaffrain, G., Soukup, T., Hazeu, G., 2010. Determining changes and flows in European landscapes 1990–2000 using CORINE land cover data. Applied Geography 30, 19–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2009.07.003

Filippini, R., Lardon, S., Bonari, E., Marraccini, E., 2018. Unraveling the contribution of periurban farming systems to urban food security in developed countries. Agron. Sustain. Dev. 38, 21. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-018-0499-1

Foley, J.A., 2005. Global Consequences of Land Use. Science 309, 570–574. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1111772

Geniaux, G., Ay, J.-S., Napoléone, C., 2011. A SPATIAL HEDONIC APPROACH ON LAND USE CHANGE ANTICIPATIONS*. Journal of Regional Science 51, 967–986. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9787.2011.00721.x

Geniaux, G., Napoléone, C., 2005. Rente foncière et anticipations dans le périurbain. Economie & prévision 168, 77–95.

Jones, J.W., Antle, J.M., Basso, B., Boote, K.J., Conant, R.T., Foster, I., Godfray, H.C.J., Herrero, M., Howitt, R.E., Janssen, S., Keating, B.A., Munoz-Carpena, R., Porter, C.H., Rosenzweig, C., Wheeler, T.R., 2017. Brief history of agricultural systems modeling. Agricultural Systems 155, 240–254. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2016.05.014

Kefalas, G., Kalogirou, S., Poirazidis, K., Lorilla, R.S., 2019. Landscape transition in Mediterranean islands: The case of Ionian islands, Greece 1985–2015. Landscape and Urban Planning 191, 103641. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2019.103641

LaMMA (Laboratory of Monitoring and Environmental Modelling) [WWW Document], 2016. URL http://www.lamma.rete.toscana.it / http://geoportale.lamma.rete.toscana.it

Lardon S., Houdart M., Loudiyi S., Filippini R., Marraccini E. (2017) Food, Integrating Urban and Agricultural Dynamics in Pisa, Italy. In: Soulard CT., Perrin C., Valette E. (eds) Toward Sustainable Relations Between Agriculture and the City. Urban Agriculture. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-71037-2_2

Leontidou, L., 1993. Postmodernism and the City: Mediterranean Versions. Urban Studies 30, 949–965. https://doi.org/10.1080/00420989320080881

LeSage, J.P., Kelley Pace, R., Lam, N., Campanella, R., Liu, X., 2011. New Orleans business recovery in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina: Business Recovery in the Aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society) 174, 1007–1027. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-985X.2011.00712.x

LeSage, J.P., Pace, R.K., 2009. Introduction to spatial econometrics, Statistics, textbooks and monographs. CRC Press, Boca Raton.

Letourneau, A., Verburg, P.H., Stehfest, E., 2012. A land-use systems approach to represent land-use dynamics at continental and global scales. Environmental Modelling & Software 33, 61–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2012.01.007

Maestre Andrés, S., Calvet Mir, L., van den Bergh, J.C.J.M., Ring, I., Verburg, P.H., 2012. Ineffective biodiversity policy due to five rebound effects. Ecosystem Services 1, 101–110. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2012.07.003

Malek, Ž., Verburg, P.H., 2018. Adaptation of land management in the Mediterranean under scenarios of irrigation water use and availability. Mitig Adapt Strateg Glob Change 23, 821–837. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11027-017-9761-0

506 Marraccini, E., Debolini, M., Moulery, M., Abrantes, P., Bouchier, A., Chéry, J.-P., Sanz Sanz, E., Sabbatini, T.,
507 Napoleone, C., 2015. Common features and different trajectories of land cover changes in six Western
508 Mediterranean urban regions. Applied Geography 62, 347–356.
509 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2015.05.004

510 Marraccini, E., Gotor, A.A., Scheurer, O., Leclercq, C., 2020. An Innovative Land Suitability Method to Assess
511 the Potential for the Introduction of a New Crop at a Regional Level. Agronomy 10, 330.
512 https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy10030330

513 Martinetti, D., Geniaux, G., 2017. Approximate likelihood estimation of spatial probit models. Regional Science
514 and Urban Economics 64, 30–45. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.regsciurbeco.2017.02.002

