



## King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2020.102085](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2020.102085)

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Müller, B., Polhill, J. G., Millington, J., Seppelt, R., & Verburg, P. H. (2020). Modelling Food Security: Bridging the Gap between the Micro and the Macro Scale. *Global Environmental Change*, 63, [102085].  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2020.102085>

### **Citing this paper**

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [librarypure@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:librarypure@kcl.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

# Modelling Food Security: Bridging the Gap between the Micro and the Macro Scale

---

Birgit Müller<sup>\*</sup>, Falk Hoffmann<sup>a</sup>, Thomas Heckeles<sup>b</sup>, Christoph Müller<sup>c</sup>, Thomas W. Hertel<sup>d</sup>, J. Gareth Polhill<sup>e</sup>, Mark van Wijk<sup>f</sup>, Thom Achterbosch<sup>g</sup>, Peter Alexander<sup>h</sup>, Calum Brown<sup>i</sup>, David Kreuer<sup>j</sup>, Frank Ewert<sup>k,l</sup>, Jiaqi Ge<sup>m</sup>, James D.A. Millington<sup>n</sup>, Ralf Seppelt<sup>o</sup>, Peter H. Verburg<sup>p</sup>, Heidi Webber<sup>q</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Ecological Modelling, Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research - UFZ, Permoserstr. 15, 04318 Leipzig, Germany

<sup>b</sup> Institute for Food and Resource Economics (ILR), University of Bonn, Nußallee 21, 53115 Bonn, Germany

<sup>c</sup> Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK), Member of the Leibniz Association, Telegrafenberg A 31, 14473 Potsdam, Germany

<sup>d</sup> Department of Agricultural Economics, Purdue University, 403 West State Street, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA

<sup>e</sup> The James Hutton Institute, Craigiebuckler, Aberdeen AB15 8QH Scotland, UK

<sup>f</sup> International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI), Sustainable Livestock Systems, Nairobi, Kenya

<sup>g</sup> Wageningen Economic Research, Wageningen University & Research, Prinses Beatrixlaan 582, 2595 BM, The Hague, The Netherlands

<sup>h</sup> School of Geosciences, University of Edinburgh, Grant Institute, King's Buildings, West Mains Road, Edinburgh, EH9 3JW, UK

<sup>i</sup> Global Academy of Agriculture and Food Security, The Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies, University of Edinburgh, Midlothian, UK

<sup>j</sup> Institute of Meteorology and Climate Research (IMK-IFU), Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT), Kreuzeckbahnstr. 19, 82467 Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany

<sup>k</sup> Leibniz Centre for Agricultural Landscape Research (ZALF), Eberswalder Str. 84, 15374 Müncheberg, Germany

<sup>l</sup> Institute of Crop Science and Resource Conservation (INRES), Katzenburgweg 5, 53115 Bonn, Germany

<sup>m</sup> Department of Geography, King's College London, Bush House (NE) 4.01, 40 Aldwych, London WC2B 4BG, UK

<sup>n</sup> Department of Computational Landscape Ecology, Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research - UFZ, Permoserstr. 15, 04318 Leipzig, Germany

<sup>o</sup> Institute of Geoscience & Geography, Martin-Luther-University Halle-Wittenberg, Germany

<sup>p</sup> Environmental Geography Group, Institute for Environmental Studies, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

<sup>q</sup> School of Geography, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK

---

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [birgit.mueller@ufz.de](mailto:birgit.mueller@ufz.de) (Birgit Müller).

## Acknowledgments

BM, DK, and FH acknowledge funding by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) for the POLISES project (01LN1315A, [www.polises.de](http://www.polises.de)). POLISES organized the international workshop on “Modelling approaches to enhance food security” that brought this paper’s authors together from March 10-12, 2018, in Leipzig. We thank Gunnar Dressler who designed Figure 1 and three anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments on earlier versions of this paper. CM acknowledges financial support from the MACMIT project (01LN1317A) funded through BMBF. JGP would like to acknowledge funding from the Scottish Government’s Rural Affairs, Food and Environment Strategic Research Portfolio 2016-2021, Theme 3 (Food, Health and Wellbeing), Work Package 3.3 (Food Security). JM acknowledges support from the UK Natural Environment Research Council (grant number NE/M021335/1) via Belmont Forum CRA13 Type 2 project, ‘Food Security and Land Use: The Telecoupling Challenge’. PA acknowledges support by the UK’s Global Food Security Programme project RUGS (BB/N020707/1). TH acknowledges that his contribution is partially funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany’s Excellence Strategy - EXC 2070 - 390732324. TWH acknowledges support from the National Science Foundation (RDCEP, SES-1463644), as well as USDA-NIFA (IND01053G2) and Hatch (100342). TA acknowledges support from the Netherlands Ministry of Agriculture (WUR knowledge base KB-22-003-001/35-002-001) and CGIAR program Agriculture for Nutrition and Health (A4NH-F1-P329).

# Modelling Food Security: Bridging the Gap between the Micro and the Macro Scale

---

## Abstract

Achieving food and nutrition security for all in a changing and globalized world remains a critical challenge of utmost importance. The development of solutions benefits from insights derived from modelling and simulating the complex interactions of the agri-food system, which range from global to household scales and transcend disciplinary boundaries. A wide range of models based on various methodologies (from food trade equilibrium to agent-based) seek to integrate direct and indirect drivers of change in land use, environment and socio-economic conditions at different scales. However, modelling such interaction poses fundamental challenges, especially for representing non-linear dynamics and adaptive behaviours.

We identify key pieces of the fragmented landscape of food security modelling, and organize achievements and gaps into different contextual domains of food security (production, trade, and consumption) and at different spatial scales. Building on in-depth reflection on three core issues of food security – volatility, technology, and transformation – we identify methodological challenges and promising strategies for advancement.

We emphasize particular requirements related to the multifaceted and multiscale nature of food security. They include the explicit representation of transient dynamics to allow for path dependency and irreversible consequences, and of household heterogeneity to incorporate inequality issues. To illustrate ways forward we provide good practice examples using meta-modelling techniques, non-equilibrium approaches and behavioural-based modelling endeavours. We argue that further integration of different model types is required to better account for both multi-level agency and cross-scale feedbacks within the food system.

**Keywords:** food security; multi-scale interactions; model integration; agent-based models; economic equilibrium models; crop models; social-ecological feedbacks; land use

## 1 Introduction

Given competing pressures on land and other environmental resources, the food security challenge requires innovative solutions to mitigate trade-offs between environmental and social objectives while balancing short and long term development (Riahi et al., 2017; Hasegawa et al., 2018). Success in sustainably achieving food security for all can be supported by insights obtained from science-based modelling of the complex interactions among factors influencing food security across scales in a complex adaptive system (e.g. Antle et al., 2017a). We understand scale as the combination of spatial, temporal, and analytical resolution and extent (see also Gibson et al. 2000). The ‘micro’ scale is then characterized by high resolution and small extent and the ‘macro’ scale by low resolution and large extent; scales may consequently range from the global to the household and transcend traditional disciplinary boundaries.

The imperative for multiscale analysis of the food system can be aptly illustrated with the case of the US Renewable Fuels Mandate. Early systems analysis by environmental and energy systems engineers found that corn ethanol production in the US could reduce life cycle greenhouse gas emissions (Farrell et al., 2006). This was based on detailed analysis of direct emissions associated with the growth of the crops as well as those tied to transportation, processing and delivery of the product to consumers.

1 However, the absence of any link to market modelling of agriculture and land use change led to the  
2 omission of the indirect impacts of diverting a substantial share of food production into the energy  
3 markets. Once this component was brought to bear, this government programme was found to have  
4 adverse impacts, both on the environment and on food security (Searchinger et al., 2008), that can be  
5 related back to the market effects of this policy (Hertel and Tyner, 2013). If early analyses had been  
6 based on a multiscale model, the programme might never have gained such overwhelming political  
7 support.

8 Achieving the transition towards sustainable food systems based on such multiscale analysis faces  
9 further challenges, particularly in many low and middle income countries. These include a rapidly  
10 growing urban and rural population, limiting and poorly functioning market infrastructure, limited  
11 nutrient inputs and poor crop management resulting in large yield gaps (Lobell et al., 2009; van  
12 Ittersum et al., 2013) and degradation of soil quality and associated ecosystem services. Further  
13 challenges are related to climate change, food wastage, water scarcity, and changing lifestyles leading  
14 to a higher demand for animal-based food products (Godfray et al., 2010). At the same time, other  
15 drivers of change include the spread of information and communication technologies, vertical  
16 coordination in supply chains, and rising import competition. The dynamics of land use change also  
17 plays a role, influencing livelihoods, human health and nutrition, and the environmental and  
18 institutional foundations upon which these depend. While the full effect of these changes may be some  
19 years away, there is evidence that rural and urban communities are already undergoing rapid  
20 transformation (e.g. Jayne et al., 2016; Fraval et al., 2018).

21 In addition to these macro-scale challenges and drivers, food security depends on household access to  
22 adequate food (see FAO, 1996, but also Coates, 2013 and Headey and Ecker, 2013) and is, from this  
23 perspective, largely an outcome of local-scale processes. Sufficient total global food production does  
24 not necessarily ensure food security for the entire population. Nutrition security therefore  
25 complements the concept of food security by considering one's ability to meet nutritional needs  
26 through food intake. Nutrition security is commonly assessed at the individual level, where pro-male  
27 and pro-adult biases have frequently been observed within households (Coates, 2013). Nevertheless,  
28 indicators of food and nutrition security are commonly aggregated to regional, national, and global  
29 levels for the purpose of policy assessment (Herrero et al., 2017). In this paper, we generally use 'food  
30 security' to mean food and nutrition security across scales.

31  
32 In the exploration of possible development pathways and their associated consequences, macro-scale  
33 impact assessment models are currently in widespread use. These models typically simulate global  
34 scenarios and explore large-scale consequences of policy options (e.g. Riahi et al., 2017). The mismatch  
35 of scales and approaches between macro-level modelling and locally-determined processes and  
36 indicators makes it difficult to answer critical questions, including: How can we better account for food  
37 security when analysing long-term trends occurring at large scales (like economic development,  
38 population growth, and water scarcity)? How can we quantify the trade-offs between different  
39 indicators when searching for a sustainable future (e.g. van Wijk, 2014)? How resilient is the food  
40 system in delivering appropriate nutrition under a range of shocks, e.g. extreme weather or geo-  
41 political instability (Tendall et al., 2015; Urruty et al., 2016)?

42 Answering these questions poses fundamental challenges, since the underlying agri-food system is  
43 characterized by interactions across scales that show non-linear dynamics and adaptive behaviours.  
44 The wide variety of models that aim to integrate land use, environment, and food security highlights  
45 the existence of different drivers of change related to distinct phenomena. These models range from  
46 the global scale (e.g. food trade equilibrium models) to the local scale (e.g. farm-level crop models,  
47 bio-economic models or agent-based approaches) (van Wijk et al., 2014). Models have been developed

1 for different purposes and typically address only selected aspects of food security from a specific point  
2 of view, ranging from agricultural science (e.g. Troost et al., 2015) and (agricultural) economics (e.g.,  
3 van Ittersum et al., 2016, Baldos & Hertel, 2015) to systems science (e.g. Hammond and Dube, 2012),  
4 and thus have different and often incompatible conceptual bases.

5 Models that address food security issues operating across multiple scales often work either through  
6 local-level proxies when analysing large-scale processes (for example through single crop yield  
7 response functions or a single farming systems representation for a given geographical zone, e.g.  
8 Hasegawa et al., 2018), or using global drivers when analysing local processes (for example through  
9 commodity prices or farm size development scenarios, e.g. Herrero et al., 2014). More recently,  
10 analyses at global or regional level have made transdisciplinary progress in finding solutions that take  
11 more account of people's local reality (e.g. Ermolieva et al., 2017; Antle et al., 2014). Examples exist in  
12 which interactions between drivers of food security at different levels have been assessed (e.g. van  
13 Ittersum et al., 2008; Laborde et al., 2016; Ruane et al., 2018). These models are a first step towards  
14 the multi-scale representation of land use, environment, and food security, but they still lack a more  
15 complete reconciliation of processes across scales to capture relevant feedbacks (see also van Wijk,  
16 2014).

17 We argue that by narrowing the gap between the micro and the macro scale, combined with a better  
18 consideration of food-system-specific (multi-level) agency and feedbacks, it is possible to improve the  
19 representation of food security-relevant processes and indicators in large-scale models and thus  
20 advance the current state of food system models. We emphasize special requirements of the  
21 multifaceted and multiscale concept of food security and argue that further integration of different  
22 model types is required to better account for both multi-level agency and cross-scale feedbacks within  
23 the food system.

24 We draw from the current state of food security modelling to identify achievements and gaps in  
25 different contextual domains of food security (production, trade, and consumption) at different spatial  
26 scales (local, regional, and global). Three core issues of food security are extracted for further in-depth  
27 reflection and analysis. Finally, we use these core issues to consider strengths and weaknesses of  
28 methodological approaches currently in use and identify promising ways forward.

## 29 2 Current State of the Art of Food Security Modelling: Achievements and 30 Gaps

31 Research on food security modelling is composed of a fragmented literature and methodology,  
32 characterized by individual efforts in disparate disciplines with relatively few interconnections.  
33 Although many literature reviews are available on the different types of modelling that might be, or  
34 have been, applied to examine agro-economic or food-related issues (e.g. van Tongeren et al., 2001;  
35 Ciaian et al., 2013; Francois and Martin, 2013; Kelly et al., 2013; Millington et al., 2017; Huber et al.,  
36 2018, some addressing food security: van Dijk and Meijerink, 2014; van Wijk, 2014; van Wijk et al.,  
37 2014; Brown et al., 2017), a comprehensive, interdisciplinary, multi-scale overview of food security  
38 modelling does not exist in the current body of literature. To address this gap, we begin by providing  
39 a summary of the modelling approaches that have been applied to examine aspects of food security,  
40 before reporting on achievements to date and the outstanding challenges.

41 Food security, as defined by FAO, 1996, consists of four key elements (cf. also FAO, 2014): physical  
42 availability of food; economic and physical access to food; food utilization; and the stability of these  
43 three dimensions over time. Of these, availability and access to food have been most thoroughly  
44 described, with new approaches currently being developed to better address utilization and stability.

1 In the following, we do not directly use these four pillars, but instead emphasize three primary  
2 components of food security reflected in contemporary models: food production, trade, and  
3 consumption. The interplay of these components is key to the challenge of feeding future global  
4 populations (Godfray et al., 2010). We also discuss the stability dimension of food security which  
5 requires dynamic models with high temporal resolution of economic and biophysical aspects (such as  
6 commodity market volatility or pest occurrence and diffusion). Utilization of food is generally poorly  
7 represented in modelling approaches and thus not considered here.

## 8 2.1 Modelling Approaches

9 Numerous approaches exist that are relevant to modelling food production, trade and consumption.  
10 Agricultural production is a key aspect of food security modelled in multiple ways, including bio-  
11 economic models (typically describing land use through optimizing an objective function like profit,  
12 e.g., Janssen and van Ittersum, 2007), process-based land use models (describing the development of  
13 land use and interactions with other factors over time through functional relations, e.g. Brown et al.,  
14 2013; Verburg et al., 2016), multi-agent models (focusing on interactions between land users and/or  
15 farmers' heterogeneity, e.g. Bharwani et al., 2005; Matthews et al., 2007; Ding et al., 2015), transition-  
16 rule-based approaches (representing the transition between different states of the land, e.g.  
17 Bestelmeyer et al., 2017 for rangelands) and econometric/statistical models (empirically describing  
18 relationships between drivers of all different sorts and consequential land use, e.g., Munroe et al.,  
19 2002; Millington et al., 2007). Models from different disciplines (e.g. economics, agronomy) tend to  
20 have a different representation of core concepts, data types and state variables in space and time. The  
21 following types of models simulating food production have been the workhorses for ex-ante analysis  
22 and priority setting for the deployment of technological interventions and for examining trade-offs  
23 related to the use of natural resources: (a) Biophysical crop models (for an overview see Müller et al.,  
24 2017b), (b) farm management models (e.g. FSSIM, Louhichi et al., 2010, IFM-CAP, Louhichi et al., 2018,  
25 also see Janssen and van Ittersum, 2007 and van Wijk et al., 2014) and (c) static and dynamic economic  
26 models (e.g. CAPRI, Fellmann et al., 2018; AgriPoliS, Happe et al., 2006). In the integrated modelling  
27 framework SEAMLESS-IF, an effort was made to link these types of models across scales in Europe (van  
28 Ittersum et al., 2008; Ewert et al., 2009).


29 Moving from production to consumption requires a consideration of trade. Computable general and  
30 partial equilibrium models have been used widely to examine how changes in policy or environmental  
31 conditions could influence trade in agricultural and food commodities, both globally and regionally.  
32 Well-established modelling frameworks such as GTAP (Aguilar et al., 2016) incorporate large databases  
33 to simulate flows of goods between countries and regions by representing bilateral trade, transport,  
34 taxes and subsidies. Equilibrium approaches have also been incorporated into integrated modelling  
35 frameworks such as IMPACT (Robinson et al., 2015) to interact with climate, crop simulation and other  
36 models to examine scenarios of environmental, socioeconomic, technological and policy change. Less  
37 widely used, system dynamics approaches use non-equilibrium representations of feedback loops  
38 composed of stocks, flows, and information propagation, and have been used to represent the impacts  
39 of land use on global trade (e.g. Warner et al., 2013). Agent-based approaches representing individual  
40 countries as decision-making entities are also being developed to simulate trade and facilitate  
41 understanding impacts of national policies on food security and food-related civil unrest (Natalini et  
42 al., 2017).

