IOSR Journal Of Agriculture and Veterinary Science (IOSR-JAVS)
e-ISSN: 2319-2380, p-ISSN: 2319-2372. Volume 18, Issue 9 Ser. 1 (September. 2025), PP 19-26
www.Iosrjournals.Org

Effects Of Interspecific Interactions In Intercropping On Soil Health: A Review

Aggah Smith Akosain Agedoni, Vitoria Jesuremen Anthony,
Soumana Abdel Rachid Traore, T.J. Clovis Dakuyo
Department Of Resources And Environmental Science, China Agricultural University, China

Abstract
Intercropping, the agricultural practice of cultivating two or more crop species in proximity, is re-emerging as a cornerstone of sustainable agriculture. This review synthesizes the current understanding of how interspecific interactions—namely complementarity, facilitation, and competition within intercropping systems influence soil health. A healthy soil, characterized by its robust physical, chemical, and biological properties, is fundamental to ecosystem resilience and sustained productivity. We examine evidence demonstrating that intercropping, particularly cereal-legume combinations, significantly improves soil physical structure by enhancing aggregate stability and reducing compaction. Chemically, these systems enrich soil fertility through mechanisms like biological nitrogen fixation and increased mobilization of phosphorus, leading to higher soil organic carbon stocks. Biologically, the diversification of root systems and their exudates fosters greater microbial biomass, diversity, and enzymatic activity, which are central to nutrient cycling and soil-borne disease suppression (. The net effect on soil health is governed by a complex interplay of these interactions, which are in turn modulated by crop selection, management practices, and environmental context. While the benefits are substantial, challenges related to managing competition and optimizing system design for specific agroecological contexts remain. Future research should focus on long-term trials, multi-species systems, and the resilience of intercropping to climate change stressors. By harnessing positive interspecific interactions, intercropping offers a powerful, nature-based solution to regenerate soil health, reduce reliance on synthetic inputs, and advance the goal of global agricultural sustainability.
Keywords: *Intercropping, Soil Health, Interspecific Interactions, Nutrient Cycling, Sustainable Agriculture*

Date of Submission: 01-09-2025 Date of Acceptance: 11-09-2025

I. Introduction

The global agricultural landscape is at a critical juncture, tasked with the dual challenge of feeding a projected population of nearly 10 billion by 2050 while simultaneously mitigating its environmental footprint and adapting to a changing climate. For decades, the dominant paradigm of intensive monoculture farming, characterized by high inputs of synthetic fertilizers, pesticides, and heavy machinery, has driven unprecedented productivity gains. However, this approach has come at a significant ecological cost, leading to widespread soil degradation, including erosion, compaction, loss of organic matter, salinization, and diminished biodiversity (Martin-Guay, 2017). This degradation compromises the soil's capacity to perform its essential ecosystem functions, thereby threatening the long-term viability and resilience of our food production systems. In response, there is a growing scientific and societal imperative to transition towards more sustainable agricultural practices that can restore, maintain, and enhance soil health.

Soil health is a holistic concept that extends beyond traditional measures of soil fertility. It is defined as the continued capacity of soil to function as a vital, living ecosystem that sustains plants, animals, and humans. A healthy soil is a dynamic and complex system where physical, chemical, and biological properties are intricately linked, interacting to support a multitude of services, including nutrient cycling, water filtration and storage, carbon sequestration, and the natural suppression of pests and diseases. The biological component, encompassing the vast diversity and activity of soil microorganisms, is increasingly recognized as a primary driver and a sensitive indicator of overall soil health (Mei, 2024).

Intercropping, the traditional practice of growing two or more crop species simultaneously in the same field, is re-emerging as a powerful agroecological strategy for enhancing agricultural sustainability and rebuilding soil health (Brooker, 2014). By intentionally increasing plant diversity within the agroecosystem, intercropping leverages complex interspecific interactions to improve resource use efficiency, increase and stabilize yields, and enhance resilience to both biotic and abiotic stresses (Ebbisa, 2022). The success of these systems hinges on the net outcome of three primary types of interactions between the component species: competition, where species negatively affect each other by vying for the same limited resources (e.g., light, water, nutrients) ; complementarity, where species utilize resources differently in time or space, thereby reducing direct competition and leading to more complete resource capture (Zhang, 2003); and facilitation, where one species has a direct or indirect positive effect on another, for instance, by improving nutrient availability (Li, 2014).

These interspecific interactions are not confined to the aboveground environment; they extend belowground, profoundly influencing the soil's physical, chemical, and biological landscape. The diversification of plant species introduces a variety of root architectures, depths, and exudate profiles, which in turn restructure the soil matrix and modulate the composition and function of the soil microbiome (You, 2024). This review aims to synthesize the current body of knowledge, drawing from a wide range of peer-reviewed literature, to elucidate the multifaceted effects of interspecific interactions in intercropping systems on soil health. We will explore the specific mechanisms through which these interactions modify soil properties and discuss the broader implications for designing sustainable, resilient, and productive agricultural systems for the future.

II. Methods

This review is based on a comprehensive synthesis of peer-reviewed literature obtained from major scientific databases, including Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar. The search strategy employed a combination of keywords such as "intercropping," "polyculture," "mixed cropping," "soil health," "soil quality," "interspecific interactions," "nutrient cycling," "soil structure," "microbial community," "carbon sequestration," and "disease suppression." The selection of references prioritized studies that provided mechanistic insights into the effects of intercropping on soil properties, long-term field experiments, and recent research utilizing advanced analytical techniques (e.g., metagenomics, metabolomics). Foundational papers and highly cited reviews were included to provide historical context and theoretical framing. The synthesized information was organized according to the three primary pillars of soil health physical, chemical, and biological to provide a structured and comprehensive overview of the topic.