515 Martínez-Fernández, J., Esteve-Selma, M.A., Baños-González, I., Carreño, F., Moreno, A., 2013. Sustainability
516 of Mediterranean irrigated agro-landscapes. Ecological Modelling 248, 11–19.
517 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2012.09.018

518 MacDonald, D., Crabtree, J.R., Wiesinger, G., Dax, T., Stamou, N., Fleury, P., Gutierrez Lazpita, J., Gibon, A.,
519 2000. Agricultural abandonment in mountain areas of Europe: Environmental consequences and policy
520 response. Journal of Environmental Management 59, 47–69. https://doi.org/10.1006/jema.1999.0335

521 McMillen, D.P., 1992. Probit with spatial autocorrelation. Journal of Regional Science 32, 335–348.
522 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9787.1992.tb00190.x

523 Ministère De L'Agriculture (SSP), 2013. Recensement Général de l'Agriculture - 2010.
524 https://doi.org/10.34724/CASD.39.120.V1

525 Ministère De L'Agriculture (SSP), 2012. Recensement Général de l'Agriculture - 2000.
526 https://doi.org/10.34724/CASD.39.126.V1

527 Mottet, A., Ladet, S., Coqué, N., Gibon, A., 2006. Agricultural land-use change and its drivers in mountain
528 landscapes: A case study in the Pyrenees. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 114, 296–310.
529 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2005.11.017

530 Overmars, K.P., Schulp, C.J.E., Alkemade, R., Verburg, P.H., Temme, A.J.A.M., Omtzigt, N., Schaminée, J.H.J.,
531 2014. Developing a methodology for a species-based and spatially explicit indicator for biodiversity on
532 agricultural land in the EU. Ecological Indicators 37, 186–198. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2012.11.006

533 Pacheco de Castro Flores Ribeiro, P., Osório de Barros de Lima e Santos, J.M., Prudêncio Rafael Canadas, M.J.,
534 Contente de Vinha Novais, A.M., Ribeiro Ferraria Moreira, F.M., de Araújo Rodrigues Lomba, Â.C., 2021.
535 Explaining farming systems spatial patterns: A farm-level choice model based on socioeconomic and
536 biophysical drivers. Agricultural Systems 191, 103140. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2021.103140

537 Parcerisas, L., Marull, J., Pino, J., Tello, E., Coll, F., Basnou, C., 2012. Land use changes, landscape ecology and
538 their socioeconomic driving forces in the Spanish Mediterranean coast (El Maresme County, 1850–2005).
539 Environmental Science & Policy 23, 120–132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2012.08.002

540 Parente, J., et. al., 2018. The role of forest fires in land use/land cover changes in Portugal, in: Advances in
541 forest fire research 2018. Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, pp. 670–676. https://doi.org/10.14195/978-
542 989-26-16-506_74

543 Piano di indirizzo territoriale con valenza di piano paesaggistico - Regione Toscana [WWW Document], n.d.
544 URL   https://www.regione.toscana.it/-/piano-di-indirizzo-territoriale-con-valenza-di-piano-paesaggistico
545 (accessed 10.19.20).

546 Pistocchi, C., Silvestri, N., Rossetto, R., Sabbatini, T., Guidi, M., Baneschi, I., Bonari, E., Trevisan, D., 2012. A
547 Simple Model to Assess Nitrogen and Phosphorus Contamination in Ungauged Surface Drainage Networks:
548 Application to the Massaciuccoli Lake Catchment, Italy. J. Environ. Qual. 41, 544–553.
549 https://doi.org/10.2134/jeq2011.0302

550 Qiu, F., Laliberté, L., Swallow, B., Jeffrey, S., 2015. Impacts of fragmentation and neighbor influences on
551 farmland conversion: A case study of the Edmonton-Calgary Corridor, Canada. Land Use Policy 48, 482–494.
552 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2015.06.024

553 Rizzo, D., Marraccini, E., Vitali, G., Martin, P., 2017. What data are available to describe cropping systems at
554 the regional level? XLVI Convegno Nazionale della Società Italiana di Agronomia, 13 Settembre, Milano (ITA).