43 On the consumption side, food allocation within and across households is critical to food security.  
44 Agent-based approaches are increasingly used to assess food security of smallholders in developing  
45 countries over time (e.g. Dobbie et al., 2018 which explicitly considers the four dimensions of food

1 security at the household and village level for a case study in Malawi). In a developing country context,  
 2 recent agent-based models (ABMs) analyse healthy food choices of consumers capturing interactions  
 3 between retail location, social networks and income (Tracy et al., 2018 pp. 82-83). Equilibrium models  
 4 are uniquely positioned to assess commodity and factor price impacts of perturbations to agricultural  
 5 supplies, technologies and policies (e.g. Hertel et al., 2007; Nelson et al., 2014a). These price outcomes  
 6 are critical in determining the consequences for earnings, consumption, and thereby food security. By  
 7 definition, these outcomes refer to a specific time period over which demands adjust to changes in  
 8 supply and vice versa. Equilibrium models may be paired with micro-simulation models in order to  
 9 determine household impacts of these types of shocks (e.g. Hertel and Winters, 2005; Cockburn, 2006;  
 10 Cogneau and Robilliard, 2007).

## 11 2.2 Representing the Food Security Context in Models

12 To present achievements and challenges in food security modelling, we consider food production, trade, and consumption,  
 13 across three spatial scales (



14  
 15 Figure 1). While we acknowledge that stability (temporal scale) is a critical dimension of food security  
 16 (cf. Mehrabi et al., 2019; Renard and Tilman, 2019), we do not represent explicitly it in Figure 1, but  
 17 assume that stability is an underpinning requirement in all depicted elements.

18 Climate-driven variability of crop yields has a large influence on the stability of food production at local  
 19 to regional scales, constituting an important source of risk to subsistence farmers and low-income  
 20 groups. Crop models are continuously developed to better capture seasonal and inter-annual yield  
 21 variability as driven by weather and extreme events (Maiorano et al., 2017; Schauburger et al., 2017;  
 22 Webber et al., 2018), but the applicability of crop models in integrated assessment studies is still  
 23 considerably constrained (Ewert et al., 2015). Additionally, landscape-scale ecological properties and  
 24 processes are most frequently neglected in food security modelling studies, including interactions




1 across multiple trophic levels of food webs and trade-offs with biodiversity (van Noordwijk, 2002). A  
2 classic example for this is pollination. The presence of pollinating species is substantially promoted by  
3 heterogeneously structured landscapes (Klein et al., 2007; Kremen and M'gonigle, 2015; Kovács-  
4 Hostyánszki et al., 2017). A sufficient abundance of animal pollinators is critical for many crops that  
5 provide vital micro-nutrients to humans (Eilers et al., 2011). An additional challenge lies in the currently  
6 observable mismatch between models representing biophysical and socioeconomic processes (cf. also  
7 Evans et al., 2013; Verburg et al., 2019).

8 Climate variability also affects farmers' income. While many agricultural sector and market models can  
9 consider impacts of climatic change on commodity prices (Nelson et al., 2014a; Nelson et al., 2014b;  
10 Balint et al., 2017; Hasegawa et al., 2018; van Meijl et al., 2018), they generally do not consider short-  
11 term variability from extreme events (with notable exceptions, cf. Schewe et al., 2017). They are also  
12 generally unable to capture the economic impacts of such shocks, together with other abrupt social  
13 and economic events, for example in limiting investments in agricultural technologies (Kalkuhl et al.,  
14 2016; Cottrell et al., 2019). Similarly, many indirect effects, including migration, changes in land tenure,  
15 strategies to cope with income shortfalls, and speculation on food prices, are also neglected.

16 Medium- to long-term developments also matter when assessing producers' reactions to risks, not  
17 least in terms of adaptive responses to ameliorate or benefit from the effects of climate change.  
18 Beneficial opportunities related, for instance, to the adoption of new crop types that better suit  
19 emerging climatic conditions are rarely modelled (cf. Holman et al., 2019), and when they are included,  
20 they typically do not distinguish between intensification and adaptation, simply resulting in an upward  
21 shift of production across all climates (Lobell, 2014; Moore et al., 2017). The different capabilities of  
22 producers to cope with risk and volatility can lead to local polarization in wealth, but is seldom  
23 considered in modelling studies (for exceptions cf. Dressler et al., 2018 or models focussing on poverty  
24 traps, cf. Zimmerman and Carter, 2003). The same holds for the integration of informal risk-sharing  
25 networks, the application of technology, or income diversification through trade activities, stock-  
26 holding, and remittances sent by relatives who have emigrated (Rockenbach and Sakdapolrak, 2017).  
27 Altogether, this reveals a gap in reflecting food-related social and justice issues in modelling.

28 A major gap in modelling is digitization of production systems (for current reviews on the relevance of  
29 big data and digitization in agriculture cf. Bronson and Knezevic, 2016; Antle et al., 2017b; Wolfert et  
30 al., 2017; Weersink et al., 2018). On the one hand, precision farming promises an increase in yields and  
31 reduced environmental stress from pesticides and fertilizers; on the other, dependency on high-tech  
32 methods may exacerbate social inequalities or change power relations (Maru et al., 2018). Spanning  
33 local to regional extents, issues of land access and land grabbing are highly relevant topics as secure  
34 access to arable land is vital to food security, particularly for smallholders (Holden and Ghebru, 2016).  
35 To date, modelling has rarely been used to show the extent of such practices and their impacts on food  
36 security. Efforts exist to conceptualize land tenure security from an interdisciplinary, dynamic  
37 equilibrium perspective (Simbizi et al., 2014) and empirical analyses are repeatedly performed,  
38 showing the relevance for productive investments (for a newer example see Fitz, 2018). However,  
39 parameters in larger scale models analysing food security take the current tenure system as given. This  
40 may be due to the context and country specific nature of tenure system impacts and the absence of  
41 endogenous investments in many models. Equilibrium models at larger scales simply do not have a  
42 comparative advantage for analysing such national changes in governance (on the limited  
43 incorporation of governance in models in general see Wang et al., 2016).

1 While consumption closely relates to production activities and incomes for many smallholder farmers,  
 2 we consider it separately here, with a focus on access and nutrition, affected by heterogeneous  
 3 behavioural dynamics. Both developing and developed countries' specific risks of malnourishment are  
 4 under-represented in food security models, with limited consideration of nutrient deficiency or obesity  
 5 (for an exception, see Springmann et al., 2016) or differing vulnerability to price shocks of urban  
 6 consumers and rural producers. However, their representation will require collaboration with  
 7 empirical experts who study household consumption and food preferences, as well as sources of  
 8 household income (Ahmed et al., 2009). Beyond individual consumption, which is largely governed by  
 9 individual resources and behaviours as influenced by social norms, transnational corporations have  
 10 recently emerged as key entities leading to increased commercialization and concentration in global  
 11 food chains (Gibbon and Ponte, 2005), with few exceptions (Sitko et al., 2018). Economic models rarely  
 12 represent these corporations' role in directing market activity although they take over a crucial part of  
 13 agency in real markets. Likewise, urban food systems have been given limited attention in terms of  
 14 modelling (cf. Bodirsky et al., 2015 as an exception, where urbanization is discussed as a driver for  
 15 modelling diets). Finally, food security challenges are also institutional: topics such as health,  
 16 environmental protection, governance, and externalities can hardly be handled properly by models  
 17 based solely on market calculations, even more since they vary in time, space, and across societies (for  
 18 an exception, see Wang et al., 2016). In this respect, it is often the capabilities of current models that  
 19 drive modelling exercises, rather than requirements of the food security issue.



20  
 21 **Figure 1: Aspects of food security modelling.** They are arranged by spatial scale (y axis) and three key components of food  
 22 systems (x axis). The temporal dimension is not represented here. We omitted several aspects (e.g. health, cultural  
 23 dimensions, and non-spatial scales such as institutional scale, cf. Preston et al., 2015) in favour of clarity. Topics may span  
 24 multiple levels. Most bullet points are about open questions, denoted by squares. Checked boxes, on the other hand,  
 25 denote that these have been adequately addressed by modellers.

### 3 In-depth Reflection and Analysis for Three Core Issues

From our overview of achievements and gaps summarized in Figure 1, we identified three core issues for in-depth reflection and analysis. These issues – volatility, technology and transformation of the food system – embody distinct core components of food security and correspond, respectively, to short-, medium- and long-run adaptations to food insecurity. They serve to illustrate particular challenges related to the micro-macro scale connection. For each core issue, we point out central mechanisms to be included in models and present the current state of the art.

#### 3.1 Volatility: Uncertainty in Supply and Prices

Uncertainties in commodity supply (e.g. due to extreme weather events or pests) can lead to instabilities in food prices which are transmitted globally through markets. With little short-run potential to adjust crop planting and technological choices, weather-induced yield variability can dramatically impact prices, and hence the affordability of food (Wiggins and Keats, 2013). This problem is particularly severe for urban residents and others who are net food buyers. To address these issues, models need to incorporate processes such as storage and transportation (trade) to better characterize the potential for mitigation of food price volatility (Wright, 2011; Burgess and Donaldson, 2010). Medium- to long-term adaptations by consumers, producers, investors, policymakers and actors in the value chain to manage increased risk exposure might in turn affect short-term volatilities, as intensification of crop production has an impact on its stability (Müller et al., 2018). Risk-coping strategies such as formal and informal insurance and income diversification also need to be taken into account.

Agricultural markets are vulnerable to uncertainties in supply, since production hinges on uncertain weather conditions as well as environmental hazards such as pests. This is a complex modelling challenge as weather effects can be highly localized, but the market outcomes represent the aggregation of these local variations. Diffenbaugh et al., 2012 reproduced national historical yield volatility in US maize production using fine-scale climate model output and crop production information, linked through a non-linear yield response to temperature and precipitation estimated by Schlenker and Roberts, 2009. Diffenbaugh et al., 2012 were able to replicate aggregate price volatility using this approach. They show that climate-driven, supply-side uncertainty is likely to increase under future climate due to more frequent exceedances of critical temperature thresholds. The consequences for commodity markets in the face of price-inelastic demands are potentially severe. Where storage is possible, price swings can be mitigated by agents taking advantage of those swings to buy low, store the commodity, and sell when supplies are low and prices high (Roberts and Tran, 2012). However, in the poorest countries of the world, pests, cash flow constraints and other factors result in considerable storage losses, leading to lower storage rates (Kaminski and Christiaensen, 2014). In much of Africa producers sell their harvest at low prices and end up buying back grains at high prices during the 'lean season'. Introduction of low cost, improved storage technologies can have a positive impact on household welfare in this context (Murdock and Baoua, 2014). It can also promote the adoption of new crop varieties which are high yielding, but more vulnerable to pests (Ricker-Gilbert and Jones, 2015).

The combination of climate and price variability can be particularly problematic for low income, net food buyer households. This emphasizes the importance of household heterogeneity which is well represented through ABM. For example, Wossen and Berger, 2015 developed an ABM for Northern Ghana, where regional climate models are projecting significant warming. They analysed the distributional consequences of climate variability on rural households and found that the provision of

1 agricultural credit and improved access to off-farm employment are particularly effective ways of  
2 mitigating the impacts of future climate variability on low-income households in this region. A broader  
3 picture is provided by a review on different types of farm household models to analyse food security  
4 under climate change by van Wijk et al., 2014.

5 One important means of dealing with climate variability is insurance. Informal insurance through  
6 extended families and social networks (Rockenbauch and Sakdapolrak, 2017) is widespread in many  
7 developing countries, as is the sale of assets including livestock. However, these traditional methods  
8 of insurance against unanticipated events are ill-suited to co-vary climate shocks, which tend to  
9 affect the entire community/region (Dercon, 2005). In light of this, index insurance tied to regional  
10 weather outcomes is a response which has been offered with great enthusiasm by some in the  
11 development community. If it is publicly provided, it tends to have low transactions costs, more rapid  
12 pay outs and it minimizes asymmetric information challenges (Giné et al., 2008; Cole and Xiong, 2017).  
13 Yet the poor have historically been slow to adopt insurance, even where such markets exist (Kiviat,  
14 2009). While there has been some progress on the adoption of micro-insurance across the developing  
15 world (<http://worldmapofmicroinsurance.org/>), this is an area ripe for further exploration where  
16 intended and unintended consequences need to be analysed (cf. Müller et al., 2017a for a review of  
17 modelling and empirical studies of the impacts of agricultural insurance). Economic modelling studies  
18 have been used on the farmer level (cf. Ricome et al., 2017) and on the financial market level (cf. Carter  
19 et al., 2016) for studying the impact of insurance on land-use strategies or on technology adoption. It  
20 would seem that agent-based models which focus on inter-household interactions and/or more  
21 sophisticated representation of farmer decision making might be able to shed additional light on the  
22 constraints and opportunities for more widespread use of index insurance (for first attempts, see  
23 Müller et al., 2011 and John et al., 2019 on the impact of insurance on pastoral land use strategies and  
24 possible side effects).

25 Another vehicle for adaptation to supply uncertainties and the ensuing price volatility is improved  
26 transport. Burgess and Donaldson, 2010 used an equilibrium trade model to demonstrate how the  
27 introduction of railroads in colonial India dramatically reduced famine in the wake of failed monsoons.  
28 Porteus, 2015 studied the consequences of high trade barriers within the African continent using a  
29 dynamic equilibrium model. He found that lowering these trade frictions to levels observed in the rest  
30 of the world would reduce the average food price index by almost 50%. In addition, he concluded that  
31 lower trade costs will promote the adoption of new agricultural technologies, as early adopters gain  
32 access to a larger market. Deeper investigation of the interplay between market structures and the  
33 adoption of technology by heterogeneous farm households is another fruitful area for integration of  
34 ABMs with market equilibrium models.

35 It is not just physical infrastructure that can play a role in mitigating the impact of volatile commodity  
36 supplies on food insecure households. Socio-political and economic considerations are equally  
37 important. Open borders allow international trade to mitigate the impacts of crop failure (Verma et  
38 al., 2014). More generally, stable governance is critical for ensuring food security. Indeed, civil strife is  
39 one of the main factors behind many of the famines in Africa over the last two decades affecting  
40 production as well as distribution (Africa Center for Strategic Studies, 2017). And, unfortunately, a  
41 changing climate can increase the likelihood of civil strife (Burke et al., 2009). Capturing this feedback  
42 from climate to food insecurity, to civil strife, and back to food insecurity is a challenge that could be  
43 further explored within an ABM framework.

44 Analysis of food security in the presence of supply uncertainties can give rise to complex models with  
45 many different choices for added sophistication. Future work might usefully focus on the nexus of  
46 economic modelling of markets and ABMs. Such an approach could offer a better representation of

1 how heterogeneous agents respond to volatility under different institutional and cultural contexts  
2 (e.g., by taking up new technologies or transforming production and marketing systems, cf. next  
3 sections and Berger et al., 2017).

### 4 3.2 Technology: Dealing with Heterogeneous Innovation Spread

5 Technological innovation and diffusion across different domains of the food system (production,  
6 marketing and trade, as well as consumption) is highly relevant to food security in the medium to long  
7 term. Technology development including breeding and crop management has been the key driver of  
8 productivity increases in the past and will be the most important driver for the future (Ewert et al.,  
9 2005). In the face of increasing risk of supply shocks, agents in the food system would be expected to  
10 adopt new technologies to adapt to new climatic conditions and mitigate the impact of extremes on  
11 land use and productivity. Adoption rates vary according to decision-making characteristics such as risk  
12 aversion, so that understanding the household level impacts requires models that capture the relevant  
13 agent heterogeneity, at individual or typological level (Daloğlu et al., 2014; Brown et al., 2019).  
14 Technology can also facilitate improvements in transport, marketing and storage. Technological  
15 innovation is generally a process driven by private incentives to achieve higher productivity producing  
16 more or better goods and services with fewer inputs (resources), and by public institutions aiming to  
17 improve (agricultural) productivity to ensure long-term food security.

18 R&D spending creates “knowledge capital”, which drives productivity growth through technological  
19 innovation. However, the capability to translate these investments into productivity gains varies widely  
20 across the world. In a recent paper reviewing 44 empirical studies, Fuglie, 2018 finds that a 1% increase  
21 in overall R&D capital leads to a 0.67% increase in agricultural output in developed countries but only  
22 0.38% in developing countries (0.17% in Sub-Saharan Africa). Dietrich et al., 2014 propose a modelling  
23 approach in which the costs of R&D for yield increases depend on the current intensity level. Spillovers  
24 across regions and R&D categories (public and private) as well as accumulation and depreciation of  
25 R&D capital over time creates complex spatio-temporal dynamics requiring appropriate modelling  
26 tools to understand how public R&D spending influences agricultural productivity and thereby the  
27 availability and accessibility dimensions of food security in the long run.

