




Review

# Knowledge Mapping of the Extant Literature on the Environmental Impacts of Using Cover Crops—A Scientometric Study

Yong Liu <sup>1,2,3,4,†</sup> , Jorge Ruiz-Menjivar <sup>1,2,3,\*,†</sup> , Yujie Hu <sup>5</sup> , Monica Zavala <sup>4</sup> and Marilyn E. Swisher <sup>1,2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Family, College of Agricultural and Life Sciences, Youth and Community Sciences, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, USA

<sup>2</sup> Center for Sustainable and Organic Food Systems, Gainesville, FL 32607, USA

<sup>3</sup> Social Dimensions of Food & Agriculture Lab, Gainesville, FL 32607, USA

<sup>4</sup> Global Lab on Economic and Behavioral Research, Gainesville, FL 32607, USA

<sup>5</sup> Department of Geography, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, USA

\* Correspondence: jorgerm@ufl.edu; Tel.: +1-(352)-294-1380; Fax: +1-(352)-392-8196

† These authors contributed equally to this work.

**Abstract:** This study examined the last four decades of the existing academic literature related to the environmental impacts of using cover crops in agricultural production systems. Data were collected from the Web of Science database, resulting in a sample of 3246 peer-reviewed articles published between 1980 and 2021. We combined two advanced scientometrics analysis software (i.e., CiteSpace 6.0.R1 and Gephi 0.9.2) to identify the trajectory of the literature, hotspots, and frontiers. We developed authorship-, institution-and country-levels networks to examine academic cooperation over the last forty years. Our findings revealed that the number of peer-reviewed outputs documenting the environmental effects of cover crops has consistently increased, with a notable rise in publications between 2015 and 2021. Eighteen salient research topics were identified in the literature, including winter cover crops' effects on soil health, cover crops' effects on nitrous oxide emissions, and the relationship between cover crops and nitrate leaching. Based on the citation-clustering analysis, the trajectory of the literature may be divided into three stages. Studies in Stage 1\_A (1980–2000) mainly assessed the role of cover crops in nitrogen management. In Stage 1\_B (2001–2010), the research evaluated the impact of using different cover crop mixtures on farming systems. In Stage 2 (2011–2021), studies primarily addressed the environmental impacts of cover crops, particularly their effects on physical and chemical soil properties. Finally, the countries with the most outputs were the United States, Brazil, and Spain. The U.S. Department of Agriculture-Agricultural Research Service was the main contributor to the literature on the environmental impacts of cover crops.

**Keywords:** cover crops; environment; scientometrics; network analysis



**Citation:** Liu, Y.; Ruiz-Menjivar, J.; Hu, Y.; Zavala, M.; Swisher, M.E. Knowledge Mapping of the Extant Literature on the Environmental Impacts of Using Cover Crops—A Scientometric Study. *Environments* **2022**, *9*, 120. <https://doi.org/10.3390/environments9090120>

Academic Editor: Ariel A. Szogi

Received: 19 July 2022

Accepted: 9 September 2022

Published: 13 September 2022

**Publisher's Note:** MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



**Copyright:** © 2022 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

## 1. Introduction

Cover crops (CC) have played a role in land management for centuries and remained a key practice in maintaining and replenishing soil fertility until the development of synthetic fertilizers [1,2]. The research about CC use and its effects on soil properties is long, with written records extending back centuries in Asia and Europe. Even in the New World, the written research record goes back to the 1700s. Soils in the U.S. were already nutrient-poor by the time of the American Revolution, and both Thomas Jefferson and George Washington conducted research with CC and disseminated their findings [3].

Research about CC's role as a source of nutrients waned when synthetic fertilizers, especially nitrogen fertilizers, became widely available and affordable in the mid-20th

century. However, interest in preventing soil erosion and other potential benefits of CC increased during this same period. Protecting the soil, building soil organic matter, and improving soil moisture retention were critical research concerns in the mid-1900s due, in large part, to the enormous damage to soil resources that occurred in the Dust Bowls in the United States and Australia [4,5].

A third wave of CC research emerged as concerns over the sustainability of input-intensive agriculture grew in the late 20th Century. Three different terms used in this period reveal the increased scope of CC research as a more ecological approach to soil management emerged. The terms primarily reflect differences in the primary goal for planting CC: maintaining organic matter and increasing nitrogen availability (green manures), preventing soil erosion (cover crop) or preventing nutrient leaching (catch crop) [6]. Various forms of “ecological agriculture” emerged as alternatives to input-intensive agriculture in the last two decades of the 20th Century. The call for more ecologically based and sustainable farming systems started primarily in the industrial and post-industrial nations [7,8] but quickly became influential in developing countries as well [9–12].

The growing interest in sustainable and ecological agriculture stimulated a new round of research about CC. Programs, such as the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)’s Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education Program (SARE) and the USDA Agricultural Research Services (ARS) in the U.S. have supported a large body of research covering the many potential benefits of CC and resulting in a much-expanded body of knowledge [13–16]. Unlike research in the earlier two waves, the topical areas tackled in this new, third round of research are broad and address the needs of many cropping systems. The growth of organic agriculture globally also played an important role. The EU led the way with organic certification in 1991, and the passage of the Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 laid the way for the development of the U.S. National Organic Standards in 2003. Both sets of regulations require CC in any organic farming system, which has become a norm in most nations [17–21].

### *Purpose of the Study and Contribution to the Literature*

The purpose of this study is to explore the research activity of the literature on the environmental impacts of CC. Over the last forty years, the body of knowledge resulting from CC research has grown in geographic scope, topical coverage, and research approach. The potential for a scientometric analysis to reveal consistent patterns and salient themes of results over numerous studies can help steer future research into the avenues with the most significant potential [22–24].

Previous studies have conducted reviews of the literature related to the benefits of CC on soil properties [25–40]. However, the main foci of previous studies have been to provide technical and descriptive summaries of the documented benefits and, in some cases, the quantifiable impact of CC on soil health and quality (e.g., meta-analysis). To our knowledge, no previous study has examined and summarized the existing CC literature using scientometric analysis. The present research complements prior efforts and contributes to the literature by mapping the evolution of the literature [41,42]. Scientometric methods find links between concepts and themes in the literature that may be easily overlooked in manual review studies, reducing the subjectivity and impressionistic description inherent in traditional review articles [43,44]. Based on this study’s findings, we provide insight into future directions for research related to cover crops, their adoption, and their impact on agricultural production systems.

## **2. Methods**

### *2.1. Data Collection*

We initiated the search of records by selecting a set of keywords representative of the area of study, including “cover crop,” “cover crops,” “cover cropping,” “environment,” “soil quality,” “air quality,” and “water quality.” The selection of keywords was informed by the experts’ opinions via the Delphi method. Institutional Review Board (IRB202102640) was

obtained for this activity. This study selected Thomson ISI Web of Science (WoS) as the database for extracting relevant publications related to the environmental impacts of CC. WoS is deemed the most comprehensive database for scientific publications [45] and covers journals and records from the most important academic publishing houses (e.g., Elsevier, Wiley, Taylor and Francis, Springer, Emerald, Palgrave, and MDPI, among others). In WoS, we retrieved records from the Science Citation Expanded (SCIE) and Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) databases. The search was delimited to peer-reviewed journal articles published in English between 1980 and 2021. The search was last conducted on 30 March 2022. We performed an artificial data-cleaning procedure to improve the search's reliability and reduce the potential noise or missing values. The search yielded a total of 3246 article records. Table 1 summarizes this study's specific parameters for searching academic papers.