III. Effects On Physical Soil Health

The physical condition of soil, encompassing its structure, porosity, and water relations, forms the essential framework for plant growth and is highly sensitive to agricultural management. Interspecific interactions in intercropping systems can induce significant improvements in physical soil health, primarily by diversifying root growth patterns and stimulating the biological activity that builds and stabilizes soil structure.

Soil Structure and Aggregate Stability

A well-aggregated soil structure, with a mix of pore sizes, is crucial for root penetration, gas exchange, water infiltration, and resistance to erosion. Intercropping systems, especially those that combine species with contrasting root architectures, such as deep-tap rooted legumes and fibrous-rooted cereals, create a more complex and extensive root network that permeates the soil profile more effectively than monocultures (Li, 2005). This diverse root architecture creates a network of biopores and physically enmeshes soil particles, providing a structural foundation for aggregation. Furthermore, the variety of root exudates released by different plant species stimulates a more diverse and active microbial community (Ma, 2024). These microbes, particularly arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) and certain bacteria, produce extracellular polysaccharides and other binding agents like glomalin, which act as a biological glue, cementing individual soil particles into stable macro- and microaggregates. While direct measurements of aggregate stability are not always the primary focus of intercropping studies, these improvements are a well-recognized indirect benefit of enhanced biological health and increased organic matter inputs (Liang, 2024; Zaeem, 2019). This enhanced aggregate stability makes the soil less susceptible to degradation from physical forces like tillage, raindrop impact, and wind, thereby reducing erosion risk.

Bulk Density and Water Relations

Soil compaction, characterized by high bulk density, is a pervasive problem in modern agriculture that restricts root growth, reduces aeration, and impedes water movement. The continuous creation and decay of diverse root channels in intercropping systems, coupled with the accumulation of soil organic matter, helps to alleviate compaction and lower bulk density over time. The resulting improvement in soil structure, with greater macroporosity, directly enhances water infiltration rates. A study on soy-wheat relay intercropping, for example, found that the practice maintained higher near-saturated soil water infiltration rates compared to sole wheat, reducing the potential for surface runoff and water erosion (Thompson, 2024).

Simultaneously, the increase in stable microaggregates and soil organic matter content improves the soil's water-holding capacity, making more water available to plants during dry periods. This is particularly beneficial in water-limited environments where efficient water capture and use are critical for crop survival and productivity (Gong, 2020; Liang, 2023). However, the net effect on soil physical health is not universally positive and depends on system management. In systems where, intense interspecific competition for light leads to poor canopy development, reduced ground cover can leave the soil surface more exposed to the erosive forces of wind and rain. Therefore, proper species selection and spatial arrangement, such as managing the proportion of border rows to optimize light distribution, are critical to maximizing positive outcomes for physical soil health (Wang, 2020).

IV. Effects On Chemical Soil Health

The chemical properties of soil, including nutrient availability, pH, and organic matter content, are direct determinants of soil fertility and plant productivity. Interspecific interactions in intercropping systems can profoundly alter soil chemistry, often leading to a more fertile, nutrient-retentive, and self-regulating environment that reduces the dependency on external inputs.

Nutrient Cycling and Availability

One of the most consistently documented benefits of intercropping is the enhancement of nutrient cycling, driven by the powerful interplay of complementarity and facilitation (Zhang, 2003). The inclusion of legumes in intercropping systems is a cornerstone of this benefit (Layek, 2018). Legumes, through their symbiotic relationship with rhizobia bacteria, perform biological nitrogen fixation (BNF), converting atmospheric N_2 into plant-available forms like ammonia (Ofori, 1987). This fixed nitrogen not only supports the legume's own growth but can also be transferred to a non-legume companion crop, such as a cereal, through root exudation, decomposition of senesced nodules and roots, and via common mycorrhizal networks. This process can significantly reduce the need for synthetic N fertilizers and minimize environmental risks like nitrate leaching and nitrous oxide emissions (Duan, 2023). Over the long term, this leads to a net accumulation of nitrogen in the soil. A seven-year field experiment demonstrated that intercropped plots had 11% more soil organic N than their sole cropped counterparts (Cong, 2014). Specific interspecific root interactions, mediated by compounds like benzoxazinoids, have been shown to directly promote N uptake in intercropped plants (Luo, 2025).

Phosphorus (P) is another critical nutrient that is often a limiting factor in agricultural soils due to its low solubility and fixation to soil minerals. Certain plant species can enhance P availability through facilitation (Hinsinger, 2011). These species release organic acids (carboxylates) and enzymes (phosphatases) from their roots, which can solubilize phosphorus bound to soil minerals, making it accessible to themselves and neighboring plants that lack this capability (Li, 2014). Similar facilitative interactions have been observed for micronutrients. For instance, on high-pH calcareous soils where iron (Fe) availability is low, graminaceous crops like maize release phytosiderophores to chelate and acquire Fe. These chelates can also be utilized by companion crops like peanuts, alleviating Fe deficiency and improving growth (Jiao, 2021). This process is often mediated by the rhizosphere microbiome, where intercropping enriches siderophore-secreting bacteria like *Pseudomonas*, leading to improved iron nutrition and yield for the companion crop (Wang, 2024).