28 Returns on R&D expenditure are therefore uncertain. Baldos et al., 2019 show that returns to public  
29 R&D materialize slowly, taking one to three decades for their largest impact to be felt in productivity  
30 gains. Such long lags in realizing agricultural output growth from R&D spending creates short-term  
31 irreversibility and the need to act early in order to prepare for uncertain future developments. Cai et  
32 al., 2017 call for significantly increased R&D spending at the global level in the first half of this century  
33 to prepare for the possibility of high population levels and climate change impacts on productivity in  
34 the second half. Region-specific analyses are crucial for assessments of the impact of innovation on  
35 food security and would require distinct identification of regional R&D spending versus its spillovers.  
36 Relating investments in agricultural technology to food security, Mason-D'Croz et al., 2019 find that  
37 spending an additional \$15 billion per year between 2015 and 2030 would reduce the share of people  
38 at risk of hunger by more than half.

39 Global-scale research on the relationship between R&D and productivity shows that investment in  
40 technology matters for food availability and access. However, it does not say much about the role of  
41 the private sector and the impacts on heterogeneous actors. Digitization and automation may provide  
42 technologies that fundamentally transform modern agricultural management without being “policy  
43 induced”. The speed, level and spatial expansion of technology uptake by actors in the supply chain is  
44 relevant for the macro-(market-)level and in turn feeds back to the adoption process (cf. Brown et al.,

1 2018a for empirical evidence for knowledge diffusion patterns in land use). Current integrated  
2 assessment models that assume immediate uptake have been criticized as unrealistic (cf. Turner et al.,  
3 2018). Closely related to the dynamics and spatial aspect of the diffusion process are questions like:  
4 Who might gain access to these new technologies? Why might they choose to adopt them (or not)?  
5 Will the technologies deliver their intended benefits ‘in the field’? And who are subsequent winners  
6 and losers from these developments?

7 A multitude of empirical, typically econometric studies on technology adoption at farm level exist,  
8 scrutinizing the determinants leading to adoption (Wu and Pretty, 2004; Knowler and Bradshaw, 2007;  
9 Baumgart-Getz et al., 2012; Genius et al., 2013; Meijer et al., 2015; Xiong et al., 2016). The empirically  
10 relevant determinants go beyond the comparative ‘profitability’ of these technologies and include a  
11 variety of cognitive, behavioural and social factors. These are often conceptualized by modern theories  
12 borrowing from the social psychology discipline such as the ‘theory of planned behaviour’ (Ajzen 1991).  
13 Attitudes, perceived control, risk, social network interaction and more all play a role to embrace or  
14 reject new production practices (Marra et al., 2003; Llewellyn, 2007; Maertens and Barrett, 2012).  
15 Models that endogenously represent technological change and assess the potential impacts need to  
16 be careful in representing behavioural mechanisms that determine adoption (Dessart et al., 2019). This  
17 is especially true if the representation of heterogeneity over space and time is targeted, but also to  
18 achieve accuracy in aggregate uptake and impact (Lambin et al., 2000; Alexander et al., 2017).

19 Although this empirical literature acknowledges dynamic and spatial feedbacks through networks and  
20 the development of supply chain structures, the formal modelling of such dynamic, spatially explicit  
21 systems seems in its infancy (for examples from the agricultural domain and beyond, see Berger, 2001;  
22 Kiesling et al., 2012; Brown et al., 2018b). This is especially the case in large-scale models that are  
23 relevant to food security issues, but require generalizations of the kind that are not yet established in  
24 the literature on the adoption of technological innovations in agriculture. Fundamental technological  
25 transformations are crucial to many of the ‘pathways’ towards international policy objectives such as  
26 the Paris Agreement on climate change mitigation, making an assessment of their adoption and effects  
27 important for policy support (van Vuuren et al., 2015; Rogelj et al., 2016; Walsh et al., 2017).

28 A detailed “bottom-up” model representation of endogenous technological change faces substantial  
29 challenges. Conceptual differences arise within and between dynamic modelling systems at the local  
30 scale and equilibrium models at larger scales regarding the length of the time horizon, the implicit (by  
31 production factor variability) or explicit (by time steps) definition of time, the spatial coverage, and the  
32 resolution of product and production activities. A key question is what type of “bottom-up” modelling  
33 of technological change – if any – is capable of adequately informing larger scale models with respect  
34 to spatial and temporal differentiation. Given the current limited experience, smaller scale models may  
35 be better placed to initially explore the behavioural and social elements identified and experiment  
36 with different representations to account for various theories and contexts. Section 4 discusses  
37 promising strategies for linking large-scale with small-scale models, which explore behavioural and  
38 social aspects.

### 39 3.3 Transformation: Moving to a Food Secure World?

40 Radical and rapid transformative change of food production (and consumption) systems is possible.  
41 Yao, 2000, for example, documents the economic reforms in China of Deng Xiaoping, starting in 1978,  
42 which in six years increased grain production by a third and doubled real per capita incomes. Achieving  
43 global food security, especially if we are to avoid increased environmental harm, will require  
44 transformative change of a kind that may entail hitherto unimagined technology and social institutions.

1 Such transformative change poses a significant challenge not only for policy and society, but also for  
2 modelling. Only recently have initial conceptual studies been published that investigate changing  
3 institutions such as social norms or collective governance, mostly through agent-based or network  
4 approaches (cf. Gräbner, 2016; Ghorbani et al., 2017; Scott et al., 2019).

5 Transformative change is challenging to model because, in its most significant form, it can radically  
6 change the way the system is conceptualized. Not only do the values of state variables change, but the  
7 structure changes too: different variables, processes, classes, individuals, and relationships need to be  
8 included for the dynamics of the new system to be adequately represented (Müller et al., 2014, Polhill  
9 et al., 2016; Donges et al., 2018; Köhler et al., 2018). As may be appreciated, endogenously generating  
10 such new elements of model structure as part of model function is far from trivial. Hence,  
11 transformative change is typically modelled exogenously using scenarios (e.g. in integrated assessment  
12 models at the macro scale, cf. van Vuuren et al., 2018) or by comparing dynamics under different  
13 parameters. Model structures in such models are designed such that they anticipate the consequences  
14 of future change. Insofar as endogenous transformative change entails ideas that have not yet been  
15 conceived, our ability to represent such concepts in models is obviously further curtailed. As a result,  
16 modelled forecasts of the outcomes of transformative change are, for understandable reasons, biased.

17 Thus, modelling is often constrained not only by observed data (e.g. for calibration and validation) but  
18 also by observed structures. Although some models endogenize technological change as an investment  
19 in improving production without necessarily specifying what the technology is (Dietrich et al., 2014;  
20 Baldos et al., 2019; Mason-D'Croz et al., 2019), radical technological change involving more than  
21 incremental improvements can provisionally be conceptualized as an exogenous disturbance to the  
22 system. Since technology is discussed in depth above, we concentrate here on social aspects of  
23 transformative change.

24 Avelino et al., 2019, p. 196 introduce the concept of Transformative Social Innovation (TSI) as “social  
25 innovation that challenges, alters or replaces dominant institutions in the social context.” They  
26 emphasize the co-evolutionary, multi-actor, multi-scale nature of TSI, bringing together social  
27 innovation (“new ways of doing, organizing, knowing and framing”), system innovation (new  
28 institutions and infrastructure), game-changers (significant macro-level changes that “change the  
29 rules” of societal interaction), and narratives of change (the local and global discourse on change,  
30 which act to spread, focus, counter and frame understandings of change).

31 As an illustration, we can consider how assessing food security based on economic models often fails  
32 to account for distributional issues. Modelling the exchange of food based on price, for example,  
33 implies that access to food is determined by the money people have. Although non-price-based food  
34 distribution does not currently prevail globally, it might one day emerge. Were such a system  
35 successful, it would meet all the criteria of TSI, but modelling its emergence is challenged by the fact  
36 that we do not even have the vocabulary to describe it, never mind data, functions or algorithms to  
37 simulate its processes. We struggle to model social transformation also because our models are  
38 embedded in current social systems. It might be insufficient to add a few fixes to the current system if  
39 the fundamental principles on which it runs will not allow sustainable global food security to be  
40 achieved. While modelling may serve as a valuable experimental tool before actually implementing a  
41 transformation, modelling transformation processes is a fundamental challenge.

42 This limitation of most current models is addressed by Holtz et al., 2015 in their review of the prospect  
43 for modelling societal transitions. As a possible solution, they propose following Andersson et al.,  
44 2014’s suggestion that the required changes in ontology need to be embedded in the dynamics of the  
45 model. By ontology, we refer to an explicit description of concepts and relationships in a domain of

1 interest (Gruber, 1993) that could be understood as the model's structure. Such changes are more  
2 difficult to implement when modelling future, rather than reconstructing past, transformations.  
3 Commenting on Holtz et al., 2015, McDowall and Geels, 2017, develop ten challenges. One of these  
4 challenges (McDowall and Geels, 2017, p. 43) returns to the issue of structural change and offers an  
5 alternative interpretation of Andersson et al., 2014's challenge of 'wicked systems' (both complex and  
6 complicated) to modelling: that formal approaches are intrinsically limited, and narrative theories are  
7 better suited.

8 The challenge of modelling ontological change in the study of transformations remains. One  
9 participatory approach is offered by García-Mira et al., 2017. They use backcasting workshops (Quist  
10 and Vergragt, 2006) to develop scenarios of transitions to lower-carbon workplaces, which they then  
11 explore with an agent-based model that is empirically calibrated using questionnaire data. Backcasting  
12 workshops entail envisioning future change, and then working backwards to the present day to  
13 consider the structural changes needed for each imagined future to occur. The results are narratives  
14 of transformations to possible futures, and provide one way of eliciting the kind of knowledge needed  
15 to include ontological change in a simulation model addressing future scenarios.

16 Participatory approaches provide a limited, but consensual environment, in which a community of  
17 people can explore ways to achieve societal transformations. The added value of modelling in such  
18 contexts, as García-Mira et al., 2017 and others have shown, is in highlighting gaps in knowledge or  
19 reasoning. Holtz et al., 2015 note that models co-constructed with stakeholders are useful when  
20 discussing forecasts and scenarios. The sixth challenge of McDowall and Geels, 2017 cautions that  
21 models used in this way should be treated carefully: are such models a scientific artefact, or dialogue  
22 facilitation tools? They warn modellers not to be over-confident.

23 Questions of system transformation also have a profoundly ethical dimension. Who gets to set the  
24 agenda? Do we, as modellers, merely try to represent how societies are functioning – or will societal  
25 functioning start to mirror our theories? Models are not innately neutral or innocent. In addition,  
26 researchers should have in mind that “food security” is a political term. Hence, how they shape the  
27 focus of their research can amount to a political statement. With these caveats in mind, participatory  
28 approaches to modelling transformations to a food secure world have some promise.

29 A further important issue relates to sustainability transitions in general (cf. Sustainable Development  
30 Goals). Food production has potentially conflicting implications for other sustainability dimensions  
31 through the use of land and other resources (Frank et al., 2017; Wolff et al., 2018). Achieving  
32 environmentally sustainable global food security requires transformations that entail an integrated  
33 vision of human-environment interactions (Hadjikakou et al. 2019). In this regard, the integration of  
34 micro-scale agro-ecological models in macro-scale production-focused models may be insightful.

35 The use of models that bring together macro-level models and micro-level processes with emergent  
36 patterns seems to be a prerequisite for investigating transformation in food systems, especially if  
37 transformative change involves bottom-up social processes rather than purely top-down policies. If so,  
38 models should endogenously represent behavioural change by consumers or producers, social  
39 network dynamics, institutions and institutional change. Integrating these into food system models  
40 requires additionally developing the modelling capability to address cross-scale influences in all  
41 directions (cf. Hammond and Dube, 2012).



## 4 Key Conceptual and Methodological Challenges and Promising Ways Forward in Food Security Modelling

Building on our review of the three core issues, we have identified a set of overarching conceptual and methodological achievements and challenges. In the following, we address five of them: (1) Interdisciplinary thematic scope; (2) Representation of agency by exploring the roles of new agent types in food systems; (3) Appropriate techniques for representing relationships and feedbacks across scales and organizational levels; (4) Integration of different modelling approaches; (5) Empirical foundation, data availability and model parameterization. A sixth issue, explicitly modelling transitions (including unexpected change), has been addressed in Section 3.3 above.

### 4.1 Interdisciplinary Thematic Scope

An important step in any modelling process is “Problem formulation”, the establishment of the study’s thematic scope. Like many contemporary social and environmental challenges, understanding food security requires a multi- and inter-disciplinary perspective that integrates social and natural sciences. To guide research into such complex phenomena, newly established theoretical frameworks combine existing approaches and provide conceptual tools. For example, the telecoupling framework (Liu et al., 2013, Liu et al., 2018a) combines concepts of teleconnections and globalization with tools from systems thinking to provide a structure around which human-environment questions can be refined, data collected and analysed, and models developed. However, regardless of the conceptual framework around which any interdisciplinary research is structured, the vital issue is to identify the processes that are relevant to the research question and its context. For food security, this means paying special attention to currently under-represented processes in existing research (Figure 1). The inclusion of case study experts and relevant stakeholders is vital to the development of better model representations in these areas. However, researchers should be wary of allowing the scope of processes considered to become too broad (to help avoid the production of so-called ‘integronster’ models, cf. Voinov and Shugart, 2013).

### 4.2 Representing Agency

With regard to an improved representation of agency, three different issues arise. First, model features such as heterogeneous types of actors, their interaction, and bounded rationality are rarely taken into account. Initial attempts with equilibrium approaches exist: models have been developed where heterogeneous types of actors are included (cf. Melnikov et al., 2017; Lundberg et al., 2015). However, these approaches fail to include more sophisticated types of interaction than those that occur through markets. Agent-based models are able to include heterogeneity of actors and their interactions either through continuous agent characteristics or through some form of grouping or typology (e.g. Valbuena et al., 2010, Rounsevell et al., 2012). In this way, ABMs can be focused on the forms and ranges of behaviour that are of most interest in a given application without introducing superfluous complexity. Representing human decision-making in this way can benefit from expertise gained in behavioural economics and computational sociology (DellaPosta et al., 2015; Schlüter et al., 2017; Schulze et al., 2017). But a number of challenges exist, ranging from inherent characteristics of socio-environmental systems as complex adaptive systems (cf. Davis et al., 2018) to the limited synthesis of empirical studies on temporal dynamics of decision processes. Second, new types of actors play an increasing role in food security, including transnational companies, large land-owners, and agribusinesses. Current food security models do not reflect these types of actors and the related power dynamics (cf. Section 2).

1 Third, by enabling agency over a larger set of decisions (such as production methods, consumption,  
2 crop choices, adaptation/technology uptake, and marketing decisions), the challenge of complex  
3 interrelations in food systems can be approached. For example, for a promising first attempt, see  
4 Rutten et al., 2018, who present a modelling concept that pushes the boundaries of what elements of  
5 food security are considered.

### 6 4.3 Relationships and Feedbacks

7 An advancement of the limited set of techniques for scaling and representing feedbacks is critical to  
8 improved food-system modelling. In particular, including the feedbacks between micro-production,  
9 macro-trade and micro-consumption (back and forth) would be a significant improvement over  
10 traditional equilibrium approaches. Different approaches have proved helpful for upscaling  
11 information from the micro to the macro level (Ewert et al., 2011). They can be structured depending  
12 on whether the model input or output data are modified, the model parameters are adjusted or the  
13 model structure is changed when applying a model at different scale (ibid.). An example for changing  
14 the model structure or type is statistical/meta-modelling (e.g., summary functions and machine  
15 learning); summary functions from models/dynamics at the micro scale can be used to characterize  
16 more complex interactions at higher scales (e.g., SIMPLE-G-US, see Table 1 below). However, in  
17 general, their meaningful generation requires sufficient knowledge of underlying processes and  
18 relationships. New machine learning tools such as Deep Learning hold promise to broaden the  
19 possibilities of meta- (surrogate) models towards representing the relevant essence of lower scale  
20 models with high dimensionality, highly non-linear input-output relationships and dynamics in models  
21 at the macro scale. Data can be generated as needed for the required accuracy of the trained meta-  
22 model, but their application in place of the original model (as 'doppelgänger', van der Hoog, 2019) may  
23 help to overcome computational challenges in the macro-scale model trying to capture lower scale  
24 complexity and feedbacks. Applications of such data-driven approaches in food system or land-use  
25 modelling are limited and mostly related to the use of boosting techniques that allow higher flexibility  
26 than traditional regression approaches (Levers et al., 2018). However, in water resource modelling  
27 there has been more development in this respect (Asher et al., 2015). The second type of approach is  
28 a classification of land use(r) types using local scale (gridded) data for the identification of land systems  
29 (so called archetypes, cf. Václavík et al., 2013; Malek and Verburg, 2017) that capture characteristics  
30 of the underlying socio-economic system as part of the land-use classification. Rather than simulating  
31 the outcomes of food systems in terms of the symptom (i.e., land cover) a land systems approach aims  
32 to understand the changes in socio-ecological systems itself, providing a promising avenue to better  
33 understand regime-shifts and transformation of these systems (Debonne et al., 2018; Malek et al.,  
34 2018).

35 A remaining methodological question related to the upscaling of information is which aggregation level  
36 at the local scale is necessary to ensure "signals" significant enough to model macro-micro feedbacks.  
37 Novel approaches that allow flexibly adjusting model resolutions depending on modelling objectives  
38 and data availability are needed. Such approaches would support re-usable model structures that  
39 include important features such as micro representations, feedbacks, and the incorporation of  
40 dynamics.