**Table 1.** Detailed search setting parameters.


Source	Web of Science Core Collection
Citation	Science Citation Expanded (SCIE) and Social Science Citation Index (SSCI)
Search Steps	TS = (("cover crop*") and ((environment) or ("soil quality") or ("air quality") or ("water quality"))) AND LANGUAGE (ENGLISH) AND DOCUMENT TYPES Article)
Time span	1980–2021
Qualified records	3246

\* is attached to the stem of a word and searches for any words and variants of that word that includes that stem. For example, crop\* includes crops and cropping.

## 2.2. Research Design and Analysis

This study employed network analysis methods to assess the extant body of knowledge on the environmental effects of using CC in agricultural systems. We combined network analysis methods with graph theory to visualize networks, including co-citation networks, co-occurrence networks of subject terms, and collaboration networks among authors, institutions, and countries. Mainly, we aimed to identify salient research domains and frontiers, high-frequency terms, and the links among various authors, institutions, and countries. Figure 1 provides a schematic of the research design used in the present study.

We used co-citation network analysis to determine pairs of articles that other publications have cited. The more times a particular pair was cited, the more strength of co-citation and more similarity between these two articles [46,47]. Co-citation network analysis is one of the core methods in social network analysis (SNA). This method has been widely used to find a domain's knowledge structure and highly-cited articles [48]. Based on the co-citation networks, we conducted citation-clustering to visualize salient research topics related to the literature on CC and soil properties. We also used co-occurrence network analysis to search for research frontiers. Lastly, we assessed authorship, academic institution, and country collaboration networks. The visualization of these networks allowed for examining cooperation and knowledge sharing among authors, institutions, and countries. This study evaluated networks using the following statistical indices: network density, betweenness centrality, and closeness centrality. See Appendix A for a description of these indicators and equations.




**Figure 1.** A schematic of the research design.

We adopted two commonly used scientometric software to analyze the literature records. First, we used CiteSpace 6.0.R.1 to visualize our networks and identify research hotspots—the software, developed by [49], is available via <http://cluster.cis.drexel.edu/~cchen/citespace/> (accessed on 22 March 2022). This software includes useful tools for visualizing progressive knowledge domains and finding critical points in the evolution of a research field [50]. The second software employed in this study was Gephi 0.9.2 [51], available at <https://gephi.org/> (accessed on 22 March 2022). Gephi is a powerful and leading software for network analysis [51]; it allows for computing statistical indicators (e.g., network density, closeness centrality, betweenness centrality) for networks to assess the importance of nodes within the network [52,53].

### 3. Results and Discussion

#### 3.1. Distribution of Publications over the Years and Cited Journals

In the last four decades, 3246 manuscripts concerning CC's environmental impacts were published in referred journals. The histogram in Figure 2 displays the number of outputs and citations per year. As shown, the number of peer-reviewed journals related to the topic of interest was limited before 1990, whereas the number of publications grew consistently from 1991 to 2010, reaching 92 publications in 2010. Notably, in the two decades (2010–2021), the number of records increased exponentially, from 112 publications in 2011 to 402 in 2021. Similarly, the number of citations followed the same trend as the number of publications. These tendencies reflect a growing and sustained interest from scholars and policymakers in CC as a conservation practice, the increased rate of funding provided to CC research, and the development and implementation of programs and guides promoting CC adoption in agricultural systems [13–16,54].



**Figure 2.** The basic descriptive of publications from 1980 to 2021.

Tables 2 and 3 provide the list of the top 10 peer-reviewed journals and top 10 subject categories for the literature related to CC and soil properties. As shown in Table 2, the leading journal with the most publications is *Agronomy Journal*, totaling 233 peer-reviewed articles since 1980. Other important journals are *Soil Tillage Research*, *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, *Soil Science Society of American Journal*, and *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*. Each of the aforementioned journals published more than 100 articles within the last forty years. Most manuscripts addressed biological and environmental issues, and the subject categories included agronomy, soil science, environmental sciences, plant sciences, agriculture multidisciplinary, ecology, water resources, and horticulture.

**Table 2.** Top 10 journals with peer-reviewed articles related to CC.

Journal Name	Impact Factor	Number of Outputs	%
Agronomy Journal	2.240	233	7.178
Soil Tillage Research	5.374	146	4.498
Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment	5.567	130	4.005
Soil science society of America Journal	2.307	112	3.450
Journal of Soil and Water Conservation	2.330	107	3.296
Journal of Environmental Quality	2.751	76	2.341
Agronomy	3.417	76	2.341
Plant and Soil	4.192	68	2.095
Agricultural Water Management	4.516	62	1.910
Field Crops Research	5.224	59	1.818

**Table 3.** Top 10 subject categories with peer-reviewed articles related to CC.

Subject	Publications	%
Agronomy	999	30.776
Soil Science	953	29.359
Environmental Sciences	606	18.669
Plant Sciences	392	12.076
Agriculture Multidisciplinary	371	11.429
Ecology	323	9.951
Water Resources	311	9.581
Horticulture	179	5.514
Agricultural Engineering	91	2.803
Geosciences Multidisciplinary	79	2.434

### 3.2. Co-Citation Analysis

The co-citation network analysis provided a picture of the evolution and trajectory of the literature. We used CiteSpace software to build and visualize the co-citation network. In particular, we set the time span from 1980 to 2021 and the slice length to one year. The “top N per slice” parameter in CiteSpace was set at “50” to obtain the top 50 most cited documents by each year (i.e., cited frequency per year). The structure of the co-citation network for the past four decades is displayed in Figure 3 (1583 nodes, 5362 edges; the average degree (In network theory, degree also can be used as a measurement of degree centrality, which denotes the total amount of direct links with other nodes [53]) of this network was 6.773, and the network density was 0.004). Consistent with our observations from Figure 1, the number of outputs and frequency of co-cited documents consistently increased throughout the last forty years. Notably, the frequencies of nodes (i.e., references in this network) and bursts were mainly concentrated between 2015 and 2021.


**Figure 3.** The overview of the co-citation network.



Table 4 provides the top ten most cited articles based on co-citation frequency. As shown, [55] and [35] are the most co-cited articles, each with a co-citation frequency of 86 times. While co-citation frequency (i.e., the frequency with which two documents are cited together by another document) is valuable for discovering the similarity between publications [56], this indicator may not necessarily reflect the importance of the references in the whole co-citation network. In order to identify the articles with a rapid rise in citations in the last decade academic and characterize the dynamics of the research field in question [57], we assessed citation bursts during the previous four decades. Figure 4 provides the top twenty articles with the strongest citation bursts between 1980 and 2021. The most influential research articles that ranked at the top were [55] (strength: 25.86), [35] (strength: 21.21), and [58] (19.5). The period (i.e., 2015–2021) in which the articles were published and the citation bursts occurred is a commonality among these influential articles. This trend reflects the growing interest of scholars in CC research and a significant increase in the contribution to the body of knowledge in the last five years.