Soil Organic Carbon (SOC) and pH

Soil organic carbon is a master variable for soil health, profoundly influencing soil structure, water retention, nutrient supply, and microbial activity. Intercropping systems typically have higher overall biomass production (both above- and below-ground) than monocultures due to more efficient and complete capture of resources like light, water, and nutrients (Willey, 1990). This increased input of diverse plant residues (leaves, stems, and roots) to the soil, combined with potentially altered soil carbon emission efficiencies (Wang, 2023), can lead to a net accumulation of SOC over time. The aforementioned long-term study by Cong et al. (2014) found that intercropping increased topsoil organic C content by 4% over seven years, equivalent to a sequestration rate of 184 ± 86 kg C ha^{-1} yr^{-1} (Cong, 2014).

The effect of intercropping on soil pH is more complex and context-dependent. The process of biological nitrogen fixation by legumes is inherently acidifying, as it involves the release of protons (H^+) into the rhizosphere to maintain charge balance. In some cases, this can lead to a measurable reduction in rhizosphere pH (Zaeem, 2019). Conversely, plant uptake of nitrate (NO_3^-), a dominant form of N in many agricultural soils, is an alkalizing process. The net change in bulk soil pH therefore depends on the balance between these processes, the specific crop species involved, the form of nitrogen being cycled, and the initial buffering capacity of the soil. While some legume-heavy systems may cause slight acidification over time, this is often localized to the rhizosphere and can even be beneficial in alkaline soils by increasing the availability of P and micronutrients.

Table 1: Observed Changes in Key Soil Chemical Properties in Intercropping Systems

Soil Property	Observed Change	Primary Mechanism(s)	Key References
Soil Organic Nitrogen (SON)	Increase	Biological Nitrogen Fixation (BNF) by legumes; Increased biomass input; Reduced N losses.	(Cong, 2014; Ofori, 1987)
Available Phosphorus (P)	Increase	Rhizosphere acidification; Release of phosphatases and organic acids; Enhanced mycorrhizal activity.	(Li, 2014; Hinsinger, 2011)

Soil Property	Observed Change	Primary Mechanism(s)	Key References
Available Iron (Fe)	Increase	Release of phytosiderophores by graminaceous crops; Enrichment of siderophore-secreting microbes.	(Wang, 2024; Luo, 2025)
Soil Organic Carbon (SOC)	Increase	Higher total biomass production (above- and below-ground); Diverse residue inputs.	(Cong, 2014; Wang, 2023)
Soil pH	Variable (often decrease in rhizosphere)	Proton release during BNF; Uptake of different N forms; Release of organic acids.	(Zaeem, 2019)

V. Effects On Biological Soil Health

The soil is home to a staggering diversity of organisms—from microbes to macrofauna—that form a complex food web. This biological community is the living engine of soil health, driving nutrient cycling, organic matter decomposition, soil structure formation, and disease suppression. Interspecific interactions among plants in intercropping systems create a more heterogeneous and resource-rich belowground environment that stimulates a more abundant, diverse, and active soil biological community.

Microbial Biomass, Diversity, and Activity

The ecological principle that "diversity begets diversity" holds true for the intimate link between plants and soil microbes. Monocultures release a relatively uniform profile of root exudates, which supports a specialized and less diverse microbial community. In contrast, intercropping systems, with two or more plant species coexisting, release a complex cocktail of sugars, amino acids, organic acids, and secondary metabolites into the rhizosphere (Luo, 2025). This greater diversity of carbon sources and signaling molecules provides a wider array of ecological niches, supporting a more diverse and abundant microbial community (Ma, 2024; Zhang, 2023).Recent studies using metagenomic approaches have quantified this effect, showing that soybean-poplar intercropping increased the abundance of microbial genes related to carbon metabolism, nitrogen cycling, phosphorus cycling, and sulfur cycling (You, 2024). This larger and more functionally diverse microbial population, in turn, exhibits higher overall metabolic activity. The activity of key soil enzymes involved in nutrient cycling—such as sucrase, urease, and β-1,4-glucosidase—is often significantly elevated in intercropped soils compared to monocultures (Xie, 2024). This heightened enzymatic activity accelerates the decomposition of organic matter and the mineralization of nutrients, making them more readily available for plant uptake. The structure of the entire soil food web can be altered, as indicated by changes in nematode community indices, which often show a shift toward more complex, fungus-dominated, and structured food webs in intercropping systems (Liang, 2024).

Mycorrhizal Fungi and Disease Suppression

Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi (AMF) are critical soil symbionts that form extensive hyphal networks, connecting with the roots of most terrestrial plants and extending far into the soil matrix. These networks are vital for enhancing plant uptake of immobile nutrients like phosphorus and zinc, and for improving water acquisition, which can confer greater drought resistance (Li, 2024). Intercropping systems are highly conducive to the proliferation of AMF. For example, a study on sugarcane-peanut intercropping demonstrated that the practice boosted the abundance and diversity of beneficial AMF communities (Fallah, 2023). The presence of multiple compatible host species can support a more diverse AMF community and lead to the formation of common mycorrhizal networks (CMNs) that can link the roots of different plants, facilitating inter-plant nutrient transfer and signaling.

The increased microbial diversity in intercropped soils can also contribute significantly to the suppression of soil-borne plant diseases (Boudreau, 2013). A diverse community of non-pathogenic microbes can outcompete pathogens for resources (competitive exclusion) or produce antibiotic compounds that directly inhibit pathogen growth (antagonism). A compelling example is the intercropping of tobacco with marigold, which significantly reduced the incidence of tobacco bacterial wilt by enriching beneficial bacterial and fungal genera like *Lysobacter*, *Burkholderia*, *Trichoderma*, and *Chaetomium* in the rhizosphere (Li, 2020). Similarly, intercropping can enrich entomopathogenic fungi that help control insect pests, adding another layer of biological control (Fallah, 2023; Khan, 1997). However, it is important to note that not all microbial interactions are predictable or universally positive; different cropping regimes can lead to highly complex and sometimes unexpected changes in microbial community structures, highlighting the need for careful system design and species selection (Granzow, 2017).