### 41 4.4 Integration of Modelling Approaches

42 Currently, few modelling approaches are available that fully integrate feedbacks up from micro to  
43 macro levels. A way to bridge this gap is the comparison and integration of different modelling

1 approaches for a specific research question. In this section, we discuss the potential for incorporating  
2 such feedbacks as well as integrating ABM and equilibrium approaches. Table 1 contains further  
3 examples that show promising ways forward for integrating different model approaches across scales.  
4 The table contains information on the availability of model code and input data, to allow researchers  
5 from external groups to reproduce and build upon existing results. Reproducibility and transparency is  
6 key to good scientific practice, and in the case of modelling studies implies the need for source code  
7 and data to be freely available.

8 Alternative modelling approaches come with different sets of intrinsic strengths and weaknesses (see  
9 2.1 describing model types), making them more or less suitable for addressing different research  
10 questions. For example, economic equilibrium models, such as CGE (computable general equilibrium)  
11 and PE (partial equilibrium) models, are well suited to studying marginal changes across and between  
12 sectors of the broader economy. However, the assumptions contained within them imply that when  
13 existing trends change and the previous associated relationships no longer hold, they may be  
14 inappropriate. This includes capturing path dependence and non-linearity. Models that represent  
15 micro-scale processes (e.g. ABMs) may, if specified correctly, be able to capture these behaviours,  
16 render equilibrium behaviour transient, and replace optimization with other behavioural assumptions  
17 where appropriate. In particular, the impact of time lags can be studied through ABMs, including  
18 general characteristics of cobweb models (see Lindgren et al., 2015 for a stylized example of  
19 agricultural land use including trade and transportation). Additionally, a greater degree of  
20 heterogeneity of individual behaviours and spatial aspects can potentially be included in micro-  
21 simulations and ABMs than in typical economic equilibrium approaches. However, the challenges of  
22 specifying such models tend to create practical limits to the extent of the system represented. The  
23 complexity and degrees of freedom introduced can create challenges in calibrating and validating  
24 models, including ABMs. CGE/PE models' capacity to closely reproduce current behaviours and their  
25 focus on representation of large-scale aggregated interaction makes them particularly suitable for  
26 some questions, e.g. policy analyses. This leads to a desire to integrate modelling approaches to exploit  
27 the advantages of both (Rounsevell et al., 2014), for example, to use a CGE model to represent the  
28 whole economy, and an ABM to represent a sector in more detail including greater spatial detail and  
29 agent heterogeneity. While the use of CGE outputs as inputs or boundary conditions for detailed  
30 models, e.g. of a specific sector, is increasingly being practised, a two-way integration between these  
31 model types is far less common. The study of Niamir and Filatova, 2015 appears to be the only one  
32 that seeks to embed a sectoral ABM (in this case of the energy sector) within a CGE.

33 A more fundamental concern regarding using only CGE models in the context of food security is the  
34 assumption of equilibrium that is central to the framework. Although equilibrium is the core of most  
35 economic theories and frameworks, real economic systems are usually not in equilibrium as drivers  
36 continuously change. An equilibrium model represents the "target", a stable state that the economic  
37 system would move to if the environment did not change. The process of moving to an equilibrium  
38 and its speed are not captured in a comparative static equilibrium model and would instead require  
39 disequilibrium models, which have received varying attention in the literature over time (e.g. Kaldor,  
40 1972; Martínás, 2007; Arthur, 2010; Frei and dos Reis, 2011). The analysis of food and nutrition security  
41 could make good use of modelling approaches beyond the equilibrium concept to capture processes  
42 with irreversibility, collapse or more generally, regime shifts. For example, a prolonged period of food  
43 shortage with malnutrition of infants and children at critical development stages, mass emigration, the  
44 slaughter of labour animals for food, the absence of schooling in favour of labour to secure food and  
45 water, the over-extraction of natural resources, and hunger-related death are irreversible to different  
46 degrees. Once these occur, the system is unlikely to go back to the previous equilibrium even if food  
47 becomes more abundant later. Consequently, other modelling approaches like ABM, or more generally

- 1 those with a recursive dynamic structure, should be able to represent the path dependency created
- 2 by shocks to the food system with irreversible consequences.
- 3

1 Table 1 displays information on several recent modelling efforts that integrate two or more scales and use innovative approaches

2 **Table 1: Promising approaches to the integration of models by bridging scales**

Reference /Model name	Research question	Types of models coupled	Integrated scales	Innovative methodological elements	New insights gained
CAPRI/GTAP (Pelikan et al., 2015)	How Green are EU Agricultural Set Asides?	Computable general equilibrium model and partial equilibrium model (CGE and PE)	NUTS-2 regions, EU region and global markets	Theoretically consistent summary function, including a lever for set aside stringency	The set aside policy improves environmental status in high-yielding regions. However, output price increases intensification in the more marginal regions of the EU. The decrease in arable land is partially offset by an increase in crop yields as well as increased fertilizer application in other regions of the globe.
SIMPLE-G-US (Liu et al., 2018b)	What are the consequences of alternative measures aimed at reducing nitrate (N) leaching?	5 arc minute grid cell resolution of cropland within the US, nested within a 16 region, global PE model	Grid cells, national and global scales	Fitting summary functions to fine-scale, simulated data from Agro-IBIS on yield and leaching response to increased N use	N leaching fees sharply reduce nitrogen use, raise corn prices; wetland restoration is the least disruptive method of mitigation.
CAPRI (Britz, 2008)	How do EU agricultural policies affect global markets? How do trade policies affect regional production?	Regional (NUTS2) agricultural programming models interacting with global multi-commodity market model	NUTS2, national and EU region	Iterative solving of regional production quantities and price reactions until convergence	It is possible to integrate technical detail at disaggregated farm level with global market feedbacks.
Diffenbaugh et al., 2012	Will market volatility increase in the face of climate change?	Gridded modelling of production, combined with an equilibrium model determining market outcomes	Grid cell, national and global scales	Use of statistical yield function to generate national yield volatility which feeds into economic model	Climate change will exacerbate market volatility – particularly in the price of biofuel mandates.
GTAP-POV (Hertel et al., 2009)	What is the impact of WTO reforms on poverty?	GTAP model of global trade and production interacting with micro-models of seven household	Global, national and household scales	Incorporates detailed survey data on the distribution of households around the poverty line and their earnings sources	The reform elements <i>left out</i> of the Development Agenda (tariff cuts) play a more important role in reducing poverty than the elements <i>included</i> (currency and export subsidies).

Reference /Model name	Research question	Types of models coupled	Integrated scales	Innovative methodological elements	New insights gained
		strata, differentiated by source of earnings			
PLUMv2 / LPJ-GUESS (Alexander et al., 2018)	How resilient is the food system to global shocks, such as extreme weather events and geo-political changes?	Dynamic vegetation model (LPJ-GUESS) with global food system model (PLUMv2)	Crop yield potentials and land use decisions on 0.5° grid, national level import and exports and global agricultural commodity markets	Explicit representation of land use intensification versus expansion of agricultural areas, using spatially specific yield potentials from a process model of crop growth. Non-equilibrium market representation	Adaptation in the global agricultural food system has capacity to diminish negative impacts and gain greater benefits from positive outcomes of climate change. Agricultural expansion and intensification may be lower than found in previous studies where spatial details and process representation were more constrained
Stürck et al. 2018  Lotze-Campen et al. 2018	1) Which affect has an increase in nature protection areas in the EU on different land-based sectors in and outside of Europe?  2) How does future land change trajectories look like across Europe?	Coupling land use models for agriculture, forestry, and urban areas in Europe, in connection with other world regions (CGE, PE, spatial explicit land use allocation models)	Global, EU, regional, local scale (until resolution of 1 km <sup>2</sup> )	A whole modelling chain coupling seven models representing different land-based sectors and different scales in a spatial explicit way	Increase in nature protection areas has different implications in different regions of Europe. In addition agricultural production is shifted from more productive land in Europe to less productive land elsewhere
Zimmermann et al. 2017	What is the impact of climate change on European crop yields, land use and environment taking into account crop management adaptations?	Linking a crop modelling framework with a market model and an environmental impact model	NUTS2, country	Detailed specification of crop management adaptation and corresponding indirect yield changes in the context of an economic equilibrium model	Crop sowing dates and thermal requirements affect crop yields and production and the environmental effects of management assumptions are most pronounced for yields and economic and environmental variables
SEAMLESS-IF (System for Environmental	Two studies:  2. What is the effect of trade liberalization on consumers,	Integration of a cropping system modelling	Field, Farm, Region, Country, EU	Use of different types of scaling methods for manipulation of data (e.g.	Study 1. Elimination of the export and reduction in import tariffs


Reference /Model name	Research question	Types of models coupled	Integrated scales	Innovative methodological elements	New insights gained
and Agricultural Modelling-Integrated Framework (Ewert et al. 2011)	farm income, employment and environment?  2. What is the impact of the European Nitrates Directive at the field, farm and regional level?	framework with a farming system model and a market model		extrapolation and aggregation) and manipulation of models (incl. statistical response functions, nested models)	price decline of agricultural com and in lower agricultural income  Study 2. At field level: Improved management leads to similar/low nitrogen leaching; at farm level: responses of arable farm types; level: slight decrease of nitrate a high increase of water and lab
MAGNET-GENuS	What are the trade-offs from plausible future food systems change on national food security and nutrient availability?	MAGNET model of global trade and production, linked to GENuS model for national nutrient availability	Global, national and household scales; food and nutrients	Explicit modelling of food and nutrient availability and affordability, to mimic food and nutrition security outcomes for representative consumer households	Downscaling of shared socioeconomic pathways (SSPs) to national level reveals implausible implicit assumptions. Structural transformation of food markets presents trade-offs between food security and affordability options for healthier diets.
MAGNET-Grid	What are plausible future changes in food consumption and food availability across metropolitan areas around the world?	MAGNET model of global trade and production, linked to Metropolitan Global-Detector for knowledge-based spatial analysis	Global, national, and household scales, linked with algorithm for cropping decisions at scale of 2.5x2.5 km grid cells	Projections for food demand at grid level, informed by demographic and economic drivers. Linking demand to land use and production decisions for crops at level of grid. Outputs of these models are downscaled to geographic maps for rural and metropolitan areas.	The application of the approach governance of the rural-urban food system of the Ghana a metropolitan area. They provide for integrating expert knowledge stakeholder participation with modelling results.
TeleABM  Dou et al. 2019, Dou (In Press)	Reciprocal land use change in China and Brazil. For example, 'if the Brazilian soybean region experiences a severe drought, what impact will this have on land use in China?'	Agent-based models of two landscapes are coupled by agent-based representation of national-level actors	Farm, municipality and national	Coupling two agent-based models reciprocally such that outputs from each model become boundary conditions for the other in each time step	Dynamics of international trade "high-tariff" scenarios have profound land-use impacts for parties in producing and consuming regions

Reference /Model name	Research question	Types of models coupled	Integrated scales	Innovative methodological elements	New insights gained
FLUTE Millington et al. 2017, Warner et al. 2013	How do events in one country (e.g., droughts, policy change) produce change land use in other countries?	Agent-based model (CRAFTY) coupled to a system dynamics model (BioLUC) of international trade and land use	Local (2500 ha), global (multiple countries)	Coupling ABM and SD models to reciprocally provide inputs and output during each timestep	Short-lived climate extremes and policies have more significant effects on land use and trade dynamics than climate change or gradual policies
CRAFTY SIRIOS Holzauer et al. 2019	What are the most important aspects of institutional intervention (e.g. subsidy rate triggering threshold) for land use change	Single agent-based model representing local land managers interacting with institutional agents at two spatial scales	Local, regional, global (abstract)	Reciprocal interactions (influence and response) between institutions and land managers	Non-linear effects can change the impact of climate change, suggesting that the effects of climate change may require non-responsive institutional action

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7



1 Apart from the challenge of bridging scales within one domain, addressing food security related  
 2 research questions (cf.



3  
 4 Figure 1) requires an integration of models representing different relevant environmental and  
 5 socioeconomic processes across domains (cf. Robinson et al., 2018 who propose a conceptual  
 6 framework for coupling models of human and natural systems). Depending on the research question,  
 7 these may include, for example, hydrological processes or the impact of land use on biodiversity,  
 8 consumer diet choice, and informal social networks. In doing so, dynamic coupling is also a prerequisite  
 9 to investigate trade-offs in time (for instance between food security and biodiversity).

#### 10 4.5 Empirical Foundation

11 Sound models require reliable data for adequate parameterization. The acquisition and use of suitable  
 12 empirical data and parameters comes with several challenges. Aggregated data at a national level  
 13 cannot capture the heterogeneity of food producers and consumers. Subnational units of analysis are  
 14 necessary and will often lead to more nuanced findings (cf. Samberg et al., 2016). While it is crucial to  
 15 capture relevant micro-scale mechanisms to reproduce and understand emergent patterns observed  
 16 at the macro scale, it is difficult to obtain sufficient data in terms of both quantity and degree of detail.  
 17 Meaningful comparative analysis, moreover, requires proper data and metrics that work and are  
 18 consistent across scales and for all regions under consideration. Coupled process-based models also  
 19 depend on the availability of biophysical and social data for different points in time. Ongoing initiatives  
 20 such as the Long-Term Socio-Ecological Research (LTSER) observatories are an important step forward  
 21 to provide coordinated data infrastructure and knowledge platforms (cf. Bourgeron et al., 2018; Dick  
 22 et al., 2018). Generating such data, at global scale with adequate spatial resolution, is a costly and  
 23 time-consuming endeavour. Existing collections of data (such as FAOstat and yield gap data) often have  
 24 inadequate spatial resolution for disaggregated food security analysis; even reliable data sets may not

1 be well documented or readily accessible (Hertel and Villoria, 2012). The FAIR principles (Wilkinson et  
2 al., 2016) provide guidelines for improved data management in the future. Finally, it is noted that  
3 access to and use of individual agent data is often restricted to avoid the identification of specific  
4 households, firms and individuals. Some techniques exist, such as random variations of geolocations,  
5 that still preserve most of the relevant spatial patterns in the data and its corresponding use in  
6 modelling without revealing identities (see Burgert et al., 2013, for an example). An alternative is a  
7 virtual data enclave allowing analysts to process the original data in models without possibilities to  
8 download and read (Richardson et al., 2015). Further development and implementation of these  
9 techniques will support the sharing of individual data and enhance the replicability of research results.

## 10 5 Outlook: How can Modelling Make a Difference to Food Security?

11 The contemporary research landscape around food security modelling is fragmented and incoherent  
12 across sectors and scales. Limitations and gaps in current modelling concern missing dimensions or  
13 scales with mismatches between concepts (e.g., ABM versus equilibrium models). Nevertheless,  
14 modelling is indispensable for better understanding the complex realities associated with food  
15 security. Recent efforts highlight the enormous potential in this field to inform decision making.  
16 Therefore, increased efforts to integrate models at different scales have the potential to contribute to  
17 achieving future food security.

18 Modellers can try to circumvent some of the methodological challenges discussed here by using 'smart  
19 scenarios' – instead of further increasing the complexity of models. For example, they could cover  
20 aspects in more complex scenarios that reflect outcomes of other models, such as the spread of new  
21 technologies in space and time. Nonetheless, the methodological challenges around the micro-macro  
22 link will need to be addressed more directly and completely. Further integration of the different  
23 interacting dynamics represented by different model types is required to better account for both multi-  
24 level agency and cross-scale feedbacks within the food system. Food system models also need to  
25 address underlying issues of food security such as poverty and inequality on a more comprehensive  
26 basis. This work could inform broader societal debates, e.g. concerning trade-offs between food  
27 security and environmental impacts.

28 We deduce several promising next steps from our assessment, which will hopefully help funding  
29 agencies and stakeholders to systematically work towards better tools and better understanding of  
30 food security challenges and solutions. First, to holistically address questions related to food security,  
31 large projects need to be initiated that have the capacity to study the relevant aspects and dimensions  
32 in conjunction with integrative methodological approaches. For instance, future work might usefully  
33 focus on the nexus of economic modelling of markets and ABMs. Second, networks of researchers  
34 spanning different countries need to be built and sustained with the goal to exchange, combine, and  
35 synthesize knowledge and methods that can advance the state of the art of modelling approaches to  
36 food security at local, regional and global scales. Third, platforms for the exchange of data, the  
37 replication of model results, and the exchange of ideas need to be developed. The progress achieved  
38 in other fields regarding technical implementation (such as modelling standards, common ontologies,  
39 and interfaces between models and to data) should increasingly be applied to the domain of food  
40 security modelling. Two examples are GeoHub (<https://mygeohub.org/>) and COMSES-Net  
41 (<https://www.comses.net/>). Developed with NSF funding, the open-source GeoHub hosts data and  
42 models developed by collaborators from around the world. COMSES-Net - "Network for Computational  
43 Modeling in Social and Ecological Sciences" offers a digital repository that supports discovery and good  
44 practices for software citation, digital preservation, reproducibility, and reuse. Platforms and  
45 endeavours such as this offer the potential to foster a community of practice focused on  
46 interdisciplinary modelling of food security. By continuing to integrate researchers and the different

1 model types available, modelling will be able to better provide the necessary understanding about  
2 multi-level agency and cross-scale feedbacks within the food system that is needed to ensure  
3 sustainable global food security.