555 Rizzo, D., Therond, O., Lardy, R., Murgue, C., Leenhardt, D., 2019. A rapid, spatially explicit approach to
556 describe cropping systems dynamics at the regional scale. Agricultural Systems 173, 491–503.
557 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2019.04.003

558 Robert, S., Fox, D., Boulay, G., Grandclément, A., Garrido, M., Pasqualini, V., Prévost, A., Schleyer-Lindenmann,
559 A., Trémélo, M.-L., 2019. A framework to analyse urban sprawl in the French Mediterranean coastal zone. Reg
560 Environ Change 19, 559–572. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-018-1425-4

561 Ruiz, I., Sanz-Sánchez, M.J., 2020. Effects of historical land-use change in the Mediterranean environment.
562 Science of The Total Environment 732, 139315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.139315

563 Ruiz-Martinez, I., Debolini, M., Sabbatini, T., Bonari, E., Lardon, S., Marraccini, E., 2020. Agri-urban patterns in
564 Mediterranean urban regions: the case study of Pisa. Journal of Land Use Science.
565 https://doi.org/10.1080/1747423X.2020.1836054

566 Ruiz-Martinez I., Gennai-Schott S., Sabbatini T., Bonari E., Marraccini E., 2016. Farming system dynamics at the
567 urban region level: the case of the Area Pisana. XLV Meeting of the Italian Society of Agronomy, Sassari, 20-22
568 September 2016, pp. 132-133. Available online at: https://www.siagr.it/it/convegni-sia/atti-convegni-
569 sia.html?download=43:xlv-convegno-sia-sassari-2016

570 Ruiz-Martinez, I., Marraccini, E., Debolini, M., Bonari, E., 2015. Indicators of agricultural intensity and
571 intensification: a review of the literature. Italian Journal of Agronomy 10, 74.
572 https://doi.org/10.4081/ija.2015.656

573 Salvati, L., Smiraglia, D., Bajocco, S., Munafo, M., 2014. Land Use Changes in Two Mediterranean Coastal
574 Regions: Do Urban Areas Matter? International Journal of Environmental, Ecological, Geological and Marine
575 Engineering 8(9), 579–583.

576 Sanz Sanz, E., Martinetti, D., Napoléone, C., 2018. Operational modelling of peri-urban farmland for public
577 action in Mediterranean context. Land Use Policy 75, 757–771.
578 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2018.04.003

579 Sanz Sanz, E., Napoléone, C., Hubert, B., Mata, R., Giorgis, S., 2017. Repenser la planification urbaine à partir
580 des espaces agricoles: Une méthodologie opérationnelle à l'échelle intercommunale. Revue d'Économie
581 Régionale & Urbaine Juin, 511. https://doi.org/10.3917/reru.173.0511

582 Scheromm, P., Soulard, C., 2018. The landscapes of professional farms in mid-sized cities, France:
583 Professionnal farming in mid-sized cities. Geographical Research 56, 154–166. https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-
584 5871.12272

585 Scorsino C. and Debolini M., 2020. A mixed approach for multi-scale assessment of land system dynamics and
586 future scenario development on the Vaucluse department (South-eastern France). Land 9(6), 180.
587 https://doi.org/10.3390/land9060180

588 Serneels, S., Lambin, E.F., 2001. Proximate causes of land-use change in Narok District, Kenya: a spatial
589 statistical model. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 85, 65–81. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-
590 8809(01)00188-8

591 Serra, P., Pons, X., Saurí, D., 2008. Land-cover and land-use change in a Mediterranean landscape: A spatial
592 analysis of driving forces integrating biophysical and human factors. Applied Geography 28, 189–209.
593 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2008.02.001

594 Serra, P., Vera, A., Tulla, A.F., Salvati, L., 2014. Beyond urban–rural dichotomy: Exploring socioeconomic and
595 land-use processes of change in Spain (1991–2011). Applied Geography 55, 71–81.
596 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2014.09.005

597 Silvestri, N., Pistocchi, C., Antichi, D., 2017. Soil and Nutrient Losses in a Flat Land-Reclamation District of
598 Central Italy. Land Degrad. Develop. 28, 638–647. https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.2549