Table 2: Core Biological Indicators and Their Response to Intercropping

Biological Indicator	Typical Response in Intercropping	Underlying Mechanism(s)	Key References
Microbial Biomass	Increase	Greater quantity and diversity of root exudates and litter inputs.	(Zaeem, 2019)

Biological Indicator	Typical Response in Intercropping	Underlying Mechanism(s)	Key References
Microbial Diversity	Increase	Increased niche diversity from multiple plant species' root systems and exudates.	(Ma, 2024; You, 2024)
Enzyme Activity	Increase	Higher microbial biomass and functional diversity lead to greater production of extracellular enzymes.	(Xie, 2024)
AM Fungi Abundance	Increase	Presence of multiple compatible host plants supports a larger and more diverse AMF community.	(Fallah, 2023; Li, 2024)
Beneficial Microbes	Enrichment	Specific root exudates select for antagonistic or plant-growth-promoting microbes.	(Li, 2020)
Soil Food Web Structure	Increased Complexity	Diversified basal resources (roots, microbes) support higher trophic levels (e.g., omnivore-predator nematodes).	(Liang, 2024; Ikoyi, 2023)

Table 3: Intercropping for Managing Soil Contamination

Management Goal	Intercropping Strategy	Mechanism	Key References
Phytoremediation of Heavy Metals	Intercropping a main crop (e.g., rice) with a hyperaccumulator (e.g., mugwort).	Interspecific root interactions increase organic acid exudation, enhancing the bioavailability and uptake of metals like Cadmium (Cd) by both plants.	(Chen, 2023)
Degradation of Organic Pollutants	Mycorrhizal-assisted intercropping (e.g., poplar and alfalfa) on contaminated sites.	Enhanced microbial activity and diversity in the rhizosphere, stimulated by diverse root systems and mycorrhizal inoculation, accelerates the breakdown of pollutants like petroleum hydrocarbons.	(Gómez-Sagasti, 2021)

VI. Mechanisms, Context, And Management

The observed improvements in soil health within intercropping systems are not automatic but are the emergent properties of complex underlying mechanisms driven by interspecific interactions. The magnitude and even the direction of these effects are highly dependent on the specific context, including the choice of crops, the prevailing climate and soil type, and the management practices employed. Understanding these factors is crucial for designing and optimizing intercropping systems for specific agroecological goals.

Key Mechanisms at Play

The net benefit of intercropping arises from a delicate balance where the positive effects of complementarity and facilitation outweigh the ever-present negative force of competition (Zhang, 2003).Niche Complementarity: This is arguably the most fundamental mechanism. By selecting species with different resource-acquisition strategies, intercropping allows for a more complete utilization of available resources in space and time (Willey, 1990). Spatial complementarity occurs when a deep-rooted crop like alfalfa accesses water and nutrients from lower soil horizons, while a shallow, fibrous-rooted companion crop like wheat utilizes resources in the topsoil (Ma, 2024). Temporal complementarity happens when the periods of peak resource demand for the component crops do not overlap. For example, the initial slow growth of pigeonpea relative to maize minimizes early-season competition, allowing both crops to thrive (Center, 2017). This spatio-temporal niche differentiation is a key strategy for maximizing overall resource capture and productivity, often leading to "overyielding," where the intercrop produces more than the weighted average of the sole crops, as quantified by the Land Equivalent Ratio (LER) (Mead, 1980).This occurs when one plant creates more favorable growing conditions for another. The classic examples, as discussed, are the transfer of fixed nitrogen from legumes to cereals and the mobilization of soil phosphorus and micronutrients by root exudates (Ebbisa, 2022; Li, 2014). These facilitative processes are often not direct plant-to-plant interactions but are mediated by the soil microbiome, where the exudates from one plant recruit and support beneficial microbes that then assist the companion crop in nutrient acquisition or stress tolerance (You, 2024).

Contextual Factors and Management Implications

The success of intercropping is not guaranteed and depends heavily on tailoring the system to local conditions and management choices (Brooker, 2014). The selection of compatible species is the most critical factor. Cereal-legume combinations are consistently successful due to their strong complementarity for nitrogen and light (Ofori, 1987). However, even within a given combination, the specific genotypes and their "production syndromes" (i.e., traits related to resource acquisition and growth) can significantly impact the outcome (Li, 2020). The spatial arrangement of crops, such as alternating single rows versus wider strips, is a key management lever that alters the interface between species, thereby determining the balance between competition and facilitation (Li, 2001).The benefits of intercropping can be particularly pronounced in low-input, resource-limited environments where facilitation and complementarity provide a significant relative advantage over monocultures. Conversely, in highly fertile environments, competition may become the dominant interaction. In semi-arid regions, intense competition for water can negate other benefits if not managed carefully with appropriate species choice, planting densities, and timing (Li, 2024). Even in temperate climates, abiotic stresses like drought can negate potential soil health benefits if one of the intercropped species is disproportionately affected, disrupting the system's balance (Thompson, 2024).The benefits of intercropping can be significantly amplified when integrated into a broader system of sustainable practices. Combining intercropping with conservation tillage (e.g., no-till or minimum tillage) can maximize improvements in soil structure and accelerate organic carbon sequestration. The management of the diverse crop residues produced in intercropping systems is also crucial; returning this biomass to the soil is essential for building long-term soil health and fertility.