## 4 6 Acknowledgments

5 see separate document

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

## 15 7 References

- 16 1. Africa Center for Strategic Studies, (2017) Acute Food Insecurity and Conflict in Africa. Africa  
17 Center for Strategic Studies (blog). [https://africacenter.org/spotlight/acute-food-insecurity-](https://africacenter.org/spotlight/acute-food-insecurity-conflict-africa/)  
18 [conflict-africa/](https://africacenter.org/spotlight/acute-food-insecurity-conflict-africa/). Accessed November 26, 2019.
- 19 2. Ahmed, S., A., Diffenbaugh, N., S. , Hertel, T., W. (2009) Climate volatility deepens poverty  
20 vulnerability in developing countries. *Environmental Research Letters* 4, 034004.
- 21 3. Aguiar, A., Narayanan, B., McDougall, R. (2016) An overview of the GTAP 9 data base. *Journal*  
22 *of Global Economic Analysis* 1, 181-208.
- 23 4. Ajzen, I. (1991) The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision*  
24 *Processes* 50 (2), 179-211.
- 25 5. Alexander, P., Prestele, R., Verburg, P.H., Arneth, A., Baranzelli, C., Batista e Silva, F., Brown,  
26 C., Butler, A., Calvin, K., Dendoncker, N., Doelman, J.C., Dunford, R., Engström, K., Eitelberg,  
27 D., Fujimori, S., Harrison, P.A., Hasegawa, T., Havlik, P., Holzauer, S., Humpenöder, F.,  
28 Jacobs-Crisioni, C., Jain, A.K., Krisztin, T., Kyle, P., Lavalle, C., Lenton, T., Liu, J., Meiyappan, P.,  
29 Popp, A., Powell, T., Sands, R.D., Schaldach, R., Stehfest, E., Steinbuks, J., Tabeau, A., van  
30 Meijl, H., Wise, M.A., Rounsevell, M.D.A. (2017) Assessing uncertainties in land cover  
31 projections. *Global Change Biology* 23, 767-781.
- 32 6. Alexander, P., Rabin, S., Anthoni, P., Henry, R., Pugh, T.A.M., Rounsevell, M.D.A., Arneth, A.  
33 (2018) Adaptation of global land use and management intensity to changes in climate and  
34 atmospheric carbon dioxide. *Global Change Biology* 24, 2791-2809.
- 35 7. Andersson, C., Törnberg, A., Törnberg, P. (2014) Societal systems – Complex or worse?  
36 *Futures* 63, 145-157.
- 37 8. Antle, J.M., Basso, B., Conant, R.T., Godfray, H.C.J., Jones, J.W., Herrero, M., Howitt, R.E.,  
38 Keating, B.A., Munoz-Carpena, R., Rosenzweig, C., Titttonell, P., Wheeler, T.R. (2017a)  
39 Towards a new generation of agricultural system data, models and knowledge products:  
40 Design and improvement. *Agricultural Systems* 155, 255-268.

- 1 9. Antle, J.M., Jones, J.W., Rosenzweig, C. (2017b) Next generation agricultural system models  
2 and knowledge products: Synthesis and strategy. *Agricultural Systems* 155, 179-185.
- 3 10. Antle, J.M., Stoorvogel, J.J., Valdivia, R.O. (2014) New parsimonious simulation methods and  
4 tools to assess future food and environmental security of farm populations. *Philosophical*  
5 *Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 369, 20120280.
- 6 11. Arthur, W.B. (2010) Complexity, the Santa Fe approach, and non-equilibrium economics.  
7 *History of Economic Ideas* 18, 149-166.
- 8 12. Asher, M.J., Croke, B.F.W., Jakeman, A.J., Peeters, L.J.M. (2015) A review of surrogate models  
9 and their application to groundwater modeling. *Water Resources Research* 51, 5957-5973.
- 10 13. Avelino, F., Wittmayer, J.M., Pel, B., Weaver, P., Dumitru, A., Haxeltine, A., Kemp, R.,  
11 Jørgensen, M.S., Bauler, T., Ruijsink, S., O'Riordan, T. (2019) Transformative social innovation  
12 and (dis)empowerment. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 145, 195-206.
- 13 14. Baldos, U.L.C., Hertel, T.W. (2015) The role of international trade in managing food security  
14 risks from climate change. *Food Security* 7, 275-290.
- 15 15. Baldos, U.L.C., Viens, F.G., Hertel, T.W., Fuglie, K.O. (2019) R&D Spending, Knowledge Capital,  
16 and Agricultural Productivity Growth: A Bayesian Approach. *American Journal of Agricultural*  
17 *Economics* 101, 291-310.
- 18 16. Balint, T., Lamperti, F., Mandel, A., Napoletano, M., Roventini, A., Sapio, A. (2017) Complexity  
19 and the Economics of Climate Change: A Survey and a Look Forward. *Ecological Economics*  
20 138, 252-265.
- 21 17. Baumgart-Getz, A., Prokopy, L.S., Floress, K. (2012) Why farmers adopt best management  
22 practice in the United States: A meta-analysis of the adoption literature. *Journal of*  
23 *Environmental Management* 96, 17-25.
- 24 18. Berger, T. (2001) Agent-based spatial models applied to agriculture: a simulation tool for  
25 technology diffusion, resource use changes and policy analysis. *Agricultural Economics* 25,  
26 245-260.
- 27 19. Berger, T., Troost, C., Wossen, T., Latynskiy, E., Tesfaye, K., Gbegbelegbe, S. (2017) Can  
28 smallholder farmers adapt to climate variability, and how effective are policy interventions?  
29 Agent-based simulation results for Ethiopia. *Agricultural Economics* 48, 693-706.
- 30 20. Bestelmeyer, B.T., Ash, A., Brown, J.R., Densambuu, B., Fernández-Giménez, M., Johanson, J.,  
31 Levi, M., Lopez, D., Peinetti, R., Rumpff, L., Shaver, P., (2017) State and Transition Models:  
32 Theory, Applications, and Challenges, in: Briske, D.D. (Ed.), *Rangeland Systems: Processes,*  
33 *Management and Challenges*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 303-345.
- 34 21. Bharwani, S., Bithell, M., Downing, T.E., New, M., Washington, R., Ziervogel, G. (2005) Multi-  
35 agent modelling of climate outlooks and food security on a community garden scheme in  
36 Limpopo, South Africa. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society London B* 360, 2183-  
37 2194.
- 38 22. Bodirsky, B.L., Rolinski, S., Biewald, A., Weindl, I., Popp, A., Lotze-Campen, H. (2015) Global  
39 Food Demand Scenarios for the 21st Century. *Plos One* 10, e0139201.
- 40 23. Bourgeron, P., Kliskey, A., Alessa, L., Loescher, H., Krauze, K., Virapongse, A., Griffith, D.L.  
41 (2018) Understanding large-scale, complex, human–environmental processes: a framework  
42 for social–ecological observatories. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 16, S52-S66.
- 43 24. Britz, W. (2008) Automated model linkages: the example of CAPRI. *German Journal of*  
44 *Agricultural Economics* 57, 363-367.
- 45 25. Bronson, K., Knezevic, I. (2016) Big Data in food and agriculture. *Big Data & Society* 3.
- 46 26. Brown, C., Alexander, P., Arneth, A., Holman, I., Rounsevell, M. (2019) Achievement of Paris  
47 climate goals unlikely due to time lags in the land system. *Nature Climate Change* 9, 203-208.

- 1 27. Brown, C., Alexander, P., Holzhauer, S., Rounsevell, M. (2017) Behavioural models of climate  
2 change adaptation and mitigation in land-based sectors. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews:*  
3 *Climate Change* 8, e448.
- 4 28. Brown, C., Alexander, P., Rounsevell, M. (2018a) Empirical evidence for the diffusion of  
5 knowledge in land use change. *Journal of Land Use Science* 13, 269-283.
- 6 29. Brown, C., Holzhauer, S., Metzger, M.J., Paterson, J.S., Rounsevell, M. (2018b) Land  
7 managers' behaviours modulate pathways to visions of future land systems. *Regional*  
8 *Environmental Change* 18, 831-845.
- 9 30. Brown, D.G., Verburg, P.H., Pontius Jr, R.G., Lange, M.D. (2013) Opportunities to improve  
10 impact, integration, and evaluation of land change models. *Current Opinion in Environmental*  
11 *Sustainability* 5, 452-457.
- 12 31. Burgert, C.R., Colston, J., Roy, T., Zachary, B., (2013) Geographic displacement procedure and  
13 georeferenced data release policy for the Demographic and Health Surveys, DHS Spatial  
14 Analysis Reports No. 7. ICF International, Calverton, Maryland, US.
- 15 32. Burgess, R., Donaldson, D. (2010) Can Openness Mitigate the Effects of Weather Shocks?  
16 Evidence from India's Famine Era. *The American Economic Review* 100, 449-453.
- 17 33. Burke, M.B., Miguel, E., Satyanath, S., Dykema, J.A., Lobell, D.B. (2009) Warming increases  
18 the risk of civil war in Africa. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 106, 20670-  
19 20674.
- 20 34. Cai, Y., Golub, A.A., Hertel, T.W. (2017) Agricultural research spending must increase in light  
21 of future uncertainties. *Food Policy* 70, 71-83.
- 22 35. Carter, M.R., Cheng, L., Sarris, A. (2016) Where and how index insurance can boost the  
23 adoption of improved agricultural technologies. *Journal of Development Economics* 118, 59-  
24 71.
- 25 36. Ciaian, P., Espinosa, M., Paloma, S.G.y., Heckelei, T., Langrell, S., Louhichi, K., Sckokai, P.,  
26 Thomas, A., Vard, T., (2013) Farm level modelling of CAP: a methodological review. *JRC*  
27 *Scientific and Policy Reports*. DOI: 10.2791/86415.
- 28 37. Coates, J. (2013) Build it back better: Deconstructing food security for improved  
29 measurement and action. *Global Food Security* 2, 188-194.
- 30 38. Cockburn, J., (2006) Trade liberalisation and poverty in Nepal: A computable general  
31 equilibrium micro-simulation analysis, in: Bussolo, M., Round, J. (Eds.), *Globalization and*  
32 *Poverty: Channels and Policies*. Routledge, London, pp. 171-194.
- 33 39. Cogneau, D., Robilliard, A.-S., (2007) Growth, Distribution, and Poverty in Madagascar:  
34 Learning from a Microsimulation Model in a General Equilibrium Framework, in: Spadaro, A.  
35 (Ed.), *Microsimulation as a tool for the evaluation of public policies : methods and*  
36 *applications*. Fundacion BBVA, Bilbao, pp. 73-113.
- 37 40. Cole, S.A., Xiong, W. (2017) Agricultural Insurance and Economic Development. *Annual*  
38 *Review of Economics* 9, 235-262.
- 39 41. Cottrell, R.S., Nash, K.L., Halpern, B.S., Remenyi, T.A., Corney, S.P., Fleming, A., Fulton, E.A.,  
40 Hornborg, S., John, A., Watson, R.A., Blanchard, J.L. (2019) Food production shocks across  
41 land and sea. *Nature Sustainability* 2, 130-137.
- 42 42. Daloğlu, I., Nassauer, J.I., Riolo, R.L., Scavia, D. (2014) Development of a farmer typology of  
43 agricultural conservation behavior in the American Corn Belt. *Agricultural Systems* 129, 93-  
44 102.
- 45 43. Davis, P.K., O'Mahony, A., Gulden, T.R., Osoba, O.A., Sieck, K., (2018) Priority Challenges for  
46 Social and Behavioral Research and Its Modeling. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation,  
47 [https://www.rand.org/pubs/research\\_reports/RR2208.html](https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2208.html). Also available in print form.

- 1 44. Debonne, N., van Vliet, J., Heinimann, A., Verburg, P. (2018) Representing large-scale land  
2 acquisitions in land use change scenarios for the Lao PDR. *Regional Environmental Change*  
3 18, 1857-1869.
- 4 45. DellaPosta, D., Shi, Y., Macy, M. (2015) Why Do Liberals Drink Lattes? *American Journal of*  
5 *Sociology* 120, 1473-1511.
- 6 46. Dercon, S., (2005) Vulnerability: A Micro Perspective. In Annual Bank Conference on  
7 Development Economics (ABCDE) Conference. Amsterdam. May 23-24, 2005.
- 8 47. Dessart, F.J., Barreiro-Hurlé, J., van Bavel, R. (2019) Behavioural factors affecting the  
9 adoption of sustainable farming practices: a policy-oriented review. *European Review of*  
10 *Agricultural Economics* 46, 417-471.
- 11 48. Dick, J., Orenstein, D.E., Holzer, J.M., Wohner, C., Achard, A.-L., Andrews, C., Avriel-Avni, N.,  
12 Beja, P., Blond, N., Cabello, J., Chen, C., Díaz-Delgado, R., Giannakis, G.V., Gingrich, S.,  
13 Izakovicova, Z., Krauze, K., Lamouroux, N., Leca, S., Melecis, V., Miklós, K., Mimikou, M.,  
14 Niedrist, G., Piscart, C., Postolache, C., Psomas, A., Santos-Reis, M., Tappeiner, U., Vanderbilt,  
15 K., Van Ryckegem, G. (2018) What is socio-ecological research delivering? A literature survey  
16 across 25 international LTSER platforms. *Science of the Total Environment* 622-623, 1225-  
17 1240.
- 18 49. Dietrich, J.P., Schmitz, C., Lotze-Campen, H., Popp, A., Müller, C. (2014) Forecasting  
19 technological change in agriculture—An endogenous implementation in a global land use  
20 model. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 81, 236-249.
- 21 50. Diffenbaugh, N.S., Hertel, T.W., Scherer, M., Verma, M. (2012) Response of corn markets to  
22 climate volatility under alternative energy futures. *Nature Climate Change* 2, 514.
- 23 51. Ding, D., Bennett, D., Secchi, S. (2015) Investigating impacts of alternative crop market  
24 scenarios on land use change with an agent-based model. *Land* 4, 1110-1137.
- 25 52. Diogo, V., Hennen, W., Verma, M., Oudendag, D., Kuiper, M., (2020) MagnetGrid: Model  
26 description and user guide. Wageningen Economic Research, Wageningen.  
27 <https://doi.org/10.18174/512146>.
- 28 53. Dobbie, S., Schreckenber, K., Dyke, J.G., Schaafsma, M., Balbi, S. (2018) Agent-Based  
29 Modelling to Assess Community Food Security and Sustainable Livelihoods. *Journal of*  
30 *Artificial Societies and Social Simulation* 21, 9.
- 31 54. Donges, J.F., Heitzig, J., Barfuss, W., Kassel, J.A., Kittel, T., Kolb, J.J., Kolster, T., Müller-  
32 Hansen, F., Otto, I.M., Wiedermann, M., Zimmerer, K.B., Lucht, W. (2018) Earth system  
33 modelling with complex dynamic human societies: the copan: CORE World-Earth modeling  
34 framework. *Earth Syst. Dynam. Discuss.* 2018, 1-27.
- 35 55. Dou, Y., Millington, J.D.A., da Silva, R.F.B., McCord, P., Viña, A., Song, Q., Yu, Q., Wu, W.,  
36 Batistella, M., Moran, E., Liu, J. (2019) Land-use changes across distant places: design of a  
37 telecoupled agent-based model. *Journal of Land Use Science*, 1-19.
- 38 56. Dou, Y., Yao, G., Herzberger, A., da Silva, R.F.B., Song, Q., Hovis, C., Batistella, M., Moran, E.,  
39 Wu, W., Liu, J. (2020) Land-Use Changes in Distant Places: Implementation of a Telecoupled  
40 Agent-Based Model. *Jasss-the Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation* 23, 11.
- 41 57. Dressler, G., Hoffmann, F., Breuer, I., Kreuer, D., Mahdi, M., Frank, K., Müller, B. (2018)  
42 Polarization in (post-)nomadic resource use in Eastern Morocco: insights using a multi-agent  
43 simulation model. *Regional Environmental Change* 19, 489-500.
- 44 58. Eilers, E.J., Kremen, C., Smith Greenleaf, S., Garber, A.K., Klein, A.-M. (2011) Contribution of  
45 Pollinator-Mediated Crops to Nutrients in the Human Food Supply. *Plos One* 6, e21363.
- 46 59. Ermolieva, T.Y., Ermoliev, Y.M., Havlík, P., Mosnier, A., Leclere, D., Fritz, S., Valin, H.,  
47 Obersteiner, M., Kyrzyuk, S.V., Borodina, O.M. (2017) Dynamic Merge of the Global and  
48 Local Models for Sustainable Land Use Planning with Regard for Global Projections from