**Table 4.** Top ten articles based on co-citation frequency.

Authors	Title	Journal	DOI	Frequency
Blanco-canqui et al. (2015) [55]	Cover Crops and Ecosystem Services: Insights from Studies in Temperate Soils	Agronomy Journal	10.2134/agronj15.0086	86
Poepplau and Don (2015) [35]	Carbon sequestration in agricultural soils via cultivation of cover crops—A meta-analysis	Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment	10.1016/j.agee.2014.10.024	86
Basche et al. (2016) [36]	Soil water improvements with the long-term use of a winter rye cover crop	Agricultural Water Management	10.1016/j.agwat.2016.04.006	70
Finney et al. (2016) [59]	Biomass Production and Carbon/Nitrogen Ratio Influence Ecosystem Services from Cover Crop Mixtures	Agronomy Journal	10.2134/agronj15.0182	67
Kaye and Quemada (2017) [34]	Using cover crops to mitigate and adapt to climate change. A review	Agronomy for Sustainable Development	10.1007/s13593-016-0410-x	67
Schipanski et al. (2014) [58]	A framework for evaluating ecosystem services provided by cover crops in agroecosystems	Agricultural Systems	10.1016/j.agsy.2013.11.004	50
Basche et al. (2016) [60]	Simulating long-term impacts of cover crops and climate change on crop production and environmental outcomes in the Midwestern United States	Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment	10.1016/j.agee.2015.11.011	47
Mbuthia et al. (2015) [61]	Long-term tillage, cover crop, and fertilization effects on microbial community structure, activity: Implications for soil quality	Soil Biology and Biochemistry	10.1016/j.soilbio.2015.06.016	39
Wittwer et al. (2017) [62]	Cover crops support ecological intensification of arable cropping systems	Scientific Reports	10.1038/srep41911	38
Pittelkow et al. (2015) [63]	Productivity limits and potentials of the principles of conservation agriculture	Nature	10.1038/nature13809	35

### Top 20 References with the Strongest Citation Bursts



**Figure 4.** Top 20 References with the Strongest Citation Bursts.

### 3.3. Citation-Clustering Analysis

Figure 5 and Table 5 present the results of citation-clustering analysis for the co-citation network; the clustering is generated via cluster optimization with the graphical method in CiteSpace software. Citation-clustering analysis can be beneficial for assessing the research domains and identifying changes in development trends in different periods. Our findings revealed that research clusters (i.e., a group of studies addressing similar and connected topics) increased primarily in the last decade, totaling 18 salient domains. Overall, research clusters of the literature may be categorized into three groups, namely Stage 1\_A (1980–2000), Stage 1\_B (2001–2010), and Stage 2 (2010–2021). In the early stage, studies primarily concentrated on the role of CC for nitrogen management and weed suppression purposes. In the second stage, research significantly focused on examining differences among types of CC in farming systems. Finally, in the last stage, research domains and hotspots in the literature generally revolved around the impact of CC on soil health.






Figure 5. Cluster view of the co-citation network.

**Table 5.** Top 5 terms in citation-clustering results.

Cluster-ID	Cluster Label	Size	Silhouette	Year	Top 5 Terms (LSI)
#8	Desiccated hairy vetch	68	0.994	1990	weed suppression; desiccated hairy vetch; hairy vetch residue; cover crop; herbicide replacement
#5	NLEAP	86	0.967	1994	winter cover crop; nitrate loss; nitrogen management; NLEAP fact; nitrogen dynamics
#10	Nitrogen fertilization	52	0.963	1997	nitrogen fertilization; fresh market tomato yield; soil nitrogen; physical properties; tillage intensity
#7	Using winter cover crop	70	0.973	1999	carbon sequestration; nutrient cycle; west Asia; dryland ecosystem; north Africa
#11	Tillage cover crop	39	0.965	2001	nitrogen fertilization; underlying soil; carbon accumulation; nitrogen fertilization effect; coastal plain field
#1	Nitrous oxide emission	119	0.880	2004	nitrous oxide emission; rye cover crop; tile drainage; winter cover crop; cover crop effect
#15	Olive grove	13	0.993	2005	olive grove; soil erosion; soil properties; soil management effect; southern Spain
#12	Mulch-based cropping system	30	0.970	2006	cropping system; mulch-based cropping system; north Cameroon; mulching practice; multi-locational on-farm assessment
#6	Microbiological function	74	0.880	2007	cover crop; microbiological function; water conservation dilemma; steep vineyard; green cover
#9	Subtropical oxisol	53	0.927	2009	subtropical oxisol; Brazilian oxisol; organic agriculture; contrasting tillage system; crop-establishment period
#13	Extractable carbon	22	0.978	2008	different cover crop residue; extractable carbon; microbial metabolic diversity; nitrogen pool; winter crop
#18	Crops-alternative	11	0.999	2010	upland rice yield; no-tillage system; crops-alternative; upland rice development; cover crop
#2	Nitrate leaching	112	0.924	2011	cover crop; cropping system; nitrate leaching; soil crop model; catch crop
#4	Reduced tillage	89	0.891	2013	cover crop; crop yield; N <sub>2</sub> O emission; reduced tillage; greenhouse gas emission
#59	Soil health indicator	3	0.993	2014	upland rice yield; no-tillage system; crops-alternative; upland rice development; cover crop
#3	Oliver orchard	104	0.934	2015	cover crop; olive orchard; European vineyard; Mediterranean vineyard; rainfed vineyard;
#0	Winter cover crops effect	265	0.840	2016	cover crop; soil properties; soil health; cover crop effect; soybean yield
#17	Uruguayan vegetable	12	0.978	2018	soil microbiota; organic amendment; Uruguayan vegetable; farming system; soil health

In Stage 1\_A, there were three salient subclusters with the following core terms: live and desiccated hairy vetch (a winter annual CC), Nitrate Leaching, Economic Analysis Package (NLEAP), and nitrogen fertilization. The research studies in Stage 1\_A predominantly assessed the role of a set of CC types for nitrogen management in cropping systems. Studies examining the use of hairy vetch CC and nitrogen management, such as [64–69], represented examples of the research scope in this first stage. The next cluster, Stage 1\_b (2001–2010), contained five salient research areas (i.e., subclusters), including winter CC use, tillage CC, mulch-based cropping system, olive grove, and nitrous oxide emission. Examples of studies published in this stage included [38,70–74]. We should note that research examining whether CC reduces N<sub>2</sub>O emissions from the soil surface bridged the scopes of research in Stages 1\_B and Stages 2. The last stage, Stage 2 (2011–2021), encompassed the majority of knowledge domains and bursts for the topic of interest in this scientometric review. Particularly, the following subclusters were salient: extractable carbon, subtropical oxisol, nitrate leaching, reduced tillage, olive orchard, soil health, and winter CC effects. A small cluster but one with recent publications and with the potential for further expansion is soil health indicators (i.e., cluster #59). As noted earlier, the majority of influential articles with the strongest citation bursts and co-cited articles were published in this Stage (See

Table 4 and Figure 4). A common theme across studies in this late stage—and a research frontier—was assessing the environmental effects of incorporating CC into crop rotations, particularly the potential benefits on physical and chemical soil properties. The most prominent hotspot in this stage and across Stages is the research focus on the winter CC effect (Refer to Figure 5, Stage 2, Cluster #0).