Table 4: Intercropping as a Soil Restoration Strategy

Restoration Goal	Intercropping Approach	Mechanism of Action	Key References
Rebuilding Soil Organic Matter	High-biomass cereal-legume intercrops (e.g., maize-faba bean).	Increased total C input from roots and shoots; diverse litter quality promotes microbial C use efficiency.	(Cong, 2014)
Improving Nutrient-Depleted Soils	Intercropping with deep-rooted legumes (e.g., alfalfa) or P-mobilizing species.	Biological N fixation adds new N to the system; deep roots "mine" nutrients from lower soil layers; P-mobilizing species unlock fixed P.	(Li, 2014; Ofori, 1987)
Restoring Degraded Grasslands	Introducing diverse legumes and herbs into grass monocultures.	Increased plant diversity enhances soil microbial diversity and function, improving nutrient cycling and soil structure.	(Ikoyi, 2023)

VII. Future Directions And Knowledge Gaps

While the benefits of intercropping for soil health are well-established, significant knowledge gaps remain that must be addressed to optimize these systems for widespread adoption and to meet future agricultural challenges. The vast majority of intercropping studies are short-term, spanning only one to three growing seasons. Soil properties, particularly stable soil organic carbon pools and the deep-soil microbiome, respond slowly to changes in management. There is a critical need for more long-term experimental platforms (10+ years) to understand the cumulative and potentially non-linear effects of intercropping on soil health. Studies like the seven-year experiment by Cong et al. (2014) are invaluable but remain rare (Cong, 2014). Research has predominantly focused on simple, two-species intercrops. The potential of more complex polycultures (three or more species), sometimes called multi-species mixtures or cover crop "cocktails," to further enhance soil health and provide a wider array of ecosystem services is largely unexplored in row-crop agriculture. Investigating these systems will require new experimental designs and advanced analytical approaches to disentangle the complex web of direct and indirect interspecific interactions (Sutton, 2025).

A key question for the 21st century is how intercropping systems will perform under the increasing stresses of climate change, including prolonged droughts, heatwaves, and extreme precipitation events. Research is needed to determine if the enhanced soil health and resource-use efficiency in intercropping systems translate into greater agroecosystem resilience and yield stability. Studies investigating intercropping under simulated drought conditions are a crucial first step in this direction (Li, 2024). The increasing threat of salinization in both coastal and inland wetlands and agricultural areas also presents a challenge where the resilience of different cropping systems needs to be evaluated (Herbert, 2015). While we have a good conceptual understanding of the mechanisms, the intricate details of root-root and root-microbe interactions remain a "black box." Advanced techniques such as stable isotope probing, metagenomics (You, 2024), and rhizosphere metabolomics (Luo, 2025) are needed to trace nutrient flows, identify key microbial players, and unravel the complex chemical signaling that governs these interactions. Understanding these processes at the appropriate spatial, temporal, and phylogenetic scales is crucial for building predictive models of community assembly and function (Ladau, 2019).For intercropping to be adopted at scale, research must also address the practical barriers faced by farmers. These include challenges related to mechanization for planting and harvesting, effective and economical weed management strategies (Liebman, 1993), market development for multiple crops, and overall economic profitability and risk reduction (Baishya, 2020). Integrating biophysical research with agricultural engineering, economics, and social science is essential for developing practical, scalable, and attractive intercropping systems (Brooker, 2014).

Table 5: Evidence-Based Soil Health Management Strategies in Intercropping

Strategy	Objective	Key Management Considerations	Supporting Evidence
Cereal-Legume Pairing	Enhance N fertility and SOC.	Select compatible species (e.g., maize/peanut); ensure good legume establishment.	(Liang, 2024; Ofori, 1987)
Strip Intercropping	Balance competition and facilitation; allow for mechanization.	Optimize strip width and border-row proportions.	(Li, 2001; Wang, 2020)
Relay Intercropping	Extend soil cover and temporal niche differentiation.	Manage planting dates to minimize competition with the primary crop.	(Thompson, 2024)
Intercropping with Functional Plants	Suppress pests/diseases or remediate soil.	Select plants with known biocidal (e.g., marigold) or hyperaccumulating properties.	(Li, 2020; Chen, 2023)

VIII. Conclusion

Interspecific interactions within intercropping systems are a powerful and often underutilized driver of soil health regeneration. By strategically combining complementary and facilitative plant species, intercropping enhances soil physical structure, enriches soil chemical fertility, and stimulates a diverse and active biological community. The core mechanisms underpinning these widespread benefits—including spatio-temporal niche differentiation (Willey, 1990), biological nitrogen fixation (Ofori, 1987), facilitation of nutrient mobilization (Li, 2014), and the fostering of beneficial microbial symbionts and communities (You, 2024)—represent a paradigm shift from input-intensive agriculture to knowledge-intensive, ecologically-based farming. Cereal-legume systems, in particular, exemplify the immense potential of harnessing these natural interactions to create more productive, resilient, and self-sustaining agroecosystems (Layek, 2018).