599 Silvestri, N., Pistocchi, C., Sabbatini, T., Rossetto, R., Bonari, E., 2012. Diachronic analysis of farmers' strategies
600 within a protected area of central Italy. Italian Journal of Agronomy 7, 20.
601 https://doi.org/10.4081/ija.2012.e20

602 Soulard, C.-T., Valette, E., Perrin, C., Abrantes, P.C., Anthopoulou, T., Benjaballah, O., Bouchemal, S., Dugué,
603 P., Amrani, M.E., Lardon, S., Marraccini, E., Mousselin, G., Napoleone, C., Paoli, J.-C., 2017. Peri-urban agro-
604 ecosystems in the Mediterranean: diversity, dynamics, and drivers. Regional Environmental Change 18, 651–
605 662. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-017-1102-z

606 Temme, A.J.A.M., Verburg, P.H., 2011. Mapping and modelling of changes in agricultural intensity in Europe.
607 Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment 140, 46–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2010.11.010

608 Tilman, D., Cassman, K.G., Matson, P.A., Naylor, R., Polasky, S., 2002. Agricultural sustainability and intensive
609 production practices. Nature 418, 671–677. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature01014

610 Turco, M., von Hardenberg, J., AghaKouchak, A., Llasat, M.C., Provenzale, A., Trigo, R.M., 2017. On the key role
611 of droughts in the dynamics of summer fires in Mediterranean Europe. Sci Rep 7, 81.
612 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-00116-9

613 Van der Sluis, T., Pedroli, B., Kristensen, S.B.P., Lavinia Cosor, G., Pavlis, E., 2016. Changing land use intensity
614 in Europe – Recent processes in selected case studies. Land Use Policy 57, 777–785.
615 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2014.12.005

616 Van Vliet, J., de Groot, H.L.F., Rietveld, P., Verburg, P.H., 2015. Manifestations and underlying drivers of
617 agricultural land use change in Europe. Landscape and Urban Planning 133, 24–36.
618 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2014.09.001

619 Veldkamp, A., 2009. Investigating land dynamics: future research perspectives. Journal of Land Use Science 4,
620 5–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/17474230802645592

621 Verburg, P.H., Crossman, N., Ellis, E.C., Heinimann, A., Hostert, P., Mertz, O., Nagendra, H., Sikor, T., Erb, K.-H.,
622 Golubiewski, N., Grau, R., Grove, M., Konaté, S., Meyfroidt, P., Parker, D.C., Chowdhury, R.R., Shibata, H.,
623 Thomson, A., Zhen, L., 2015. Land system science and sustainable development of the earth system: A global
624 land project perspective. Anthropocene 12, 29–41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ancene.2015.09.004

625 Verburg, P.H., Soepboer, W., Veldkamp, A., Limpiada, R., Espaldon, V., Mastura, S.S.A., 2002. Modeling the
626 Spatial Dynamics of Regional Land Use: The CLUE-S Model. Environmental Management 30, 391–405.
627 https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-002-2630-x

628 Viedma, O., Moreno, J.M., Güngöroglu, C., Cosgun, U., Kavgacı, A., 2017. Recent land-use and land-cover
629 changes and its driving factors in a fire-prone area of southwestern Turkey. Journal of Environmental
630 Management 197, 719–731. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2017.02.074

631 Weiltin M., Zasada I., Piorr A., Debolini M., Geniaux G., Moreno-Perez O., Schererd L., Tudela Marco L., Schulp
632 C.N., 2018. Conceptualising Fields of Action for Sustainable Intensification – A systematic Literature Review
633 and Application to Regional Case Studies. Agriculture, Ecosystem and Environment 257: 68-80.

634 Zambon, I., Serra, P., Grigoriadis, E., Carlucci, M., Salvati, L., 2017. Emerging urban centrality: An entropy-
635 based indicator of polycentric development and economic growth. Land Use Policy 68, 365–371.
636 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2017.07.063

637 Zambon, I., Ferrara, A., Salvia, R., Mosconi, E., Fici, L., Turco, R., Salvati, L., 2018. Rural Districts between
638 Urbanization and Land Abandonment: Undermining Long-Term Changes in Mediterranean Landscapes.
639 Sustainability 10, 1159. https://doi.org/10.3390/su10041159
640

641