Table 5 provides the list of the 18 research hotspots in detail by the year's slice. The second column provides the size of the cluster—that is, the number of cited articles in a given cluster. The Silhouette value (third column in Table 5) denotes the efficiency and validity of clustering; a value greater than 0.6 indicates acceptable homogeneity [75]. In our study, the Silhouette values for clusters were well over 0.6. The year column denotes the average publication year for articles within a cluster; for example, cluster #8 contained 68 articles, most of which were published around 1990. Finally, the column of the top five terms presents the top five research terms in a specific cluster, ranked by latent semantic indexing (LSI). Results in this section were consistent with the hotspots and frontiers discussed in Figure 5. CC effects on nitrogen dynamics and soil quality were the two dominant research topics across all three stages. Moreover, the top five terms highlighted research foci by stage. For example, the terms “hairy vetch” and “Nitrogen” consistently appeared in clusters (i.e., 5, 8, 9, and 10) with articles published in the first stage (1980–2000). In the second stage (2001–2011), “nitrogen fertilization” and “mulch-based cropping system” were recurring terms. Finally, key terms used by studies published in the last stage include “cover crop effect” and “soil properties,” denoting the current research frontiers of CC research.


### 3.4. Co-Occurrence Network of Subject Terms Analysis

This section presents the results co-occurrence network of subject terms analysis. [76] argued that the keywords and co-occurrence networks could identify research hotspots in the literature on a particular topic. Figure 6 displays the co-occurrence network of subject categories (398 nodes, 1590 edges; average degree of 7.99 and network density of 0.02). Similar to our findings in Figure 5 or Table 5, the most important keywords used in the literature were yield, Nitrogen, soil organic matter, water quality, and conservation tillage. Further, we calculated a set of indicators (i.e., frequency, degree centrality, betweenness centrality, and closeness centrality) for the co-occurrence network. We should note that we excluded keywords, such as CC and word extensions (e.g., cover crops, cover cropping), from the top five subject terms listed in Table 6. Overall, the salient hotspots in the literature were topics, such as Nitrogen and weed management and conservation tillage. Importantly, CC research emphasizing corn cropping systems and wheat (used as a CC and in the crop rotation of other cash crops) appears to be hotspots in the literature. These results are consistent with our findings in the citation-clustering analysis (see Table 5).

**Table 6.** Top five subject terms in co-occurrence network by four indexes.

Rank	Frequency	Degree Centrality	Betweenness Centrality	Closeness Centrality
1	Management (756)	Residue (39)	water quality (4575) Weed	Nitrogen (0.426)
2	Nitrogen (475)	Nitrogen (38)	Management (4567)	Management (0.423)
3	Yield (470)	wheat (38)	Quality (4199)	Wheat (0.418)
4	Tillage (439)	conservation tillage (36)	Germination (3976)	Carbon (0.417)
5	Soil (432)	Management (36)	Residue (3780)	Corn (0.416)

CiteSpace, v. 5.8.R1 (64-bit) Basic  
 March 22, 2022 at 5:45:58 PM EDT  
 WoS: D:\OneDrive - University of Florida\Desktop\data  
 Timespan: 1980-2021 (Slice Length=1)  
 Selection Criteria: Top 10.0% per slice, up to 100, LRF=3.0, L/N=10, LB=5, q=1.0  
 Network: N=398, E=1558 (Density=0.021)  
 Largest CC: 394 (99%)  
 Nodes Labeled: 1.0%  
 Pruning: MST



**Figure 6.** Co-occurrence network of subject terms.


### 3.5. Academic Cooperation among Authors, Institutions, and Countries

Academic collaboration among scholars, institutions, and countries is vital for advancing knowledge and promoting the development of new technologies [77,78]. Collaboration analyses help understand scholarly communication and knowledge diffusion [22,79]. In this paper, we constructed three collaboration networks—author-level, institutional, and country-level—to analyze links and patterns of academic collaboration as reflected in the literature on the environmental effects of CC.

#### 3.5.1. Co-Authorship Network Analysis

Figure 7 depicts the author's collaboration network for literature on the environmental effects of CC research. We used Gephi software to analyze the network structure and characteristics. The nodes and edges of the co-authorship network were 1227 and 2412, respectively. In this network, nodes represented individual authors, and links illustrated patterns of cooperation among authors. The size of each node represented the number of publications, and the thickness of the links represented the strength or level of collaboration among a set of authors [45,80]. The average degree of this network was 3.92, and the network density was 0.003, indicative of a dispersive network. In other words, scholars, particularly those with significant contributions to the literature, may seldom co-author publications. Table 7 provides a set of indicators—i.e., citation frequency degree centrality, betweenness centrality, and closeness centrality—to represent the impacts of authors [80]. Based on the indicators above, the following were the most prominent scholars in the literature regarding the environmental effects of CC: Dr. José Alfonso Gómez Calero (Research Scientist in the Institute for Sustainable Agriculture, Spanish National Research Council [Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas]), Dr. Tom Kaspar (Retired Plant physiologist at USDA-ARS), Dr. Rattan Lal (Distinguished University Professor of Soil Science at The Ohio State University), Dr. Steven Mirsky (Research Ecologist at USDA-ARS), Dr. Eric Justes (In the co-authorship network, the name of author Eric Justes, Ph.D. was listed as Eric Justes and Justes E. The CiteSpace software cannot identify these two names variants as the same author automatically, nor does it combine the outputs attributed to this author. Importantly, we should note that the combined citation frequency for Dr. Eric Justes makes him the most productive author in the network) (Senior scientist in agronomy and Agroecology at the French Agricultural Research Centre for International Development

[Centre de Coopération Internationale en Recherche Agronomique pour le Développement, CIRAD]].



**Figure 7.** The results of co-authorship network analysis.

**Table 7.** The centrality of the top 5 productive authors in the co-authorship network.

Author	Frequency	Degree Centrality	Betweenness Centrality	Closeness Centrality
José A. Gómez	18	10	38.7	1.0
Tom Kaspar	16	15	916.4	1.0
Rattan Lal	16	2	1.0	1.0
Steven Mirsky	14	18	363.0	1.0
Eric Justes	14	6	166.0	1.0

### 3.5.2. Institution and Country Collaboration Network Analyses

The institution and country collaboration networks are displayed in Figures 8 and 9. The institution collaboration network contained 744 nodes and 1319 edges, while the country collaboration network had 127 nodes and 555 edges. The average degree of institution collaboration network was 3.546, and the network density was 0.005. The average degree for the country collaboration network was 8.74, with a network density of 0.069. The thicker edge in Figures 8 and 9 denotes more collaborations between two nodes, i.e., countries and institutions. Overall, we found that the country collaboration network was denser than the institution collaboration network; in other words, there is more country collaboration than inter-institutional cooperation in the extant literature.




Figure 8. The results of institution cooperation network analysis.




Figure 9. The results of country cooperation network analysis.

Table 8 shows the centrality indicators of the top ten institutions based on their frequency in the networks. USDA-ARS ranks at the top of the list with 397 publications or 12.23% of total records. Similarly, based on the examined indicators, USDA-ARS was the most productive contributor to the literature on CC. Other contributing institutions to the field of study are Iowa State University (107 manuscripts), University of California-Davis (96 manuscripts), The Pennsylvania State University (74 manuscripts), Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada (71 manuscripts), and Michigan State University (65 manuscripts). A



salient finding is that most top contributing institutions to the CC field are in the United States.

**Table 8.** Top 10 institutions based on the frequency.

Institution	Frequency	Degree Centrality	Betweenness Centrality	Closeness Centrality
USDA ARS	397	120	35,856.347	0.471
Iowa State University	107	51	5063.947	0.416
University of California Davis	96	41	9797.681	0.376
The Pennsylvania State University	74	27	7125.650	0.398
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada	71	31	5403.697	0.379
Michigan State University	65	36	4899.075	0.395
Cornell University	64	33	9221.985	0.390
Ohio State University	61	25	3229.640	0.370
University of Minnesota	48	34	3709.021	0.39
French National Institute for Agricultural Research	53	28	8676.522	0.323

Note: USDA ARS appears in literature metadata as USDA ARS and ARS. For the purpose of this study and this table, USDA ARS and ARS are combined. The frequency for ARS was 153.