The effectiveness of intercropping is inherently context-dependent, requiring careful, site-specific consideration of crop choice, climate, soil type, and management. However, the consistent and growing body of evidence demonstrating its positive impacts on nearly every facet of soil health positions it as a key strategy for the sustainable intensification of agriculture (Martin-Guay, 2017). It offers a tangible pathway to reduce reliance on synthetic fertilizers, enhance soil carbon sequestration (Cong, 2014), conserve biodiversity, and build agroecosystem resilience to environmental shocks. As we move forward, a concerted effort involving continued research to fill critical knowledge gaps, coupled with supportive policy and extension services to facilitate farmer adoption, will be crucial to unlocking the full potential of intercropping. By working with, rather than against, nature's principles of diversity and interaction, we can cultivate healthier soils that are capable of supporting both a productive agricultural sector and a healthy planet for generations to come.

References

[1]. Baishya, L, Jamir, T, Walling, N, & Rajkhowa, D (2020). Evaluation Of Maize (Zea Mays L.) + Legume Intercropping System For Productivity, Profitability, Energy Budgeting And Soil Health In Hill Terraces Of Eastern Himalayan Region. Legume Research - An International Journal, (Of). Https://Doi.Org/10.18805/Lr-4190

[2]. Boudreau, M (2013). Diseases In Intercropping Systems. Annual Review Of Phytopathology, 51(1), 499-519. Https://Doi.Org/10.1146/Annurev-Phyto-082712-102246

[3]. Brooker, R, Bennett, A, Cong, W, Daniell, T, George, T, Hallett, P, Hawes, C, Iannetta, P, Jones, H, Karley, A, Li, L, Mckenzie, B, Pakeman, R, Paterson, E, Schöb, C, Shen, J, Squire, G, Watson, C, Zhang, C, ... White, P (2014). Improving Intercropping: A Synthesis Of Research In Agronomy, Plant Physiology And Ecology. New Phytologist, 206(1), 107-117. Https://Doi.Org/10.1111/Nph.13132

[4]. Center, W, & Agriculture, S (2017). Africa RISING Tanzania- Intensifying Maize-Based Cropping Systems Through Pigeonpea Integrations. Harvard Dataverse, . Https://Doi.Org/10.7910/Dvn/Vs4fbu

[5]. Chen, X, Zhang, Z, Song, X, Deng, Z, Xu, C, Huang, D, & Qin, X (2023). Interspecific Root Interaction Enhances Cadmium Accumulation In Oryza Sativa When Intercropping With Cadmium Accumulator Artemisia Argyi. Ecotoxicology And Environmental Safety, 269, 115788-115788. Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Ecoenv.2023.115788

[6]. Cong, W, Hoffland, E, Li, L, Six, J, Jian-Hao, S, Bao, X, Zhang, F, & Werf, W (2014). Intercropping Enhances Soil Carbon And Nitrogen. Global Change Biology, 21(4), 1715-1726. Https://Doi.Org/10.1111/Gcb.12738

[7]. Duan, M, Li, Y, Zhu, G, Wu, X, Huang, H, Qin, J, Long, S, Li, X, Feng, B, Qin, S, Liu, Q, Li, C, Wang, L, Li, Q, He, T, & Wang, Z (2023). Soil Chemistry, Metabarcoding, And Metabolome Analyses Reveal That A Sugarcane—Dictyophora Indusiata Intercropping System Can Enhance Soil Health By Reducing Soil Nitrogen Loss. Frontiers In Microbiology, 14. Https://Doi.Org/10.3389/Fmicb.2023.1193990

[8]. Ebbisa, A (2022). Mechanisms Underlying Cereal/Legume Intercropping As Nature-Based Biofortification: A Review. Food Production Processing And Nutrition, 4(1). Https://Doi.Org/10.1186/S43014-022-00096-Y

[9]. Fallah, N, Pang, Z, Zhou, Y, Yuan, Z, & Lin, W (2023). Sugarcane-Peanut Intercropping Stimulatory Effects On Arbuscular Mycorrhizal And Entomopathogenic Fungi Promote Soil Health And Crop Productivity. Field Crops Research, 303, 109110-109110. Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Fcr.2023.109110

[10]. Gong, X, Dang, K, Lv, S, Zhao, G, Tian, L, Luo, Y, & Baili, F (2020). Interspecific Root Interactions And Water-Use Efficiency Of Intercropped Proso Millet And Mung Bean. European Journal Of Agronomy, 115, 126034-126034. Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Eja.2020.126034

[11]. Granzow, S, Kaiser, K, Wemheuer, B, Pfeiffer, B, Daniel, R, Vidal, S, & Wemheuer, F (2017). The Effects Of Cropping Regimes On Fungal And Bacterial Communities Of Wheat And Faba Bean In A Greenhouse Pot Experiment Differ Between Plant Species And Compartment. Frontiers In Microbiology, 8. Https://Doi.Org/10.3389/Fmicb.2017.00902

[12]. Gómez-Sagasti, M, Garbisu, C, Urra, J, Míguez, F, Artetxe, U, Hernández, A, Vilela, J, Alkorta, I, & Becerril, J (2021). Mycorrhizal-Assisted Phytoremediation And Intercropping Strategies Improved The Health Of Contaminated Soil In A Peri-Urban Area. Frontiers In Plant Science, 12. Https://Doi.Org/10.3389/Fpls.2021.693044

[13]. Herbert, E, Boon, P, Burgin, A, Neubauer, S, Franklin, R, Ardón, M, Hopfensperger, K, Lamers, L, & Gell, P (2015). A Global Perspective On Wetland Salinization: Ecological Consequences Of A Growing Threat To Freshwater Wetlands. Ecosphere, 6(10), 1-43. Https://Doi.Org/10.1890/Es14-00534.1

