Supplementary Information

Table S1. Filled out PRISMA guidelines.

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	1
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	2
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	2-3
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	4
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	5-6
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	4
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	4-5
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	4-5
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	4-5
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	4
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	4-5
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	6
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	5-6
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	5-6
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	5-6
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	4-5
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	4-6
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	4-6
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	4-6
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	6
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	4-6

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
RESULTS			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	6-7
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	n/a
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	6-9
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	6
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	6-9
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	6
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	6-9
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	6-9
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	n/a
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	n/a
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	6-9
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	9-17
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	6, 17
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	6,17
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	17
OTHER INFORMATION			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	n/a
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	n/a
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	n/a
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	17
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	18
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	17

Table S2. Genera of plants most frequently used for the restoration of degraded lands consistently documented across various regions in the reviewed literature.

Genus	Relative count (%)
Acacia	15.15
Leucaena	7.58
Eucalyptus	6.06
Artemisia	4.55
Robinia, Stipa, Terminalia, Toona and Zenia, Combretum	3.03
Acer, Ageratina, Anthyllis, Azadirachta, Bothriochloa, Bunias, Caragana, Carex, Cedrelinga, Cenostigma, Chromolaena, Cotula, Cryptomeria, Cupressus, Dactylis, Desmoschoenus, Eleusine, Ficus, Fraxinus, Gnetum,Helianthemum, Hypnum, Maireana, Miscanthus, Ochroma, Pinus, Prosopis, Rhus, Syzigium, Tenaxia, Tribulus, Ulmus, Grewia	1.52

A Complete list of articles used in the present systematic review.

1. Talukder, B.; Ganguli, N.; Matthew, R.; vanLoon, G.W.; Hipel, K.W.; Orbinski, J. Climate change-triggered land degradation and planetary health: A Review. *Land Degrad. Dev.* **2021**, *32*, 4509–4522. https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.4056.
2. Hoffmann, S. Challenges, and opportunities of area-based conservation in reaching biodiversity and sustainability goals. *Biodivers. Conserv.* **2021**, *31*, 325–352. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-021-02340-2.
3. Krausmann, F.; Schandl, H.; Eisenmenger, N.; Giljum, S.; Jackson, T. Material flow accounting: Measuring global material use for sustainable development. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* **2017**, *42*, 647–675. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-102016-060726.
4. Sonter, L.J.; Moran, C.J.; Barrett, D.J.; Soares-Filho, B.S. Processes of land use change in mining regions. *J. Clean. Prod.* **2014**, *84*, 494–501. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.03.084.
5. Dhiman, B. Ecosystem Degradation and the Need for Restoration: Through the Lens of Environment and Human Health. *Environ. Pollut. Clim. Chang.* **2022**, *6*, 1–4. https://doi.org/10.4172/2573-458X.1000304.
6. Lewis, S.L. Realizing the potential of restoration science. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **2022**, *378*, 20210174. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2021.0174.
7. Simonson, W.D.; Miller, E.; Jones, A.; García-Rangel, S.; Thornton, H.; McOwen, C. Enhancing climate change resilience of ecological restoration—A framework for action. *Perspect. Ecol. Conserv.* **2021**, *19*, 300–310. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pecon.2021.05.002.
8. Aronson, J.; Goodwin, N.; Orlando, L.; Eisenberg, C.; Cross, A.T. A world of possibilities: Six restoration strategies to support the United Nation's decade on Ecosystem Restoration. *Restor. Ecol.* **2020**, *28*, 730–736. https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.13170.
9. Metzger, J.P.; Esler, K.; Krug, C.; Arias, M.; Tambosi, L.; Crouzeilles, R.; Acosta, A.L.; Brancalion, P.H.; D'Albertas, F.; Duarte, G.T.; et al. Best practice for the use of scenarios for restoration planning. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* **2017**, *29*, 14–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2017.10.004.
10. Lal, R. Restoring soil quality to mitigate soil degradation. *Sustainability* **2015**, *7*, 5875–5895. https://doi.org/10.3390/su7055875.
11. Méndez-Toribio, M.; Martínez-Garza, C.; Ceccon, E. Challenges during the execution, results, and monitoring phases of Ecological Restoration: Learning from a country-wide assessment. *PLoS ONE* **2021**, *16*, e0249573. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0249573.
12. Restrepo, M.F.; Florez, C.P.; Osorio, N.W.; León, J.D. Passive and active restoration strategies to activate soil biogeochemical nutrient cycles in a degraded tropical dry land. *Int. Sch. Res. Not.* **2013**, *2013*, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/461984.
13. Stone, K.; Bhat, M.; Bhatta, R.; Mathews, A. Factors influencing community participation in mangrove restoration: A contingent valuation analysis. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* **2008**, *51*, 476–484. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2008.02.001.
14. Chazdon, R.L.; Broadbent, E.N.; Rozendaal, D.M.A.; Bongers, F.; Zambrano, A.M.A.; Aide, T.M.; Balvanera, P.; Becknell, J.M.; Boukili, V.; Brancalion, P.H.S.; et al. Carbon sequestration potential of second-growth forest regeneration in the Latin American tropics. *Sci. Adv.* **2016**, *2*, e1501639. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1501639.
15. Bustamante, M.M.; Silva, J.S.; Scariot, A.; Sampaio, A.B.; Mascia, D.L.; Garcia, E.; Sano, E.; Fernandes, G.W.; Durigan, G.; Roitman, I.; et al. Ecological restoration as a strategy for mitigating and adapting to climate change: Lessons and challenges from Brazil. *Mitig. Adapt. Strateg. Glob. Chang.* **2019**, *24*, 1249–1270. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11027-018-9837-5.
16. Constenla-Villoslada, S.; Liu, Y.; Wen, J.; Sun, Y.; Chonabayashi, S. Large-scale land restoration improved drought resilience in Ethiopia's degraded watersheds. *Nat. Sustain.* **2022**, *5*, 488–497. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-022-00861-4.
17. Hou, X.; Liu, S.; Cheng, F.; Su, X.; Dong, S.; Zhao, S.; Liu, G. Variability of environmental factors and the effects on vegetation diversity with different restoration years in a large open pit phosphorite mine. *Ecol. Eng.* **2019**, *127*, 245–253. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2018.12.006.
18. Derak, M.; Taiquib, L.; Aledoc, A.; Cortina, J. Similarities in stakeholder identification of restoration targets in a semiarid area. *J. Arid Environ.* **2016**, *128*, 30–39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaridenv.2015.12.003.
19. Reyes-García, V.; Fernández-Llamazares, Á.; McElwee, P.; Molnár, Z.; Öllerer, K.; Wilson, S.J.; Brondizio, E.S. The contributions of indigenous peoples and local communities to ecological restoration. *Restor. Ecol.* **2019**, *27*, 3–8. https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.12894.