Table 9 provides the list of the ten countries with the highest rank of contribution to the literature of interest. The United States ranked first with 1608 publications, contributing about 49.53% of the total records published in peer-reviewed journals. Likewise, the degree centrality, betweenness centrality, and closeness centrality indicators placed the United States as the highest producer of academic outputs on the relationship between CC and environmental effects. Other countries with at least 100 publications included Brazil (236 articles), Spain (203 articles), Italy (179 articles), Canada (177 articles), France (149 articles), China (145 articles), and Germany (112 articles).

**Table 9.** Top 10 countries based on the frequency.

Country	Frequency	Degree Centrality	Betweenness Centrality	Closeness Centrality
USA	1608	87	3755.560	0.758
Brazil	236	25	144.465	0.541
Spain	203	35	461.344	0.565
Italy	179	32	165.041	0.543
Canada	177	21	85.837	0.518
France	149	41	565.124	0.584
China	145	29	246.070	0.548
Germany	112	49	691.823	0.610
England	83	36	304.888	0.568
Australia	74	32	654.972	0.556

#### 4. Conclusions

Using network analysis methods and indicators (e.g., average degree, density, component, average paths length, and centrality), this study explored research frontiers, hotspots, and cooperation (i.e., at the scholar-, institution-and country-levels) in the existing literature related to the environmental impacts of CC. We retrieved and analyzed 3246 peer-reviewed articles published in the last forty years from the Web of Science database. The main output of this article was a knowledge map of the literature (see Figure 10) that provides insight into the research activity, trajectory, and frontier of knowledge.



**Figure 10.** Mind map of this paper.

Overall, the number of peer-reviewed outputs documenting the effects of CC on the environment—particularly the relationship between the use of CC and soil properties—has consistently increased in the past 40 years, with a notable rise in publications within the last decade. Research studies have primarily addressed 18 core research topics, where the most salient domains included the impact of using winter CC in cropping systems, the relationship between CC usage and nitrous oxide emissions, reduction of nitrate leaching in agroecosystems, and the implications of incorporating CC and reduce tillage/no-tillage for soil health and field quality. The existing literature may be categorized into three stages: Stage 1\_A (1980–2000), Stage 1\_B (2001–2010), and Stage 2 (2010–2021). In the early stage, research mainly examined the association between CC, nitrogen management, and weed suppression. In the middle stage, CC studies assessed the impact of using different CC mixtures in farming systems. Lastly, in the last stage and current research frontier, the literature primarily addressed the environmental benefits of CC, particularly the implications for physical and chemical soil properties and soil health indicators to assess the impact of CC. The following were influential articles in the literature: [35,55,58,61,72]. Interestingly, most of these studies were published in Stage 2 between 2011 and 2021. The leading journals with a higher rate of publication on the environmental effects of CC included *Agronomy Journal*, *Soil Tillage Research*, *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, and the *Soil science Society of America Journal*. In terms of author-institution-and country-level networks, our findings indicated that Drs. Justes (CIRAD, France), Gómez Calero (the Spanish National Research Council), Kaspar (USDA-ARS), Lal (the Ohio State University), and Mirsky (USDA-ARS) are influential contributors to the literature on the environmental effects of CC. Further, based on network structures, country collaboration patterns were more frequent than co-authorship or institutional collaboration patterns. The countries with the most research outputs were the United States, Brazil, and Spain. Finally, the majority of top contributing institutions to the field of CC research were based in the United States. USDA-ARS was the most productive contributor to the literature on CC research in the last forty years.

This study's results provide insight into future directions for CC research. For example, literature presenting farmers' perceptions of future avenues for research regarding CC is

limited. Expanding coverage of this experiential knowledge is needed for several reasons. One is the potential for increasing adoption of CC, given that farmers consistently respond that “other growers” are a major trusted source of advice when asked about their sources of information. Experienced CC producers consistently point to three needs for expanded research. One is that new adopters need to commit to a lengthy trial of CC on their farms to adequately assess both the biological and economic advantages of using CC. On-farm trials for short periods do not generate reliable data because of annual differences in weather, pests, and other sources of variance. Research over more extended time frames than the typical two to five years is needed. The need for longer periods of record for research is directly tied to the need for greater emphasis on soil health. In research involving farmers on research teams, long-time growers have consistently cited opportunities to reduce input applications of nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium by using cover crops to retain nutrients applied to a cash crop. They argue that finding optimal systems of rotation between CC and cash crops is the key to success. Timing is crucial to ensure that cash crops are in the field soon enough to capture nutrients released by CC at termination. More data for longer observation periods are needed to identify key parameters in the many systems of CC/cash crop combinations, all subject to variance in soil physical characteristics. Growers have also expressed interest in larger-scale trials that make direct comparisons between a farmer’s current practices and systems using CC so that the full variance in field conditions can be assessed, perhaps plots as large as 20 acres. Experienced farmers also argue that there is an over-emphasis on yield and insufficient attention paid to profitability. The basic argument is that a farmer can earn a higher profit per unit of production with fewer inputs because the cost of the inputs is higher than the value of the added productivity. This is an economic factor that deserves attention, given the rapidly increasing cost of fertilizer inputs and the instability in yield that we may anticipate under the conditions of global climate change.

#### *Limitations and Future Scientometric Research*

Several limitations must be considered when interpreting the findings from this scientometric analysis. First, the data for this study were delimited to peer-reviewed articles published in scientific journals indexed in the Web of Science—which is the most comprehensive database for scientific outputs [45]. In other words, gray literature (e.g., working papers, technical bulletins, theses and dissertations, conference proceedings, government reports) and books were excluded from the analysis due to time and financial constraints. To reduce publication bias [81], future research studies may consider grey literature document types for the analysis and include other large science databases (e.g., Scopus and Google Scholar). A second limitation worth noting is that the literature review in this paper was limited to articles published in the English language. This particular limitation has ramifications for the findings concerning institution- and country-level networks. Finally, the scope of this scientometric analysis focused exclusively on the existing literature on the environmental impacts of CC. Future review and scientometric studies may consider a broader approach and include investigations concerning the economic and social externalities of CC for analysis purposes.

**Author Contributions:** Y.L.: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, Writing—Original Draft, Writing—Review and Editing, Validation. J.R.-M.: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing—Original Draft, Writing—Review and Editing, Validation, Project administration, Funding acquisition. Y.H.: Methodology, Writing—Original Draft, Writing—Review and Editing, Validation. M.Z.: Writing—Reviewing and Editing. M.E.S.: Writing—Reviewing and Editing. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Funding:** This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture/National Institute of Food and Agriculture (USDA/NIFA) Hatch Multistate project titled “Cover Crops for Sustainable Southern Agroecosystems” (S1085): FLA-FYC-005952, FLA-FYC-005946, the University of Florida International Center (UFIC) Global Fellowship Award, and the UFIC Collaborative Faculty Team Project.