[14]. Hinsinger, P, Bétencourt, E, Bernard, L, Brauman, A, Plassard, C, Shen, J, Tang, X, & Zhang, F (2011). P For Two, Sharing A Scarce Resource: Soil Phosphorus Acquisition In The Rhizosphere Of Intercropped Species. PLANT PHYSIOLOGY, 156(3), 1078-1086. Https://Doi.Org/10.1104/Pp.111.175331

[15]. Ikoyi, I, Grange, G, Finn, J, & Brennan, F (2023). Plant Diversity Enhanced Nematode-Based Soil Quality Indices And Changed Soil Nematode Community Structure In Intensively-Managed Agricultural Grasslands. European Journal Of Soil Biology, 118, 103542-103542. Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Ejsobi.2023.103542

[16]. Jiao, N, Wang, F, Ma, C, Zhang, F, & Jensen, E (2021). Interspecific Interactions Of Iron And Nitrogen Use In Peanut (Arachis Hypogaea L.)-Maize (Zea Mays L.) Intercropping On A Calcareous Soil. European Journal Of Agronomy, 128, 126303-126303. Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Eja.2021.126303

[17]. Jiao, N, Wang, J, Ma, C, Zhang, C, Guo, D, Zhang, F, & Jensen, E (2021). The Importance Of Aboveground And Belowground Interspecific Interactions In Determining Crop Growth And Advantages Of Peanut/Maize Intercropping. The Crop Journal, 9(6), 1460-1469. Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Cj.2020.12.004

[18]. Khan, Z, Ampong-Nyarko, K, Chiliswa, P, Hassanali, A, Kimani, S, Lwande, W, Overholt, W, Overholt, W, Picketta, J, Smart, L, & Woodcock, C (1997). Intercropping Increases Parasitism Of Pests. Nature, 388(6643), 631-632. Https://Doi.Org/10.1038/41681

[19]. Ladau, J, & Eloe-Fadrosh, E (2019). Spatial, Temporal, And Phylogenetic Scales Of Microbial Ecology. Trends In Microbiology, 27(8), 662-669. Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Tim.2019.03.003

[20]. Layek, J, Das, A, Mitran, T, Nath, C, Meena, R, Yadav, G, Shivakumar, B, Kumar, S, & Lal, R (2018). Cereal+Legume Intercropping: An Option For Improving Productivity And Sustaining Soil Health. Springer Ebooks, , 347-386. Https://Doi.Org/10.1007/978-981-13-0253-4_11

[21]. Liang, S, Feng, C, Li, N, Sun, Z, Li, Y, Zhang, X, & Liang, W (2024). Soil Biological Health Assessment Based On Nematode Communities Under Maize And Peanut Intercropping. Ecological Processes, 13(1). Https://Doi.Org/10.1186/S13717-024-00562-0

[22]. Liang, X, Kayler, Z, Rein, I, Shaber, J, & Sapkota, B (2023). Barley–Pulse Intercropping Improves Resource Use Efficiency And Soil Health. Crops & Soils, 56(6), 10-13. Https://Doi.Org/10.1002/Crso.20324

[23]. Liebman, M, & Dyck, E (1993). Crop Rotation And Intercropping Strategies For Weed Management. Ecological Applications, 3(1), 92-122. Https://Doi.Org/10.2307/1941795

[24]. Li, C, Hoffland, E, Kuyper, T, Yu, Y, Zhang, C, Li, H, Zhang, F, & Werf, W (2020). Syndromes Of Production In Intercropping Impact Yield Gains. Nature Plants, 6(6), 653-660. Https://Doi.Org/10.1038/S41477-020-0680-9

[25]. Li, L, Sun, J, Zhang, F, Guo, T, Bao, X, SMITH, F, & Smith, S (2005). Root Distribution And Interactions Between Intercropped Species. Oecologia, 147(2), 280-290. Https://Doi.Org/10.1007/S00442-005-0256-4

[26]. Li, L, Sun, J, Zhang, F, Li, X, Yang, S, & Rengel, Z (2001). Wheat/Maize Or Wheat/Soybean Strip Intercropping. Field Crops Research, 71(2), 123-137. Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/S0378-4290(01)00156-3

[27]. Li, L, Tilman, D, Lambers, H, & Zhang, F (2014). Plant Diversity And Overyielding: Insights From Belowground Facilitation Of Intercropping In Agriculture. New Phytologist, 203(1), 63-69. Https://Doi.Org/10.1111/Nph.12778

[28]. Li, S (2024). Intercropping Perennial Cereal And Legumes For Improving Biological Soil Health And Microbial Drought Resilience. Acta Universitatis Agriculturae Sueciae, . Https://Doi.Org/10.54612/A.4ve4ma46ur

[29]. Li, Y, Feng, J, Zheng, L, Huang, J, Yang, Y, & Li, X (2020). Intercropping With Marigold Promotes Soil Health And Microbial Structure To Assist In Mitigating Tobacco Bacterial Wilt. Journal Of Plant Pathology, 102(3), 731-742. Https://Doi.Org/10.1007/S42161-020-00490-W

[30]. Luo, C, Wang, X, Ding, H, Yang, S, Wan, S, & Dong, Y (2025). Rhizosphere Metabolomics Reveals Benzoxazinoid-Mediated Interspecific Root Interactions That Promote N And Fe Uptake In Intercropped Plants. Soil Biology And Biochemistry, , 109792-109792. Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Soilbio.2025.109792

[31]. Martin-Guay, M, Paquette, A, Dupras, J, & Rivest, D (2017). The New Green Revolution: Sustainable Intensification Of Agriculture By Intercropping. The Science Of The Total Environment, 615, 767-772. Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Scitotenv.2017.10.024