20. Ellison, A.M. Mangrove restoration: Do we know enough? *Restor. Ecol.* **2000**, *8*, 219–229. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1526-100x.2000.80033.x.
21. Whittaker, A.R. Why we fail: Stakeholders' perceptions of the social and ecological barriers to reforestation in southern Malawi. *People Nat.* **2020**, *2*, 450–467. https://doi.org/10.1002/pan3.10084.
22. Samuel, E.M.; Mitchell, R.M.; Winkler, D.E. Perspectives on challenges and opportunities at the restoration-policy interface in the U.S.A. *Restor. Ecol.* **2022**, *31*, e13823. https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.13823.
23. Murcia, C.; Guariguata, M.R.; Andrade, Á.; Andrade, G.I.; Aronson, J.; Escobar, E.M.; Etter, A.; Moreno, F.H.; Ramírez, W.; Montes, E. Challenges and prospects for scaling-up ecological restoration to meet international commitments: Colombia as a case study. *Conserv. Lett.* **2016**, *9*, 213–220. https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12199.
24. Curran, M.; Hellweg, S.; Beck, J. Is there any empirical support for biodiversity offset policy? *Ecol. Appl.* **2014**, *24*, 617–631. https://doi.org/10.1890/13-0243.1.
25. Crouzeilles, R.; Ferreira, M.S.; Chazdon, R.L.; Lindenmayer, D.B.; Sansevero, J.B.; Monteiro, L.; Iribarrem, A.; Latawiec, A.E.; Strassburg, B.B. Ecological Restoration Success is higher for natural regeneration than for active restoration in tropical forests. *Sci. Adv.* **2017**, *3*, e1701345. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1701345.
26. Wu, X.; Shen, C.; Ma, X.; Hu, L.; He, Y.; Shang, H.; Fu, D. Soil moisture and available phosphorus as the factors driving variation in functional characteristics across different restoration communities in a subtropical mountain ecosystem. *Biology* **2023**, *12*, 427. https://doi.org/10.3390/biology12030427.
27. Ahammad, R.; Hossain, M.K.; Sobhan, I.; Hasan, R.; Biswas, S.R.; Mukul, S.A. Social-ecological and institutional factors affecting forest and landscape restoration in the Chittagong Hill tracts of Bangladesh. *Land Use Policy* **2023**, *125*, 106478. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2022.106478.
28. Han, Z.; Huang, S.; Huang, Q.; Bai, Q.; Leng, G.; Wang, H.; Zhao, J.; Wei, X.; Zheng, X. Effects of vegetation restoration on groundwater drought in the Loess Plateau, China. *J. Hydrol.* **2020**, *591*, 125566. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2020.125566.
29. Brancalion, P.H.S.; Lamb, D.; Ceccon, E.; Boucher, D.; Herbohn, J.; Strassburg, B.; Edwards, D.P. Using markets to leverage investment in forest and landscape restoration in the Tropics. *For. Policy Econ.* **2017**, *85*, 103–113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2017.08.009.
30. Alba-Patiño, D.; Carabassa, V.; Castro, H.; Gutiérrez-Briceño, I.; García-Llorente, M.; Giagnocavo, C.; Gómez-Tenorio, M.; Cabello, J.; Aznar-Sánchez, J.A.; Castro, A.J. Social indicators of ecosystem restoration for enhancing human wellbeing. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.* **2021**, *174*, 105782. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2021.105782.
31. Iftekhar, M.S.; Polyakov, M.; Ansell, D.; Gibson, F.; Kay, G.M. How economics can further the success of ecological restoration. *Conserv. Biol.* **2016**, *31*, 261–268. https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12778.
32. Berger, J.J. Ecological restoration, and nonindigenous plant species: A Review. *Restor. Ecol.* **1993**, *1*, 74–82. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1526-100x.1993.tb00012.x.
33. Anderson, P. Ecological restoration and creation: A Review. *Biol. J. Linn. Soc.* **1995**, *56*, 187–211. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8312.1995.tb01133.x.
34. Cairns, J.; Heckman, J.R. Restoration ecology: The state of an emerging field. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* **1996**, *21*, 167–189. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.energy.21.1.167.
35. Jones, T.A. Ecosystem restoration: Recent advances in theory and Practice. *Rangel. J.* **2017**, *39*, 417. https://doi.org/10.1071/rj17024.
36. Maus, V.; Giljum, S.; Gutschlhofer, J.; da Silva, D.M.; Probst, M.; Gass, S.L.; Luckeneder, S.; Lieber, M.; McCallum, I. A global-scale data set of mining areas. *Sci. Data* **2020**, *7*, 289. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-020-00624-w.
37. Hu, Z.; Liu, S.; Gong, Y. Evaluation of soil quality and maize growth in different profiles of reclaimed land with coal gangue filling. *Land* **2021**, *10*, 1307. https://doi.org/10.3390/land10121307.
38. Hu, Y.; Zhang, S.; Shi, Y.; Guo, L. Quantifying the impact of the grain-for-green program on ecosystem service scarcity value in Qinghai, China. *Sci. Rep.* **2023**, *13*, 2927. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-29937-7.
39. Correa, J.; Cisneros, E.; Börner, J.; Pfaff, A.; Costa, M.; Rajão, R. Evaluating redd+ at subnational level: Amazon Fund impacts in Alta Floresta, Brazil. *For. Policy Econ.* **2020**, *116*, 102178. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2020.102178.
40. Tedesco, A.M.; Brancalion, P.H.; Hepburn, M.L.; Walji, K.; Wilson, K.A.; Possingham, H.P.; Dean, A.J.; Nugent, N.; Elias-Trostmann, K.; Perez-Hammerle, K.-V. The role of incentive mechanisms in promoting forest restoration. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **2022**, *378*, 20210088. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2021.0088.
41. Estoque, R.C.; Ooba, M.; Avitabile, V.; Hijioka, Y.; DasGupta, R.; Togawa, T.; Murayama, Y. The future of Southeast Asia's forests. *Nat. Commun.* **2019**, *10*, 1829. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-09646-4.
42. Golpo, V.A.G.; Ricafort, J.D. Challenges Encountered by Coordinators and School Heads in the Implementation of the National Greening Program in Bulan II District Elementary Schools. *Am. Res. J. Humanit. Soc. Sci.* **2023**, *6*, 7–14.