- 1 GLOBIOM and Local Technical-Economic Feasibility and Resource Constraints\*. *Cybernetics*  
2 *and Systems Analysis* 53, 176-185.
- 3 60. Evans, T.P., Robinson, D.T., Schmitt-Harsh, M., (2013) Limitations, challenges, and solutions  
4 to integrating carbon dynamics with land-use models, in: Reed, B.C., Brown, D.G., Robinson,  
5 D.T., French, N.H.F. (Eds.), *Land use and the carbon cycle. Advances in integrated science,*  
6 *management, and policy.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 178-208.
- 7 61. Ewert, F., Rotter, R.P., Bindi, M., Webber, H., Trnka, M., Kersebaum, K.C., Olesen, J.E., van  
8 Ittersum, M.K., Janssen, S., Rivington, M., Semenov, M.A., Wallach, D., Porter, J.R., Stewart,  
9 D., Verhagen, J., Gaiser, T., Palosuo, T., Tao, F., Nendel, C., Roggero, P.P., Bartosova, L.,  
10 Asseng, S. (2015) Crop modelling for integrated assessment of risk to food production from  
11 climate change. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 72, 287-303.
- 12 62. Ewert, F., Rounsevell, M.D.A., Reginster, I., Metzger, M.J., Leemans, R. (2005) Future  
13 scenarios of European agricultural land use: I. Estimating changes in crop productivity.  
14 *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 107, 101-116.
- 15 63. Ewert, F., van Ittersum, M.K., Bezlepkina, I., Therond, O., Andersen, E., Belhouchette, H.,  
16 Bockstaller, C., Brouwer, F., Heckeley, T., Janssen, S., Knapen, R., Kuiper, M., Louhichi, K.,  
17 Olsson, J.A., Turpin, N., Wery, J., Wien, J.E., Wolf, J. (2009) A methodology for enhanced  
18 flexibility of integrated assessment in agriculture. *Environmental Science & Policy* 12, 546-  
19 561.
- 20 64. Ewert, F., van Ittersum, M.K., Heckeley, T., Therond, O., Bezlepkina, I., Andersen, E. (2011)  
21 Scale changes and model linking methods for integrated assessment of agri-environmental  
22 systems. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 142, 6-17.
- 23 65. FAO, (1996) Rome Declaration on World Food Security. Rome.  
24 <http://www.fao.org/3/w3613e/w3613e00.htm>. Accessed November 26, 2019.
- 25 66. FAO\_IFAD&WFP (2014) The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2014. Strengthening the  
26 enabling environment for food security and nutrition. Rome, FAO.  
27 <http://www.fao.org/3/i4030e/i4030e.pdf>, Accessed November 26, 2019.
- 28 67. Farrell, A.E., Plevin, R.J., Turner, B.T., Jones, A.D., Hare, M., Kammen, D.M. (2006) Ethanol  
29 Can Contribute to Energy and Environmental Goals. *Science* 311, 506.
- 30 68. Fellmann, T., Witzke, P., Weiss, F., Van Doorslaer, B., Drabik, D., Huck, I., Salputra, G.,  
31 Jansson, T., Leip, A. (2018) Major challenges of integrating agriculture into climate change  
32 mitigation policy frameworks. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change* 23,  
33 451-468.
- 34 69. Fitz, D. (2018) Evaluating the impact of market-assisted land reform in Brazil. *World*  
35 *Development* 103, 255-267.
- 36 70. Francois, J., Martin, W., (2013) Computational general equilibrium modelling of international  
37 trade, *Palgrave handbook of international trade.* Springer, pp. 571-593.
- 38 71. Frank, S., Havlík, P., Soussana, J.-F., Levesque, A., Valin, H., Wollenberg, E., Kleinwechter, U.,  
39 Fricko, O., Gusti, M., Herrero, M., Smith, P., Hasegawa, T., Kraxner, F., Obersteiner, M. (2017)  
40 Reducing greenhouse gas emissions in agriculture without compromising food security?  
41 *Environmental Research Letters* 12, 105004.
- 42 72. Fraval, S., Hammond, J., Lannerstad, M., Oosting, S.J., Sayula, G., Teufel, N., Silvestri, S.,  
43 Poole, E.J., Herrero, M., van Wijk, M.T. (2018) Livelihoods and food security in an urban  
44 linked, high potential region of Tanzania: Changes over a three year period. *Agricultural*  
45 *Systems* 160, 87-95.
- 46 73. Frei, C., dos Reis, G. (2011) A financial market with interacting investors: does an equilibrium  
47 exist? *Mathematics and Financial Economics* 4, 161-182.

- 1 74. Fuglie, K. (2018) R&D Capital, R&D Spillovers, and Productivity Growth in World Agriculture.  
2 Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy 40, 421-444.
- 3 75. García-Mira, R., Dumitru, A., Alonso-Betanzos, A., Sánchez-Marño, N., Fontenla-Romero, Ó.,  
4 Craig, T., Polhill, J.G. (2017) Testing Scenarios to Achieve Workplace Sustainability Goals  
5 Using Backcasting and Agent-Based Modeling. Environment and Behavior 49, 1007-1037.
- 6 76. Genius, M., Koundouri, P., Nauges, C., Tzouvelekas, V. (2013) Information transmission in  
7 irrigation technology adoption and diffusion: Social learning, extension services, and spatial  
8 effects. American Journal of Agricultural Economics 96, 328-344.
- 9 77. Ghorbani, A., Bravo, G., Frey, U., Theesfeld, I. (2017) Self-organization in the commons: An  
10 empirically-tested model. Environmental Modelling & Software 96, 30-45.
- 11 78. Gibbon, P., Ponte, S. (2005) Trading down: Africa, value chains, and the global economy.  
12 Temple University Press.
- 13 79. Gibson, C.C., Ostrom, E., Ahn, T.K. (2000) The concept of scale and the human dimensions of  
14 global change: a survey. Ecological Economics 32, 217-239.
- 15 80. Giné, X., Townsend, R., Vickery, J. (2008) Patterns of Rainfall Insurance Participation in Rural  
16 India. The World Bank Economic Review 22, 539-566.
- 17 81. Godfray, H.C., Beddington, J.R., Crute, I.R., Haddad, L., Lawrence, D., Muir, J.F., Pretty, J.,  
18 Robinson, S., Thomas, S.M., Toulmin, C. (2010) Food Security: The Challenge of Feeding 9  
19 Billion People. Science 327, 812-818.
- 20 82. Gräbner, C. (2016) Agent-based computational models– a formal heuristic for institutionalist  
21 pattern modelling? Journal of Institutional Economics 12, 241-261.
- 22 83. Gruber, T.R. (1993) A translation approach to portable ontology specifications. Knowledge  
23 Acquisition 5, 199-220.
- 24 84. Hadjikakou, M., Ritchie, E.G., Watermeyer, K.E., Bryan, B.A. (2019) Improving the assessment  
25 of food system sustainability. The Lancet Planetary Health 3, e62-e63.
- 26 85. Hammond, R.A., Dube, L. (2012) A systems science perspective and transdisciplinary models  
27 for food and nutrition security. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the  
28 United States of America 109, 12356-12363.
- 29 86. Happe, K., Kellermann, K., Balmann, A. (2006) Agent-based analysis of agricultural policies: an  
30 illustration of the agricultural policy simulator AgriPoliS, its adaptation and behavior. Ecology  
31 and Society 11, Art. no. 49 [online].
- 32 87. Hasegawa, T., Fujimori, S., Havlík, P., Valin, H., Bodirsky, B.L., Doelman, J.C., Fellmann, T.,  
33 Kyle, P., Koopman, J.F.L., Lotze-Campen, H., Mason-D’Croz, D., Ochi, Y., Pérez Domínguez, I.,  
34 Stehfest, E., Sulser, T.B., Tabeau, A., Takahashi, K., Takakura, J.y., van Meijl, H., van Zeist, W.-  
35 J., Wiebe, K., Witzke, P. (2018) Risk of increased food insecurity under stringent global  
36 climate change mitigation policy. Nature Climate Change 8, 699-703.
- 37 88. Headey, D., Ecker, O. (2013) Rethinking the measurement of food security: from first  
38 principles to best practice. Food Security 5, 327-343.
- 39 89. Herrero, M., Thornton, P.K., Bernués, A., Baltenweck, I., Vervoort, J., van de Steeg, J.,  
40 Makokha, S., van Wijk, M.T., Karanja, S., Rufino, M.C., Staal, S.J. (2014) Exploring future  
41 changes in smallholder farming systems by linking socio-economic scenarios with regional  
42 and household models. Global Environmental Change 24, 165-182.
- 43 90. Herrero, M., Thornton, P.K., Power, B., Bogard, J.R., Remans, R., Fritz, S., Gerber, J.S., Nelson,  
44 G., See, L., Waha, K., Watson, R.A., West, P.C., Samberg, L.H., van de Steeg, J., Stephenson, E.,  
45 van Wijk, M., Havlík, P. (2017) Farming and the geography of nutrient production for human  
46 use: a transdisciplinary analysis. The Lancet Planetary Health 1, e33-e42.
- 47 91. Hertel, T., Verma, M., Bouet, A., Cranfield, J., Preckel, P., (2007) Global Nutrition Impacts of  
48 Rapid Economic Growth in China and India. Paper prepared for the Tenth Annual Conference



- 1 on Global Economic Analysis, Purdue University, June 7 – 9, 2007, as well as the annual  
2 meetings of the AAEA, Portland, Oregon, July 29-31. <http://purl.umn.edu/9841>.
- 3 92. Hertel, T., Villoria, N., (2012) GEOSHARE: Geospatial Open Source Hosting of Agriculture,  
4 Resource and Environmental Data for Discovery and Decision Making. PPRI Digital Library.  
5 Paper 7. <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/gpridocs/7>.
- 6 93. Hertel, T.W., Keeney, R., Ivanic, M., Winters, L.A. (2009) Why Isn't the Doha Development  
7 Agenda more Poverty Friendly? *Review of Development Economics* 13, 543-559.
- 8 94. Hertel, T.W., Tyner, W.E. (2013) Market-mediated environmental impacts of biofuels. *Global*  
9 *Food Security* 2, 131-137.
- 10 95. Hertel, T.W., Winters, L.A. (2005) *Poverty and the WTO: Impacts of the Doha Development*  
11 *Agenda*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire : Washington, DC: World Bank Publications.
- 12 96. Holden, S.T., Ghebru, H. (2016) Land tenure reforms, tenure security and food security in  
13 poor agrarian economies: Causal linkages and research gaps. *Global Food Security* 10, 21-28.
- 14 97. Holman, I.P., Brown, C., Carter, T.R., Harrison, P.A., Rounsevell, M. (2019) Improving the  
15 representation of adaptation in climate change impact models. *Regional Environmental*  
16 *Change* 19, 711-721.
- 17 98. Holzhauser, S., Brown, C., Rounsevell, M. (2019) Modelling dynamic effects of multi-scale  
18 institutions on land use change. *Regional Environmental Change* 19, 733-746.
- 19 99. Holtz, G., Alkemade, F., de Haan, F., Köhler, J., Trutnevyte, E., Luthe, T., Halbe, J.,  
20 Papachristos, G., Chappin, E., Kwakkel, J., Ruutu, S. (2015) Prospects of modelling societal  
21 transitions: Position paper of an emerging community. *Environmental Innovation and*  
22 *Societal Transitions* 17, 41-58.
- 23 100. Huber, R., Bakker, M., Balmann, A., Berger, T., Bithell, M., Brown, C., Grêt-Regamey,  
24 A., Xiong, H., Le, Q.B., Mack, G., Meyfroidt, P., Millington, J., Müller, B., Polhill, J.G., Sun, Z.,  
25 Seidl, R., Troost, C., Finger, R. (2018) Representation of decision-making in European  
26 agricultural agent-based models. *Agricultural Systems* 167, 143-160.
- 27 101. Janssen, S., van Ittersum, M.K. (2007) Assessing farm innovations and responses to  
28 policies: A review of bio-economic farm models. *Agricultural Systems* 94, 622-636.
- 29 102. Jayne, T.S., Chamberlin, J., Traub, L., Sitko, N., Muyanga, M., Yeboah, F.K., Anseeuw,  
30 W., Chapoto, A., Wineman, A., Nkonde, C., Kachule, R. (2016) Africa's changing farm size  
31 distribution patterns: the rise of medium-scale farms. *Agricultural Economics* 47, 197-214.
- 32 103. John, F., Toth, R., Frank, K., Groeneveld, J., Müller, B. (2019) Ecological Vulnerability  
33 Through Insurance? Potential Unintended Consequences of Livestock Drought Insurance.  
34 *Ecological Economics* 157, 357-368.
- 35 104. Kaldor, N. (1972) The Irrelevance of Equilibrium Economics. *The Economic Journal* 82,  
36 1237-1255.
- 37 105. Kalkuhl, M., von Braun, J., Torero, M., (2016) Volatile and extreme food prices, food  
38 security, and policy: an overview, *Food Price Volatility and Its Implications for Food Security*  
39 *and Policy*. Springer, pp. 3-31.
- 40 106. Kaminski, J., Christiaensen, L. (2014) Post-harvest loss in sub-Saharan Africa—what  
41 do farmers say? *Global Food Security* 3, 149-158.
- 42 107. Kelly, R.A., Jakeman, A.J., Barreteau, O., Borsuk, M.E., ElSawah, S., Hamilton, S.H.,  
43 Henriksen, H.J., Kuikka, S., Maier, H.R., Rizzoli, A.E., van Delden, H., Voinov, A.A. (2013)  
44 Selecting among five common modelling approaches for integrated environmental  
45 assessment and management. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 47, 159-181.
- 46 108. Kiesling, E., Günther, M., Stummer, C., Wakolbinger, L.M. (2012) Agent-based  
47 simulation of innovation diffusion: a review. *Central European Journal of Operations*  
48 *Research* 20, 183-230.

- 1 109. Kiviat, B., (2009) Why The World's Poor Refuse Insurance, Time. September 21, 2009,  
2 <http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1921590,00.html>, last accessed,  
3 November 26 2019.
- 4 110. Klein, A.-M., Vaissière, B.E., Cane, J.H., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Cunningham, S.A.,  
5 Kremen, C., Tscharntke, T. (2007) Importance of pollinators in changing landscapes for world  
6 crops. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B. Biological sciences* 274, 303-313.
- 7 111. Knowler, D., Bradshaw, B. (2007) Farmers' adoption of conservation agriculture: A  
8 review and synthesis of recent research. *Food Policy* 32, 25-48.
- 9 112. Köhler, J., de Haan, F., Holtz, G., Kubeczko, K., Moallemi, E., Papachristos, G.,  
10 Chappin, E. (2018) Modelling sustainability transitions: An assessment of approaches and  
11 challenges. *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation* 21, 8.
- 12 113. Kovács-Hostyánszki, A., Espíndola, A., Vanbergen, A.J., Settele, J., Kremen, C., Dicks,  
13 L.V. (2017) Ecological intensification to mitigate impacts of conventional intensive land use  
14 on pollinators and pollination. *Ecology Letters* 20, 673-689.
- 15 114. Kremen, C., M'Gonigle, L.K. (2015) EDITOR'S CHOICE: Small-scale restoration in  
16 intensive agricultural landscapes supports more specialized and less mobile pollinator  
17 species. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 52, 602-610.
- 18 115. Laborde, D., Majeed, F., Tokgoz, S., Torero, M., (2016) Long-Term Drivers of Food and  
19 Nutrition Security, IFPRI Discussion Paper 01531.
- 20 116. Lambin, E.F., Rounsevell, M.D.A., Geist, H.J. (2000) Are agricultural land-use models  
21 able to predict changes in land-use intensity? *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 82,  
22 321-331.
- 23 117. Levers, C., Schneider, M., Prishchepov, A.V., Estel, S., Kuemmerle, T. (2018) Spatial  
24 variation in determinants of agricultural land abandonment in Europe. *Science of the Total*  
25 *Environment* 644, 95-111.
- 26 118. Lindgren, K., Jonson, E., Lundberg, L. (2015) Projection of a heterogeneous agent-  
27 based production economy model to a closed dynamics of aggregate variables. *Advances in*  
28 *Complex Systems* 18, 1550012.
- 29 119. Liu, J., Dou, Y., Batistella, M., Challies, E., Connor, T., Friis, C., Millington, J.D.A.,  
30 Parish, E., Romulo, C.L., Silva, R.F.B., Triezenberg, H., Yang, H., Zhao, Z., Zimmerer, K.S.,  
31 Huettmann, F., Treglia, M.L., Basher, Z., Chung, M.G., Herzberger, A., Lenschow, A.,  
32 Mechiche-Alami, A., Newig, J., Roche, J., Sun, J. (2018a) Spillover systems in a telecoupled  
33 Anthropocene: typology, methods, and governance for global sustainability. *Current Opinion*  
34 *in Environmental Sustainability* 33, 58-69.
- 35 120. Liu, J., Hertel, T.W., Bowling, L., Jame, S., Kucharik, C., Ramankutty, N. (2018b)  
36 Evaluating Alternative Options for Managing Nitrogen Losses from Corn Production, Purdue  
37 Policy Research Institute (PPRI) Policy Briefs: Vol. 4 : Iss. 1 , Article 9. Available at:  
38 <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/gripb/vol4/iss1/9>.
- 39 121. Liu, J., Hull, V., Batistella, M., DeFries, R., Dietz, T., Fu, F., Hertel, T.W., Izaurralde,  
40 R.C., Lambin, E.F., Li, S., Martinelli, L.A., McConnell, W.J., Moran, E.F., Naylor, R., Ouyang, Z.,  
41 Polenske, K.R., Reenberg, A., de Miranda Rocha, G., Simmons, C.S., Verburg, P.H., Vitousek,  
42 P.M., Zhang, F., Zhu, C. (2013) Framing Sustainability in a Telecoupled World. *Ecology and*  
43 *Society* 18.
- 44 122. Llewellyn, R.S. (2007) Information quality and effectiveness for more rapid adoption  
45 decisions by farmers. *Field Crops Research* 104, 148-156.
- 46 123. Lobell, D.B. (2014) Climate change adaptation in crop production: Beware of illusions.  
47 *Global Food Security* 3, 72-76.