[32]. Ma, H, Surigaoge, S, Xu, Y, Li, Y, Christie, P, Zhang, W, & Li, L (2024). Responses Of Soil Microbial Community Diversity And Co-Occurrence Networks To Interspecific Interactions In Soybean/Maize And Peanut/Maize Intercropping Systems. Applied Soil Ecology, 203, 105613-105613. Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Apsoil.2024.105613

[33]. Ma, Q, Wu, Y, Liu, Y, Shen, Y, & Wang, Z (2024). Interspecific Interaction And Productivity In A Dryland Wheat/Alfalfa Strip Intercropping. Field Crops Research, 309, 109335-109335. Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Fcr.2024.109335

[34]. Mead, R, & Willey, R (1980). The Concept Of A 'Land Equivalent Ratio' And Advantages In Yields From Intercropping. Experimental Agriculture, 16(3), 217-228. Https://Doi.Org/10.1017/S0014479700010978

[35]. Mei, L, Hu, J, Wei, Z, Jousset, A, Pommier, T, Yu, X, Xu, Y, & Shen, Q (2024). Synthetic Microbial Communities: Sandbox And Blueprint For Soil Health Enhancement. Imeta, 3(1). Https://Doi.Org/10.1002/Imt2.172

[36]. Ofori, F, & Stern, W (1987). Cereal–Legume Intercropping Systems. Advances In Agronomy, , 41-90. Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/S0065-2113(08)60802-0

[37]. Sutton, E, Snapp, S, Morrone, V, & Blesh, J (2025). Cover Crop Functional Trait Plasticity In Response To Soil Conditions And Interspecific Interactions. Plant And Soil, . Https://Doi.Org/10.1007/S11104-025-07471-X

[38]. Thompson, J, Döring, T, Bowles, T, Kolb, S, Bellingrath-Kimura, S, & Reckling, M (2024). Seasonal Soil Health Dynamics In Soy-Wheat Relay Intercropping. Scientific Reports, 14(1). Https://Doi.Org/10.1038/S41598-024-69903-5

[39]. Wang, N, Wang, T, Chen, Y, Wang, M, Lu, Q, Wang, K, Dou, Z, Chi, Z, Qiu, W, Dai, J, Niu, L, Cui, J, Wei, Z, Zhang, F, Kümmerli, R, & Zuo, Y (2024). Microbiome Convergence Enables Siderophore-Secreting-Rhizobacteria To Improve Iron Nutrition And Yield Of Peanut Intercropped With Maize. Nature Communications, 15(1). Https://Doi.Org/10.1038/S41467-024-45207-0

[40]. Wang, R, Sun, Z, Zhang, L, Yang, N, Feng, L, Bai, W, Zhang, D, Wang, Q, Evers, J, Liu, Y, Ren, J, Zhang, Y, & Werf, W (2020). Border-Row Proportion Determines Strength Of Interspecific Interactions And Crop Yields In Maize/Peanut Strip Intercropping. Field Crops Research, 253, 107819-107819. Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Fcr.2020.107819

[41]. Wang, W, Li, M, Zhou, R, Zhu, S, Tao, H, Khan, A, Uzamurera, A, Wang, B, Jin, J, Ma, Y, Li, W, Tao, X, & Xiong, Y (2023). Effects Of Interspecific Interactions On Soil Carbon Emission And Efficiency In The Semiarid Intercropping Systems. Soil And Tillage Research, 234, 105857-105857. Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Still.2023.105857

[42]. Willey, R (1990). Resource Use In Intercropping Systems. Agricultural Water Management, 17(1-3), 215-231. Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/0378-3774(90)90069-B

[43]. Xie, Y, Jing, Y, Wang, Y, Zheng, R, Xu, Q, Sun, Z, & Duan, T (2024). Leguminous Green Manure Intercropping Promotes Soil Health In A Citrus (Citrus Reticulata) Orchard. Agriculture, 14(11), 1897-1897. Https://Doi.Org/10.3390/Agriculture14111897

[44]. You, Y, Wang, L, Liu, X, Wang, X, Jiang, L, Ding, C, Wang, W, Zhang, D, & Zhao, X (2024). Interspecific Plant Interaction Structures The Microbiomes Of Poplar-Soil Interface To Alter Nutrient Cycling And Utilization. Microbiology Spectrum, 12(2). Https://Doi.Org/10.1128/Spectrum.03368-23

[45]. Zaeem, M, Nadeem, M, Pham, T, Ashiq, W, Ali, W, Gilani, S, Elavarthi, S, Kavanagh, V, Cheema, M, Galagedara, L, & Thomas, R (2019). The Potential Of Corn-Soybean Intercropping To Improve The Soil Health Status And Biomass Production In Cool Climate Boreal Ecosystems. Scientific Reports, 9(1). Https://Doi.Org/10.1038/S41598-019-49558-3

[46]. Zhang, F, & Li, L (2003). Using Competitive And Facilitative Interactions In Intercropping Systems Enhances Crop Productivity And Nutrient-Use Efficiency. Plant And Soil, 248(1/2), 305-312. Https://Doi.Org/10.1023/A:1022352229863

[47]. Zhang, G, Yang, H, Zhang, W, Bezemer, T, Liang, W, Li, Q, & Li, L (2023). Interspecific Interactions Between Crops Influence Soil Functional Groups And Networks In A Maize/Soybean Intercropping System. Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment, 355, 108595-108595. Https://Doi.Org/10.1016/J.Agee.2023.108595