**Data Availability Statement:** Data used for this study came from the Web of Science databases.

**Acknowledgments:** We are grateful for the feedback we received on this paper from members of the Hatch Multistate project “Cover Crops for Sustainable Southern Agroecosystems” (S1085), as well as for the comments from two anonymous reviewers.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## Appendix A

### Network Analysis Indicators

Network density can be represented as follow [82]:

$$\rho = \frac{c}{n-1} \quad (\text{A1})$$

where  $\rho$  denotes the network density,  $c$  is the mean degree of nodes in an undirected network, and  $n$  is the number of nodes. The possible value of network density ranges from 0 to 1. When the density value approaches 1, the network is denser. Otherwise, the network is more dispersed. A higher network density value means a greater connection between nodes, such as references, keywords, and authors.

Betweenness centrality is one of the centrality measurements and can be represented as follows:

$$c_B(k) = \sum_i \sum_j \frac{\rho(i,j,k)}{\rho(i,j)}, i < j, k \neq i \neq j \quad (\text{A2})$$

where  $c_B(k)$  is the betweenness centrality of node  $k$ ,  $\rho(i,j)$  is the number of geodesic or shortest paths between node  $i$  and node  $j$  and  $\rho(i,j,k)$  refers to the number of paths that pass-through node  $k$ . In our study, we used the betweenness centrality as an indicator to determine the importance of each node in networks.

Closeness centrality refers to the sum of distances from one node to the other nodes [53]. It can be given as:

$$\ell_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_j d_{ij} \quad (\text{A3})$$

where  $d_{ij}$  is the length of a geodesic path from  $i$  to  $j$ .

## References

- Jiang, Y.; Li, S.; Chen, W.; Cai, D.; Liu, Y. The Evolution of Crop Cultivation and Paleoenvironment in the Longji Terraces, Southern China: Organic Geochemical Evidence from Paleosols. *J. Environ. Manag.* **2017**, *202*, 524–531. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
- King, F.H. *Farmers of Forty Centuries: Organic Farming in China, Korea, and Japan*, Later ed.; Dover Publications: Mineola, NY, UAS, 2004; ISBN 978-0-486-43609-8.
- Groff, S. The Past, Present, and Future of the Cover Crop Industry. *J. Soil Water Conserv.* **2015**, *70*, 130A–133A. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Hu, Q.; Torres-Alavez, J.A.; Broeke, M.S.V.D. Land-Cover Change and the “Dust Bowl” Drought in the U.S. Great Plains. *J. Clim.* **2018**, *31*, 4657–4667. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Sauter, S. Australia’s Dust Bowl: Transnational Influences in Soil Conservation and the Spread of Ecological Thought. *Aust. J. Polit. Hist.* **2015**, *61*, 352–365. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Magdoff, F.; van Es, H. Building Soils for Better Crops: Organic Matter Management. *Soil Sci.* **1993**, *156*, 371. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Hamilton, N.D. Eight Steps to Understanding the Evolution of Sustainable Agriculture in the United States Essay. *Drake J. Agric. Law* **2019**, *24*, 67–74.
- Laforge, J.M.L.; Levkoe, C.Z. Seeding Agroecology through New Farmer Training in Canada: Knowledge, Practice, and Relational Identities. *Local Environ.* **2018**, *23*, 991–1007. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Acevedo-Osorio, Á.; Chohan, J.K. Agroecology as Social Movement and Practice in Cabrera’s Peasant Reserve Zone, Colombia. *Agroecol. Sustain. Food Syst.* **2020**, *44*, 331–351. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Kansanga, M.M.; Luginaah, I.; Bezner Kerr, R.; Lupafya, E.; Dakishoni, L. Beyond Ecological Synergies: Examining the Impact of Participatory Agroecology on Social Capital in Smallholder Farming Communities. *Int. J. Sustain. Dev. World Ecol.* **2020**, *27*, 1–14. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Mdee, A.; Wostry, A.; Coulson, A.; Maro, J. A Pathway to Inclusive Sustainable Intensification in Agriculture? Assessing Evidence on the Application of Agroecology in Tanzania. *Agroecol. Sustain. Food Syst.* **2019**, *43*, 201–227. [[CrossRef](#)]