- 1 124. Lobell, D.B., Cassman, K.G., Field, C.B., (2009) Crop yield gaps: Their importance,  
2 magnitudes, and causes, *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, pp. 179-204.
- 3 125. Lotze-Campen, H., Verburg, P.H., Popp, A., Lindner, M., Verkerk, P.J., Moiseyev, A.,  
4 Schrammeijer, E., Helming, J., Tabeau, A., Schulp, C.J.E., van der Zanden, E.H., Lavalle, C., e  
5 Silva, F.B., Walz, A., Bodirsky, B. (2018) A cross-scale impact assessment of European nature  
6 protection policies under contrasting future socio-economic pathways. *Regional*  
7 *Environmental Change* 18, 751-762.
- 8 126. Louhichi, K., Espinosa, M., Ciaian, P., Perni, A., Vosough Ahmadi, B., L., C., Gomez y  
9 Paloma, S., (2018) The EU-Wide Individual Farm Model for Common Agricultural Policy  
10 Analysis (IFM-CAP v.1). European Commission, Joint Research Centre, EUR 28829 EN,  
11 doi:10.2760/218047.
- 12 127. Louhichi, K., Kanellopoulos, A., Janssen, S., Flichman, G., Blanco, M., Hengsdijk, H.,  
13 Heckelei, T., Berentsen, P., Lansink, A.O., Ittersum, M.V. (2010) FSSIM, a bio-economic farm  
14 model for simulating the response of EU farming systems to agricultural and environmental  
15 policies. *Agricultural Systems* 103, 585-597.
- 16 128. Lundberg, L., Jonson, E., Lindgren, K., Bryngelsson, D., Verendel, V. (2015) A cobweb  
17 model of land-use competition between food and bioenergy crops. *Journal of Economic*  
18 *Dynamics and Control* 53, 1-14.
- 19 129. Maertens, A., Barrett, C.B. (2012) Measuring social networks' effects on agricultural  
20 technology adoption. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 95, 353-359.
- 21 130. Maiorano, A., Martre, P., Asseng, S., Ewert, F., Müller, C., Rötter, R.P., Ruane, A.C.,  
22 Semenov, M.A., Wallach, D., Wang, E. (2017) Crop model improvement reduces the  
23 uncertainty of the response to temperature of multi-model ensembles. *Field Crops Research*  
24 202, 5-20.
- 25 131. Malek, Ž., Verburg, P. (2017) Mediterranean land systems: Representing diversity and  
26 intensity of complex land systems in a dynamic region. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 165,  
27 102-116.
- 28 132. Malek, Ž., Verburg, P.H., R Geijzendorffer, I., Bondeau, A., Cramer, W. (2018) Global  
29 change effects on land management in the Mediterranean region. *Global Environmental*  
30 *Change* 50, 238-254.
- 31 133. Marra, M., Pannell, D.J., Ghadim, A.A. (2003) The economics of risk, uncertainty and  
32 learning in the adoption of new agricultural technologies: where are we on the learning  
33 curve? *Agricultural Systems* 75, 215-234.
- 34 134. Martínás, K., (2007) Non-Equilibrium Economics. *Interdisciplinary Description of*  
35 *Complex Systems - scientific journal*, Croatian Interdisciplinary Society Provider Homepage:  
36 <http://indec.eu>, 4(2), pp. 63-79.
- 37 135. Maru, A., Berne, D., De Beer, J.e.a., (2018) Digital and Data-Driven Agriculture:  
38 Harnessing the Power of Data for Smallholders. Rome: Global Forum on Agricultural  
39 Research and Innovation [version 1; not peer reviewed]. *F1000Research* 2018, 7:525.  
40 <https://doi.org/10.7490/f1000research.1115402.1>.
- 41 136. Mason-D'Croz, D., Sulser, T.B., Wiebe, K., Rosegrant, M.W., Lowder, S.K., Nin-Pratt,  
42 A., Willenbockel, D., Robinson, S., Zhu, T., Cenacchi, N., Dunston, S., Robertson, R.D. (2019)  
43 Agricultural investments and hunger in Africa modeling potential contributions to SDG2 -  
44 Zero Hunger. *World Development* 116, 38-53.
- 45 137. Matthews, R.B., Gilbert, N.G., Roach, A., Polhill, J.G., Gotts, N.M. (2007) Agent-based  
46 land-use models: a review of applications. *Landscape Ecology* 22, 1447-1459.

- 1 138. McDowall, W., Geels, F.W. (2017) Ten challenges for computer models in transitions  
2 research: Commentary on Holtz et al. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions* 22,  
3 41-49.
- 4 139. Mehrabi, Z., Ramankutty, N. (2019) Synchronized failure of global crop production.  
5 *Nature Ecology & Evolution* 3, 780-786.
- 6 140. Meijer, S.S., Catacutan, D., Ajayi, O.C., Sileshi, G.W., Nieuwenhuis, M. (2015) The role  
7 of knowledge, attitudes and perceptions in the uptake of agricultural and agroforestry  
8 innovations among smallholder farmers in sub-Saharan Africa. *International Journal of*  
9 *Agricultural Sustainability* 13, 40-54.
- 10 141. Melnikov, N.B., O'Neill, B.C., Dalton, M.G., van Ruijven, B.J. (2017) Downscaling  
11 heterogeneous household outcomes in dynamic CGE models for energy-economic analysis.  
12 *Energy Economics* 65, 87-97.
- 13 142. Millington, J.D.A., (2019) CRAFTY-Brazil Input Maps (Version v.1.0.0). Zenodo.  
14 <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3549788>
- 15 143. Millington, J., Xiong, H., Peterson, S., Woods, J. (2017) Integrating Modelling  
16 Approaches for Understanding Telecoupling: Global Food Trade and Local Land Use. *Land* 6,  
17 56.
- 18 144. Millington, J.D., Perry, G.L., Romero-Calcerrada, R. (2007) Regression techniques for  
19 examining land use/cover change: a case study of a Mediterranean landscape. *Ecosystems*  
20 10, 562-578.
- 21 145. Moore, F., C., Baldos, U.L., C. , Hertel, T. (2017) Economic impacts of climate change  
22 on agriculture: a comparison of process-based and statistical yield models. *Environmental*  
23 *Research Letters* 12, 065008.
- 24 146. Müller, B., Johnson, L., Kreuer, D. (2017a) Maladaptive outcomes of climate  
25 insurance in agriculture. *Global Environmental Change* 46, 23-33.
- 26 147. Müller, B., Quaas, M.F., Frank, K., Baumgärtner, S. (2011) Pitfalls and Potential of  
27 Institutional Change: Rain-Index Insurance and the Sustainability of Rangeland Management.  
28 *Ecological Economics* 70, 2137-2144.
- 29 148. Müller, C., Elliott, J., Chryssanthacopoulos, J., Arneth, A., Balkovic, J., Ciais, P., Deryng,  
30 D., Folberth, C., Glotter, M., Hoek, S., Iizumi, T., Izaurralde, R.C., Jones, C., Khabarov, N.,  
31 Lawrence, P., Liu, W., Olin, S., Pugh, T.A.M., Ray, D.K., Reddy, A., Rosenzweig, C., Ruane, A.C.,  
32 Sakurai, G., Schmid, E., Skalsky, R., Song, C.X., Wang, X., de Wit, A., Yang, H. (2017b) Global  
33 gridded crop model evaluation: benchmarking, skills, deficiencies and implications. *Geosci.*  
34 *Model Dev.* 10, 1403-1422.
- 35 149. Müller, C., Elliott, J., Pugh, T.A.M., Ruane, A.C., Ciais, P., Balkovic, J., Deryng, D.,  
36 Folberth, C., Izaurralde, R.C., Jones, C.D., Khabarov, N., Lawrence, P., Liu, W., Reddy, A.D.,  
37 Schmid, E., Wang, X.H. (2018) Global patterns of crop yield stability under additional nutrient  
38 and water inputs. *Plos One* 13.
- 39 150. Müller, D., Sun, Z.L., Vongvisouk, T., Pflugmacher, D., Xu, J.C., Mertz, O. (2014)  
40 Regime shifts limit the predictability of land-system change. *Global Environmental Change-*  
41 *Human and Policy Dimensions* 28, 75-83.
- 42 151. Munroe, D.K., Southworth, J., Tucker, C.M. (2002) The dynamics of land-cover change  
43 in western Honduras: exploring spatial and temporal complexity. *Agricultural Economics* 27,  
44 355-369.
- 45 152. Murdock, L.L., Baoua, I.B. (2014) On Purdue Improved Cowpea Storage (PICS)  
46 technology: Background, mode of action, future prospects. *Journal of Stored Products*  
47 *Research* 58, 3-11.

- 1 153. Natalini, D., Bravo, G., Jones, A.W. (2017) Global food security and food riots – an  
2 agent-based modelling approach. *Food Security*, 1-21.
- 3 154. Nelson, G.C., Valin, H., Sands, R.D., Havlík, P., Ahammad, H., Deryng, D., Elliott, J.,  
4 Fujimori, S., Hasegawa, T., Heyhoe, E., Kyle, P., Von Lampe, M., Lotze-Campen, H., Mason  
5 d’Croz, D., van Meijl, H., van der Mensbrugge, D., Müller, C., Popp, A., Robertson, R.,  
6 Robinson, S., Schmid, E., Schmitz, C., Tabeau, A., Willenbockel, D. (2014a) Climate change  
7 effects on agriculture: Economic responses to biophysical shocks. *Proceedings of the*  
8 *National Academy of Sciences* 111, 3274-3279.
- 9 155. Nelson, G.C., van der Mensbrugge, D., Ahammad, H., Blanc, E., Calvin, K., Hasegawa,  
10 T., Havlik, P., Heyhoe, E., Kyle, P., Lotze-Campen, H., von Lampe, M., Mason d’Croz, D., van  
11 Meijl, H., Müller, C., Reilly, J., Robertson, R., Sands, R.D., Schmitz, C., Tabeau, A., Takahashi,  
12 K., Valin, H., Willenbockel, D. (2014) Agriculture and climate change in global scenarios: why  
13 don’t the models agree. *Agricultural Economics* 45, 85-101.
- 14 156. Niamir, L., Filatova, T., (2015) Linking Agent-based Energy Market with Computable  
15 General Equilibrium Model: an Integrated Approach to Climate -Economy-Energy System. In:  
16 The 20th WEHIA Conference, 21-23 May 2015, Sophia Antipolis, France.
- 17 157. Pelikan, J., Britz, W., Hertel, T.W. (2015) Green Light for Green Agricultural Policies?  
18 An Analysis at Regional and Global Scales. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 66, 1-19.
- 19 158. Polhill, J.G., Filatova, T., Schlüter, M., Voinov, A. (2016) Modelling systemic change in  
20 coupled socio-environmental systems. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 75, 318-332.
- 21 159. Porteus, O. (2015) High Trade Costs and Their Consequences: An Estimated Model of  
22 African Agricultural Storage and Trade. AgeconSearch. San Francisco, CA.  
23 <http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/205776/2/Porteous%20HTCC%20AAEA.pdf>.
- 24 160. Preston, B.L., King, A.W., Ernst, K.M., Absar, S.M., Nair, S.S., Parish, E.S. (2015) Scale  
25 and the representation of human agency in the modeling of agroecosystems. *Current*  
26 *Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 14, 239-249.
- 27 161. Quist, J., Vergragt, P. (2006) Past and future of backcasting: The shift to stakeholder  
28 participation and a proposal for a methodological framework. *Futures* 38, 1027-1045.
- 29 162. Renard, D., Tilman, D. (2019) National food production stabilized by crop diversity.  
30 *Nature* 571, 257-260.
- 31 163. Riahi, K., van Vuuren, D.P., Kriegler, E., Edmonds, J., O’Neill, B.C., Fujimori, S., Bauer,  
32 N., Calvin, K., Dellink, R., Fricko, O., Lutz, W., Popp, A., Cuaresma, J.C., Kc, S., Leimbach, M.,  
33 Jiang, L., Kram, T., Rao, S., Emmerling, J., Ebi, K., Hasegawa, T., Havlik, P., Humpenöder, F., Da  
34 Silva, L.A., Smith, S., Stehfest, E., Bosetti, V., Eom, J., Gernaat, D., Masui, T., Rogelj, J., Strefler,  
35 J., Drouet, L., Krey, V., Luderer, G., Harmsen, M., Takahashi, K., Baumstark, L., Doelman, J.C.,  
36 Kainuma, M., Klimont, Z., Marangoni, G., Lotze-Campen, H., Obersteiner, M., Tabeau, A.,  
37 Tavoni, M. (2017) The Shared Socioeconomic Pathways and their energy, land use, and  
38 greenhouse gas emissions implications: An overview. *Global Environmental Change* 42, 153-  
39 168.
- 40 164. Richardson, D.B., Kwan, M.-P., Alter, G., McKendry, J.E. (2015) Replication of scientific  
41 research: addressing geoprivacy, confidentiality, and data sharing challenges in geospatial  
42 research. *Annals of GIS* 21, 101-110.
- 43 165. Ricker-Gilbert, J., Jones, M. (2015) Does storage technology affect adoption of  
44 improved maize varieties in Africa? Insights from Malawi’s input subsidy program. *Food*  
45 *Policy* 50, 92-105.
- 46 166. Ricome, A., Affholder, F., Gérard, F., Muller, B., Poeydebat, C., Quirion, P., Sall, M.  
47 (2017) Are subsidies to weather-index insurance the best use of public funds? A bio-

- 1 economic farm model applied to the Senegalese groundnut basin. *Agricultural Systems* 156,  
2 149-176.
- 3 167. Roberts, M.J., Tran, A.N., (2012) Commodity Price Adjustment in a Competitive  
4 Storage Model with an Application to the US Biofuel Policies. 2012 Annual Meeting, August  
5 12-14, 2012, Seattle, Washington 124869, Agricultural and Applied Economics Association.
- 6 168. Robinson, D.T., Di Vittorio, A., Alexander, P., Arneth, A., Barton, C.M., Brown, D.G.,  
7 Kettner, A., Lemmen, C., O'Neill, B.C., Janssen, M., Pugh, T.A.M., Rabin, S.S., Rounsevell, M.,  
8 Syvitski, J.P., Ullah, I., Verburg, P.H. (2018) Modelling feedbacks between human and natural  
9 processes in the land system. *Earth Syst. Dynam.* 9, 895-914.
- 10 169. Robinson, S., Mason-D'Croz, D., Sulser, T., Islam, S., Robertson, R., Zhu, T., Gueneau,  
11 A., Pitois, G., Rosegrant, M. (2015) The international model for policy analysis of agricultural  
12 commodities and trade (IMPACT): model description for version 3.
- 13 170. Rockenbauch, T., Sakdapolrak, P. (2017) Social networks and the resilience of rural  
14 communities in the Global South: a critical review and conceptual reflections. *Ecology and  
15 Society* 22.
- 16 171. Rogelj, J., den Elzen, M., Höhne, N., Fransen, T., Fekete, H., Winkler, H., Schaeffer, R.,  
17 Sha, F., Riahi, K., Meinshausen, M. (2016) Paris Agreement climate proposals need a boost to  
18 keep warming well below 2 °C. *Nature* 534, 631.
- 19 172. Rounsevell, M.D.A., Arneth, A., Alexander, P., Brown, D.G., de Noblet-Ducoudré, N.,  
20 Ellis, E., Finnigan, J., Galvin, K., Grigg, N., Harman, I., Lennox, J., Magliocca, N., Parker, D.,  
21 O'Neill, B.C., Verburg, P.H., Young, O. (2014) Towards decision-based global land use models  
22 for improved understanding of the Earth system. *Earth Syst. Dynam.* 5, 117-137.
- 23 173. Rounsevell, M.D.A., Robinson, D.T., Murray-Rust, D. (2012) From actors to agents in  
24 socio-ecological systems models. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological  
25 Sciences* 367, 259-269.
- 26 174. Ruane, A.C., Antle, J., Elliott, J., Folberth, C., Hoogenboom, G., Mason-D'Croz, D.,  
27 Müller, C., Porter, C., Phillips, M.M., Raymundo, R.M., Sands, R., Valdivia, R.O., White, J.W.,  
28 Wiebe, K., Rosenzweig, C. (2018) Biophysical and economic implications for agriculture  
29 of +1.5 degrees and +2.0 degrees C global warming using AgMIP Coordinated Global and  
30 Regional Assessments. *Climate Research* 76, 17-39.
- 31 175. Rutten, M., Achterbosch, T.J., de Boer, I.J.M., Cuaresma, J.C., Geleijnse, J.M., Havlík,  
32 P., Heckelei, T., Ingram, J., Leip, A., Marette, S., van Meijl, H., Soler, L.-G., Swinnen, J., van't  
33 Veer, P., Vervoort, J., Zimmermann, A., Zimmermann, K.L., Zurek, M. (2018) Metrics, models  
34 and foresight for European sustainable food and nutrition security: The vision of the  
35 SUSFANS project. *Agricultural Systems* 163, 45-57.
- 36 176. Samberg, L.H., Gerber, J.S., Ramankutty, N., Herrero, M., West, P.C. (2016)  
37 Subnational distribution of average farm size and smallholder contributions to global food  
38 production. *Environmental Research Letters* 11, 124010.
- 39 177. Schauburger, B., Archontoulis, S., Arneth, A., Balkovic, J., Ciais, P., Deryng, D., Elliott,  
40 J., Folberth, C., Khabarov, N., Müller, C. (2017) Consistent negative response of US crops to  
41 high temperatures in observations and crop models. *Nature Communications* 8, 13931.
- 42 178. Schewe, J., Otto, C., Frieler, K. (2017) The role of storage dynamics in annual wheat  
43 prices. *Environmental Research Letters* 12, 054005.
- 44 179. Schlenker, W., Roberts, M.J. (2009) Nonlinear temperature effects indicate severe  
45 damages to U.S. crop yields under climate change. *Proceedings of the National Academy of  
46 Sciences* 106, 15594.
- 47 180. Schlüter, M., Baeza, A., Dressler, G., Frank, K., Groeneveld, J., Jager, W., Janssen,  
48 M.A., McAllister, R.R.J., Müller, B., Orach, K., Schwarz, N., Wijermans, N. (2017) A framework