12. Corina Paula, N. Urban Agroecology in Campo Grande, Brazil. *Ann. Univ. Oradea Geogr. Ser.* **2019**, *29*, 19–29. [CrossRef]
13. SARE Cover Crops for Sustainable Crop Rotations. Available online: <https://www.sare.org/resources/cover-crops/> (accessed on 26 August 2022).
14. SARE National Farmer Survey Documents a Wide Range of Cover Crop Benefits as Acreage Continues to Expand. Available online: <https://www.sare.org/news/2020-cover-crop-survey-report/> (accessed on 26 August 2022).
15. USDA ARS Cover Crop Chart. Available online: <https://www.ars.usda.gov/plains-area/mandan-nd/ngprl/docs/cover-crop-chart/> (accessed on 26 August 2022).
16. USDA ERS Cover Crop Trends, Programs, and Practices in the United States. Available online: <http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/pub-details/?pubid=100550> (accessed on 26 August 2022).
17. The Organic Foods Production Act of 1990 (OFPA), Provisions of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990. Available online: [https://www.ers.usda.gov/webdocs/publications/42024/50891\\_aib624a.pdf?v=5337](https://www.ers.usda.gov/webdocs/publications/42024/50891_aib624a.pdf?v=5337) (accessed on 26 August 2022).
18. National Organic Program (NOP), Part IV: Rules and Regulations. Available online: <https://www.govinfo.gov/app/details/FR-2000-12-21/00-32257> (accessed on 26 August 2022).
19. Council Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 of 24 June 1991 on Organic Production of Agricultural Products and Indications Referring Thereto on Agricultural Products and Foodstuffs, 1991. Available online: <http://extwprlegs1.fao.org/docs/pdf/eur2355.pdf> (accessed on 26 August 2022).
20. Council Regulation (EEC) No 2078/92 of 30 June 1992 on Agricultural Production Methods Compatible with the Requirements of the Protection of the Environment and the Maintenance of the Countryside, 1997. Available online: <http://aei.pitt.edu/6215/1/6215.pdf> (accessed on 26 August 2022).
21. Council Regulation (EEC) No 1804/1999 of 19 July 1999 Supplementing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 on Organic Production of Agricultural Products and Indications Referring Thereto on Agricultural Products and Foodstuffs to Include Livestock Production, CELEX1; Publications Office of the European Union, 1999. Available online: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:1991R2092:20060506:EN:PDF> (accessed on 26 August 2022).
22. Chen, C. CiteSpace II: Detecting and Visualizing Emerging Trends and Transient Patterns in Scientific Literature. *J. Am. Soc. Inf. Sci. Technol.* **2006**, *57*, 359–377. [CrossRef]
23. Lee, W. How to Identify Emerging Research Fields Using Scientometrics: An Example in the Field of Information Security. *Scientometrics* **2008**, *76*, 503–525. [CrossRef]
24. Zhang, L.; Yan, C.; Guo, Q.; Zhang, J.; Ruiz-Menjivar, J. The Impact of Agricultural Chemical Inputs on Environment: Global Evidence from Informetrics Analysis and Visualization. *Int. J. Low-Carbon Technol.* **2018**, *13*, 338–352. [CrossRef]
25. Blanco-Canqui, H.; Ruis, S.J. Cover Crop Impacts on Soil Physical Properties: A Review. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* **2020**, *84*, 1527–1576. [CrossRef]
26. Haruna, S.I.; Anderson, S.H.; Udawatta, R.P.; Gantzer, C.J.; Phillips, N.C.; Cui, S.; Gao, Y. Improving Soil Physical Properties through the Use of Cover Crops: A Review. *Agrosystems Geosci. Environ.* **2020**, *3*, e20105. [CrossRef]
27. Adetunji, A.T.; Ncube, B.; Mulidzi, R.; Lewu, F.B. Management Impact and Benefit of Cover Crops on Soil Quality: A Review. *Soil Tillage Res.* **2020**, *204*, 104717. [CrossRef]
28. Bolinder, M.A.; Crotty, F.; Elsen, A.; Frac, M.; Kismányoky, T.; Lipiec, J.; Tits, M.; Tóth, Z.; Kätterer, T. The Effect of Crop Residues, Cover Crops, Manures and Nitrogen Fertilization on Soil Organic Carbon Changes in Agroecosystems: A Synthesis of Reviews. *Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Change* **2020**, *25*, 929–952. [CrossRef]
29. Bergtold, J.S.; Ramsey, S.; Maddy, L.; Williams, J.R. A Review of Economic Considerations for Cover Crops as a Conservation Practice. *Renew. Agric. Food Syst.* **2019**, *34*, 62–76. [CrossRef]
30. Thapa, R.; Mirsky, S.B.; Tully, K.L. Cover Crops Reduce Nitrate Leaching in Agroecosystems: A Global Meta-Analysis. *J. Environ. Qual.* **2018**, *47*, 1400–1411. [CrossRef]
31. Osipitan, O.A.; Dille, J.A.; Assefa, Y.; Knezevic, S.Z. Cover Crop for Early Season Weed Suppression in Crops: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Agron. J.* **2018**, *110*, 2211–2221. [CrossRef]
32. Bowles, T.M.; Jackson, L.E.; Loeher, M.; Cavagnaro, T.R. Ecological Intensification and Arbuscular Mycorrhizas: A Meta-Analysis of Tillage and Cover Crop Effects. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **2017**, *54*, 1785–1793. [CrossRef]
33. Alvarez, R.; Steinbach, H.S.; De Paepe, J.L. Cover Crop Effects on Soils and Subsequent Crops in the Pampas: A Meta-Analysis. *Soil Tillage Res.* **2017**, *170*, 53–65. [CrossRef]
34. Kaye, J.P.; Quemada, M. Using Cover Crops to Mitigate and Adapt to Climate Change. A Review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.* **2017**, *37*, 4. [CrossRef]
35. Poelau, C.; Don, A. Carbon Sequestration in Agricultural Soils via Cultivation of Cover Crops—A Meta-Analysis. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* **2015**, *200*, 33–41. [CrossRef]
36. Basche, A.D.; Miguez, F.E.; Kaspar, T.C.; Castellano, M.J. Do Cover Crops Increase or Decrease Nitrous Oxide Emissions? A Meta-Analysis. *J. Soil Water Conserv.* **2014**, *69*, 471–482. [CrossRef]
37. Kartika, J.G.; Reyes, M.R.; Susila, A.D. Sustainable Agriculture and Natural Resource Management (SANREM) Knowledgebase. Available online: <https://vtechworks.lib.vt.edu/handle/10919/64847> (accessed on 24 August 2022).
38. Snapp, S.S.; Swinton, S.M.; Labarta, R.; Mutch, D.; Black, J.R.; Leep, R.; Nyiraneza, J.; O’Neil, K. Evaluating Cover Crops for Benefits, Costs and Performance within Cropping System Niches. *Agron. J.* **2005**, *97*, 322–332. [CrossRef]



39. Creamer, N.G.; Dabney, S.M. Killing Cover Crops Mechanically: Review of Recent Literature and Assessment of New Research Results. *Am. J. Altern. Agric.* **2002**, *17*, 32–40. [CrossRef]
40. Dabney, S.M.; Delgado, J.A.; Reeves, D.W. Using Winter Cover Crops to Improve Soil and Water Quality. *Commun. Soil Sci. Plant Anal.* **2001**, *32*, 1221–1250. [CrossRef]
41. Nalimov, V.V.; Mulchenko, Z.M. *Measurement of Science. Study of the Development of Science as an Information Process*; Education Resources Information Center: Washington, DC, USA, 1971.
42. Börner, K.; Chen, C.; Boyack, K.W. Visualizing Knowledge Domains. *Annu. Rev. Inf. Sci. Technol.* **2005**, *37*, 179–255. [CrossRef]
43. Su, H.-N.; Lee, P.-C. Mapping Knowledge Structure by Keyword Co-Occurrence: A First Look at Journal Papers in Technology Foresight. *Scientometrics* **2010**, *85*, 65–79. [CrossRef]
44. Markoulli, M.P.; Lee, C.I.S.G.; Byington, E.; Felps, W.A. Mapping Human Resource Management: Reviewing the Field and Charting Future Directions. *Hum. Resour. Manag. Rev.* **2017**, *27*, 367–396. [CrossRef]
45. Olawumi, T.O.; Chan, D.W.M. A Scientometric Review of Global Research on Sustainability and Sustainable Development. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2018**, *183*, 231–250. [CrossRef]
46. Boyack, K.W.; Klavans, R. Co-Citation Analysis, Bibliographic Coupling, and Direct Citation: Which Citation Approach Represents the Research Front Most Accurately? *J. Am. Soc. Inf. Sci. Technol.* **2010**, *61*, 2389–2404. [CrossRef]
47. Hsiao, C.H.; Yang, C. The Intellectual Development of the Technology Acceptance Model: A Co-Citation Analysis. *Int. J. Inf. Manag.* **2011**, *31*, 128–136. [CrossRef]
48. Shiau, W.-L.; Dwivedi, Y.K.; Yang, H.S. Co-Citation and Cluster Analyses of Extant Literature on Social Networks. *Int. J. Inf. Manag.* **2017**, *37*, 390–399. [CrossRef]
49. Chen, C.; Ibekwe-SanJuan, F.; Hou, J. The Structure and Dynamics of Cocitation Clusters: A Multiple-Perspective Cocitation Analysis. *J. Am. Soc. Inf. Sci. Technol.* **2010**, *61*, 1386–1409. [CrossRef]
50. Chen, C. Searching for Intellectual Turning Points: Progressive Knowledge Domain Visualization. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **2004**, *101*, 5303–5310. [CrossRef]
51. Bastian, M.; Heymann, S.; Jacomy, M. Gephi: An Open Source Software for Exploring and Manipulating Networks. In Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media, San Jose, CA, USA, 17–20 May 2009; pp. 361–362.
52. Golbeck, J. Chapter 3—Network Structure and Measures. In *Analyzing the Social Web*; Golbeck, J., Ed.; Morgan Kaufmann: Boston, MA, USA, 2013; pp. 25–44. ISBN 978-0-12-405531-5.
53. Zhang, J.; Luo, Y. Degree Centrality, Betweenness Centrality, and Closeness Centrality in Social Network. In Proceedings of the 2017 2nd International Conference on Modelling, Simulation and Applied Mathematics (MSAM2017), Bangkok, Thailand, 26–27 March 2017; pp. 300–303.
54. U.S. Department of Agriculture-Natural Resource Conservation Services (NRCS) Cover Crop Action Plan. Available online: <https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/climatechange/?cid=stelprdb1077238> (accessed on 26 August 2022).
55. Blanco-Canqui, H.; Shaver, T.M.; Lindquist, J.L.; Shapiro, C.A.; Elmore, R.W.; Francis, C.A.; Hergert, G.W. Cover Crops and Ecosystem Services: Insights from Studies in Temperate Soils. *Agron. J.* **2015**, *107*, 2449–2474. [CrossRef]
56. Torres-Pruñonosa, J.; Plaza-Navas, M.A.; Díez-Martín, F.; Beltrán-Cangrós, A. The Intellectual Structure of Social and Sustainable Public Procurement Research: A Co-Citation Analysis. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 774. [CrossRef]
57. Amjad, T.; Shahid, N.; Daud, A.; Khatoon, A. Citation Burst Prediction in a Bibliometric Network. *Scientometrics* **2022**, *127*, 2773–2790. [CrossRef]
58. Shipanski, M.E.; Barbercheck, M.; Douglas, M.R.; Finney, D.M.; Haider, K.; Kaye, J.P.; Kemanian, A.R.; Mortensen, D.A.; Ryan, M.R.; Tooker, J.; et al. A Framework for Evaluating Ecosystem Services Provided by Cover Crops in Agroecosystems. *Agric. Syst.* **2014**, *125*, 12–22. [CrossRef]
59. Finney, D.M.; White, C.M.; Kaye, J.P. Biomass Production and Carbon/Nitrogen Ratio Influence Ecosystem Services from Cover Crop Mixtures. *Agron. J.* **2016**, *108*, 39–52. [CrossRef]
60. Basche, A.D.; Archontoulis, S.V.; Kaspar, T.C.; Jaynes, D.B.; Parkin, T.B.; Miguez, F.E. Simulating Long-Term Impacts of Cover Crops and Climate Change on Crop Production and Environmental Outcomes in the Midwestern United States. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* **2016**, *218*, 95–106. [CrossRef]
61. Mbuthia, L.W.; Acosta-Martínez, V.; DeBruyn, J.; Schaeffer, S.; Tyler, D.; Odoi, E.; Mpheshea, M.; Walker, F.; Eash, N. Long Term Tillage, Cover Crop, and Fertilization Effects on Microbial Community Structure, Activity: Implications for Soil Quality. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* **2015**, *89*, 24–34. [CrossRef]
62. Wittwer, R.A.; Dorn, B.; Jossi, W.; van der Heijden, M.G.A. Cover Crops Support Ecological Intensification of Arable Cropping Systems. *Sci. Rep.* **2017**, *7*, 41911. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
63. Pittelkow, C.M.; Liang, X.; Linquist, B.A.; van Groenigen, K.J.; Lee, J.; Lundy, M.E.; van Gestel, N.; Six, J.; Venterea, R.T.; van Kessel, C. Productivity Limits and Potentials of the Principles of Conservation Agriculture. *Nature* **2015**, *517*, 365–368. [CrossRef]
64. Utomo, M.; Frye, W.W.; Blevins, R.L. Sustaining Soil Nitrogen for Corn Using Hairy Vetch Cover Crop. *Agron. J.* **1990**, *82*, 979–983. [CrossRef]
65. Hoffman, M.L.; Regnier, E.E.; Cardina, J. Weed and Corn (Zea Mays) Responses to a Hairy Vetch (Vicia Villosa) Cover Crop. *Weed Technol.* **1993**, *7*, 594–599. [CrossRef]



66. Teasdale, J.R. Reduced-Herbicide Weed Management Systems for No-Tillage Corn (*Zea Mays*) in a Hairy Vetch (*Vicia Villosa*) Cover Crop. *Weed Technol.* **1993**, *7*, 879–883. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
67. Teasdale, J.R.; Shirley, D.W. Influence of Herbicide Application Timing on Corn Production in a Hairy Vetch Cover Crop. *J. Prod. Agric.* **1998**, *11*, 121–125. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
68. Delgado, J.A. Sequential NLEAP Simulations to Examine Effect of Early and Late Planted Winter Cover Crops on Nitrogen Dynamics. *J. Soil Water Conserv.* **1998**, *53*, 241–244.
69. Rosecrance, R.C.; McCarty, G.W.; Shelton, D.R.; Teasdale, J.R. Denitrification and N Mineralization from Hairy Vetch (*Vicia Villosa* Roth) and Rye (*Secale Cereale*, L.) Cover Crop Monocultures and Bicultures. *Plant Soil* **2000**, *227*, 283–290. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
70. Strock, J.S.; Porter, P.M.; Russelle, M.P. Cover Cropping to Reduce Nitrate Loss through Subsurface Drainage in the Northern U.S. Corn Belt. *J. Environ. Qual.* **2004**, *33*, 1010–1016. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
71. Peter, R.H.; Ken, S.; Raj, G. The Role of Conservation Agriculture in Sustainable Agriculture. Available online: <https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/epdf/10.1098/rstb.2007.2169> (accessed on 24 August 2022).
72. Celette, F.; Gaudin, R.; Gary, C. Spatial and Temporal Changes to the Water Regime of a Mediterranean Vineyard Due to the Adoption of Cover Cropping. *Eur. J. Agron.* **2008**, *29*, 153–162. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
73. Celette, F.; Findeling, A.; Gary, C. Competition for Nitrogen in an Unfertilized Intercropping System: The Case of an Association of Grapevine and Grass Cover in a Mediterranean Climate. *Eur. J. Agron.* **2009**, *30*, 41–51. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
74. Kaspar, T.C.; Jaynes, D.B.; Parkin, T.B.; Moorman, T.B. Rye Cover Crop and Gamagrass Strip Effects on NO<sub>3</sub> Concentration and Load in Tile Drainage. *J. Environ. Qual.* **2007**, *36*, 1503–1511. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
75. Jia, Q.; Shi, S.; Yuan, G.; Shi, J.; Shi, S.; Hu, Y. Analysis of Knowledge Bases and Research Hotspots of Coronavirus from the Perspective of Mapping Knowledge Domain. *Med. (Baltim.)* **2020**, *99*, e20378. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
76. Yu, D.; Xu, Z.; Pedrycz, W.; Wang, W. Information Sciences 1968–2016: A Retrospective Analysis with Text Mining and Bibliometric. *Inf. Sci.* **2017**, *418–419*, 619–634. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
77. Koseoglu, M.A. Mapping the Institutional Collaboration Network of Strategic Management Research: 1980–2014. *Scientometrics* **2016**, *109*, 203–226. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
78. Choe, H.; Lee, D.H. The Structure and Change of the Research Collaboration Network in Korea (2000–2011): Network Analysis of Joint Patents. *Scientometrics* **2017**, *111*, 917–939. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
79. Fang, Y.; Yin, J.; Wu, B. Climate Change and Tourism: A Scientometric Analysis Using CiteSpace. *J. Sustain. Tour.* **2018**, *26*, 108–126. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
80. Zandi, S.; Nemati, B.; Jahanianfard, D.; Davarazar, M.; Sheikhejad, Y.; Mostafaie, A.; Kamali, M.; Aminabhavi, T.M. Industrial Biowastes Treatment Using Membrane Bioreactors (MBRs) -a Scientometric Study. *J. Environ. Manag.* **2019**, *247*, 462–473. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
81. Paez, A. Gray Literature: An Important Resource in Systematic Reviews. *J. Evid.-Based Med.* **2017**, *10*, 233–240. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
82. Frey, B.B. *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Measurement, and Evaluation*, 1st ed.; SAGE Publications: Southend Oaks, CA, USA, 2018; ISBN 978-1-5063-2614-6.