- 1 for mapping and comparing behavioural theories in models of social-ecological systems.  
2 Ecological Economics 131, 21-35.
- 3 181. Schulze, J., Müller, B., Groeneveld, J., Grimm, V. (2017) Agent-Based Modelling of  
4 Social-Ecological Systems: Achievements, Challenges, and a Way Forward. *Journal of Artificial*  
5 *Societies and Social Simulation* 20, 8.
- 6 182. Scott, T.A., Thomas, C.W., Magallanes, J.M. (2019) Convening for Consensus:  
7 Simulating Stakeholder Agreement in Collaborative Governance Processes Under Different  
8 Network Conditions. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 29, 32-49.
- 9 183. Searchinger, T., Heimlich, R., Houghton, R.A., Dong, F., Elobeid, A., Fabiosa, J., Tokgoz,  
10 S., Hayes, D., Yu, T.-H. (2008) Use of U.S. Croplands for Biofuels Increases Greenhouse Gases  
11 Through Emissions from Land-Use Change. *Science* 319, 1238.
- 12 184. Simbizi, M.C.D., Bennett, R.M., Zevenbergen, J. (2014) Land tenure security:  
13 Revisiting and refining the concept for Sub-Saharan Africa's rural poor. *Land Use Policy* 36,  
14 231-238.
- 15 185. Sitko, N.J., Chisanga, B., Tschirley, D., Jayne, T.S. (2018) An evolution in the middle:  
16 examining the rise of multinational investment in smallholder grain trading in Zambia. *Food*  
17 *Security* 10, 473-488.
- 18 186. Smeets-Kristkova, Z., Achterbosch, T., Kuiper, M., 2019. Healthy Diets and Reduced  
19 Land Pressure: Towards a Double Gain for Future Food Systems in Nigeria. *Sustainability* 11,  
20 835.
- 21 187. Smith, M.R., Micha, R., Golden, C.D., Mozaffarian, D., Myers, S.S., 2016. Global  
22 Expanded Nutrient Supply (GENUS) Model: A New Method for Estimating the Global Dietary  
23 Supply of Nutrients. *PLOS ONE* 11, e0146976.
- 24 188. Springmann, M., Mason-D'Croz, D., Robinson, S., Garnett, T., Godfray, H.C.J., Gollin,  
25 D., Rayner, M., Ballon, P., Scarborough, P. (2016) Global and regional health effects of future  
26 food production under climate change: a modelling study. *The Lancet* 387, 1937-1946.
- 27 189. Stürck, J., Levers, C., van der Zanden, E.H., Schulp, C.J.E., Verkerk, P.J., Kuemmerle, T.,  
28 Helming, J., Lotze-Campen, H., Tabeau, A., Popp, A., Schrammeijer, E., Verburg, P. (2018)  
29 Simulating and delineating future land change trajectories across Europe. *Regional*  
30 *Environmental Change* 18, 733-749.
- 31 190. Tendall, D.M., Joerin, J., Kopainsky, B., Edwards, P., Shreck, A., Le, Q.B., Kruetli, P.,  
32 Grant, M., Six, J. (2015) Food system resilience: Defining the concept. *Global Food Security* 6,  
33 17-23.
- 34 191. Tracy, M., Cerda, M., Keyes, K.M., (2018) Agent-Based Modeling in Public Health:  
35 Current Applications and Future Directions, in: Fielding, J.E., Brownson, R.C., Green, L.W.  
36 (Eds.), *Annual Review of Public Health*, Vol 39, pp. 77-94.
- 37 192. Troost, C., Walter, T., Berger, T. (2015) Climate, energy and environmental policies in  
38 agriculture: Simulating likely farmer responses in Southwest Germany. *Land Use Policy* 46,  
39 50-64.
- 40 193. Turner, P.A., Field, C., Lobell, D.B., Sanchez, D., Mach, K. (2018) Unprecedented rates  
41 of land-use transformation in modelled climate change mitigation pathways. *Nature*  
42 *Sustainability* 1, 240.
- 43 194. Urruty, N., Tailliez-Lefebvre, D., Huyghe, C. (2016) Stability, robustness, vulnerability  
44 and resilience of agricultural systems. A review. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development* 36:  
45 15.
- 46 195. Václavík, T., Lautenbach, S., Kuemmerle, T., Seppelt, R. (2013) Mapping global land  
47 system archetypes. *Global Environmental Change* 23, 1637-1647.

- 1 196. Valbuena, D., Verburg, P., Veldkamp, A., Bregt, A.K., Ligtenberg, A. (2010) Effects of  
2 farmers' decisions on the landscape structure of a Dutch rural region: An agent-based  
3 approach. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 97, 98-110.
- 4 197. van der Hoog, S. (2019) Surrogate Modelling in (and of) Agent-Based Models: A  
5 Prospectus. *Computational Economics* 53, 1245-1263.
- 6 198. van Dijk, M., Meijerink, G.W. (2014) A review of global food security scenario and  
7 assessment studies: Results, gaps and research priorities. *Global Food Security* 3, 227-238.
- 8 199. van Ittersum, M.K., Cassman, K.G., Grassini, P., Wolf, J., Tittone, P., Hochman, Z.  
9 (2013) Yield gap analysis with local to global relevance—A review. *Field Crops Research* 143,  
10 4-17.
- 11 200. van Ittersum, M.K., Ewert, F., Hecke, T., Wery, J., Alkan Olsson, J., Andersen, E.,  
12 Bezlepikina, I., Brouwer, F., Donatelli, M., Flichman, G., Olsson, L., Rizzoli, A.E., van der Wal,  
13 T., Wien, J.E., Wolf, J. (2008) Integrated assessment of agricultural systems – A component-  
14 based framework for the European Union (SEAMLESS). *Agricultural Systems* 96, 150-165.
- 15 201. van Ittersum, M.K., van Bussel, L.G.J., Wolf, J., Grassini, P., van Wart, J., Guilpart, N.,  
16 Claessens, L., de Groot, H., Wiebe, K., Mason-D'Croz, D., Yang, H., Boogaard, H., van Oort,  
17 P.A.J., van Loon, M.P., Saito, K., Adimo, O., Adjei-Nsiah, S., Agali, A., Bala, A., Chikowo, R.,  
18 Kaizzi, K., Kouressy, M., Makoi, J.H.J.R., Ouattara, K., Tesfaye, K., Cassman, K.G. (2016) Can  
19 sub-Saharan Africa feed itself? *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113, 14964.
- 20 202. van Meijl, H., Havlik, P., Lotze-Campen, H., Stehfest, E., Witzke, P., Domínguez, I.P.,  
21 Bodirsky, B.L., van Dijk, M., Doelman, J., Fellmann, T. (2018) Comparing impacts of climate  
22 change and mitigation on global agriculture by 2050. *Environmental Research Letters* 13,  
23 064021.
- 24 203. van Noordwijk, M. (2002) Scaling trade-offs between crop productivity, carbon stocks  
25 and biodiversity in shifting cultivation landscape mosaics: the FALLOW model. *Ecological*  
26 *Modelling* 149, 113-126.
- 27 204. van Tongeren, F., van Meijl, H., Surry, Y. (2001) Global models applied to agricultural  
28 and trade policies: a review and assessment. *Agricultural Economics* 26, 149-172.
- 29 205. van Vuuren, D.P., Kok, M., Lucas, P.L., Prins, A.G., Alkemade, R., van den Berg, M.,  
30 Bouwman, L., van der Esch, S., Jeuken, M., Kram, T., Stehfest, E. (2015) Pathways to achieve a  
31 set of ambitious global sustainability objectives by 2050: Explorations using the IMAGE  
32 integrated assessment model. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 98, 303-323.
- 33 206. van Vuuren, D.P., Stehfest, E., Gernaat, D.E., Berg, M., Bijl, D.L., Boer, H.S., Daiglou,  
34 V., Doelman, J.C., Edelenbosch, O.Y., Harmsen, M. (2018) Alternative pathways to the 1.5° C  
35 target reduce the need for negative emission technologies. *Nature Climate Change* 8, 391.
- 36 207. van Wijk, M.T. (2014) From global economic modelling to household level analyses of  
37 food security and sustainability: How big is the gap and can we bridge it? *Food Policy* 49, Part  
38 2, 378-388.
- 39 208. van Wijk, M.T., Rufino, M.C., Enahoro, D., Parsons, D., Silvestri, S., Valdivia, R.O.,  
40 Herrero, M. (2014) Farm household models to analyse food security in a changing climate: A  
41 review. *Global Food Security-Agriculture Policy Economics and Environment* 3, 77-84.
- 42 209. Verburg, P.H., Alexander, P., Evans, T., Magliocca, N.R., Malek, Z., Rounsevell, M.D.A.,  
43 van Vliet, J. (2019) Beyond land cover change: towards a new generation of land use models.  
44 *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 38, 77-85.
- 45 210. Verburg, P.H., Dearing, J.A., Dyke, J.G., Leeuw, S.v.d., Seitzinger, S., Steffen, W.,  
46 Syvitski, J. (2016) Methods and approaches to modelling the Anthropocene. *Global*  
47 *Environmental Change* 39, 328-340.



- 1 211. Verma, M., Hertel, T., Diffenbaugh, N. (2014) Market-oriented ethanol and corn-  
2 trade policies can reduce climate-induced US corn price volatility. *Environmental Research*  
3 *Letters* 9, 064028.
- 4 212. Voinov, A., Shugart, H.H. (2013) 'Integronsters', integral and integrated modeling.  
5 *Environmental Modelling & Software* 39, 149-158.
- 6 213. Walsh, B., Ciais, P., Janssens, I.A., Peñuelas, J., Riahi, K., Rydzak, F., van Vuuren, D.P.,  
7 Obersteiner, M. (2017) Pathways for balancing CO2 emissions and sinks. *Nature*  
8 *Communications* 8, 14856.
- 9 214. Wang, X., Biewald, A., Dietrich, J.P., Schmitz, C., Lotze-Campen, H., Humpenöder, F.,  
10 Bodirsky, B.L., Popp, A. (2016) Taking account of governance: Implications for land-use  
11 dynamics, food prices, and trade patterns. *Ecological Economics* 122, 12-24.
- 12 215. Warner, E., Inman, D., Kunstman, B., Bush, B., Vimmerstedt, L., Peterson, S.,  
13 Macknick, J., Zhang, Y. (2013) Modeling biofuel expansion effects on land use change  
14 dynamics. *Environmental Research Letters* 8, 015003.
- 15 216. Webber, H., Ewert, F., Olesen, J.E., Müller, C., Fronzek, S., Ruane, A.C., Bourgault, M.,  
16 Martre, P., Ababaei, B., Bindi, M. (2018) Diverging importance of drought stress for maize  
17 and winter wheat in Europe. *Nature Communications* 9, 4249.
- 18 217. Weersink, A., Fraser, E., Pannell, D., Duncan, E., Rotz, S. (2018) Opportunities and  
19 Challenges for Big Data in Agricultural and Environmental Analysis. *Annual Review of*  
20 *Resource Economics* 10, 19-37.
- 21 218. Wiggins, S., Keats, S. (2013) Looking back, peering forward Food prices & the food  
22 price spike of 2007 / 08. Overseas Development Institute.  
23 [https://www.odi.org/publications/7384-looking-back-peering-forward-what-has-been-](https://www.odi.org/publications/7384-looking-back-peering-forward-what-has-been-learned-food-price-spike-2007-2008)  
24 [learned-food-price-spike-2007-2008.](https://www.odi.org/publications/7384-looking-back-peering-forward-what-has-been-learned-food-price-spike-2007-2008)
- 25 219. Wilkinson, M.D., Dumontier, M., Aalbersberg, I.J., Appleton, G., Axton, M., Baak, A.,  
26 Blomberg, N., Boiten, J.-W., da Silva Santos, L.B., Bourne, P.E., Bouwman, J., Brookes, A.J.,  
27 Clark, T., Crosas, M., Dillo, I., Dumon, O., Edmunds, S., Evelo, C.T., Finkers, R., Gonzalez-  
28 Beltran, A., Gray, A.J.G., Groth, P., Goble, C., Grethe, J.S., Heringa, J., 't Hoen, P.A.C., Hooft,  
29 R., Kuhn, T., Kok, R., Kok, J., Lusher, S.J., Martone, M.E., Mons, A., Packer, A.L., Persson, B.,  
30 Rocca-Serra, P., Roos, M., van Schaik, R., Sansone, S.-A., Schultes, E., Sengstag, T., Slater, T.,  
31 Strawn, G., Swertz, M.A., Thompson, M., van der Lei, J., van Mulligen, E., Velterop, J.,  
32 Waagmeester, A., Wittenburg, P., Wolstencroft, K., Zhao, J., Mons, B. (2016) The FAIR  
33 Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. *Scientific Data* 3, 160018.
- 34 220. Wolfert, S., Ge, L., Verdouw, C., Bogaardt, M.-J. (2017) Big Data in Smart Farming – A  
35 review. *Agricultural Systems* 153, 69-80.
- 36 221. Wolff, S., Schrammeijer, E.A., Schulp, C.J.E., Verburg, P.H. (2018) Meeting global land  
37 restoration and protection targets: What would the world look like in 2050? *Global*  
38 *Environmental Change* 52, 259-272.
- 39 222. Wossen, T., Berger, T. (2015) Climate variability, food security and poverty: Agent-  
40 based assessment of policy options for farm households in Northern Ghana. *Environmental*  
41 *Science & Policy* 47, 95-107.
- 42 223. Wright, B.D. (2011) The Economics of Grain Price Volatility. *Applied Economic*  
43 *Perspectives and Policy* 33, 32-58.
- 44 224. Wu, B., Pretty, J. (2004) Social connectedness in marginal rural China: The case of  
45 farmer innovation circles in Zhidan, north Shaanxi. *Agriculture and Human Values* 21, 81-92.
- 46 225. Xiong, H., Wang, P., Zhu, Y. (2016) Diffusion on social networks: Survey data from  
47 rural villages in central China. *Data in brief* 7, 546-550.

- 1 226. Yao, S. (2000) Economic Development and Poverty Reduction in China over 20 Years  
2 of Reforms. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 48, 447-474.
- 3 227. Zimmerman, F.J., Carter, M.R. (2003) Asset smoothing, consumption smoothing and  
4 the reproduction of inequality under risk and subsistence constraints. *Journal of*  
5 *Development Economics* 71, 233-260.
- 6 228. Zimmermann, A., Webber, H., Zhao, G., Ewert, F., Kros, J., Wolf, J., Britz, W., de Vries,  
7 W. (2017) Climate change impacts on crop yields, land use and environment in response to  
8 crop sowing dates and thermal time requirements. *Agricultural Systems* 157, 81-92.



## Production



## Trade



Global



Regional



Local

### Production intensification

- 5 Account for effects of intensification metrics on production variability
- Account for biodiversity changes through production intensification
- Implement biodiversity-related ecosystem functions into higher-scale agro-ecological models
- Incorporate ecosystem function-ag-production into global agro-economic models.

### Digitization

### Land access and land grabbing

### Climate variability

- 5 Seasonal climate-driven variation in crop production versus stability of food or income from farming
- 5 Impact on commodity production and prices
- Indirect climatic effects
- Structural impacts of extreme weather

### Economic risk

- 5 Single farm household risk models
- Market level volatility models
- Combine fundamental factors (medium to long term) with farm-level risk and yield volatility models (short term)
- Pests

### Diversification of coping strategies

- Potential to mitigate climate impacts on commodity production and prices
- Effects of stockholding

### Conceptual mismatch at different scales

- 5 Use of equilibrium models at high scales, process-based
- Dynamic non-equilibrium market approach for higher

### Transnational corporations

- Consider how transnational corporations mediate between producers and consumers

### Institutional/governance challenges

- Consideration of effective institutions to minimize environmental
- Investigation of food production systems and decisions
- Capturing externalities with respect to decision-making

### Social and justice issues

- Local polarisation
- Stabilising role of social networks
- Vulnerability across social groups

### Access

- Movement of consumers
- challenge
- Diet of influence
- food s
- Structural market
- Behavior

### Ur

- C
- s
- f

## Declaration of interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests:

## Authors contribution:

All authors helped to shape the review based on a joint workshop. **Birgit Müller:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Acquisition of the financial support for the project leading to this publication, Leading Writing; **Falk Hoffmann:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing- Original draft preparation; **Thomas Heckelei:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing- Original draft preparation; **Christoph Müller:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing- Original draft preparation; **Thomas W. Hertel:** Conceptualization, Writing- Original draft preparation; J. Gareth Polhill: Conceptualization, Writing- Original draft preparation, **Mark van Wijk:** Writing- Original draft preparation; **Thom Achterbosch, Peter Alexander, Calum Brown, David Kreuer, Frank Ewert, Jiaqi Ge, James D.A. Millington, Ralf Seppelt, Peter H. Verburg, Heidi Webber:** Writing- Reviewing and Editing.