43. Dang, T.K.; The discourse of forest cover in Vietnam and its policy implications. *Sustainability* **2022**, *14*, 10976. https://doi.org/10.3390/su141710976.
44. Su, K.; Yu, Q.; Yue, D.; Zhang, Q.; Yang, L.; Liu, Z.; Niu, T.; Sun, X. Simulation of a forest-grass ecological network in a typical desert oasis based on multiple scenes. *Ecol. Model.* **2019**, *413*, 108834. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2019.108834.
45. Han, Y.; Ke, Y.; Zhu, L.; Feng, H.; Zhang, Q.; Sun, Z.; Zhu, L. Tracking vegetation degradation and recovery in multiple mining areas in Beijing, China, based on time-series landsat imagery. *GIScience & Remote Sensing* **2021**, 58(8), 1477–1496. https://doi.org/10.1080/15481603.2021.1996319
46. Qiu, Y.; Wang, D.; Yu, X.; Jia, G.; Li, H. Effects of groundwater table decline on vegetation in groundwater-dependent ecosystems. *Forests* **2023**, *14*, 2326. https://doi.org/10.3390/f14122326.
47. Wang, Q.; Jiang, S.; Zhai, J.; He, G.; Zhao, Y.; Zhu, Y.; He, X.; Li, H.; Wang, L.; He, F.; et al. Effects of vegetation restoration on evapotranspiration water consumption in mountainous areas and assessment of its remaining Restoration Space. *J. Hydrol.* **2022**, *605*, 127259. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2021.127259.
48. Zheng, H.; Miao, C.; Li, X.; Kong, D.; Gou, J.; Wu, J.; Zhang, S. Effects of vegetation changes and multiple environmental factors on evapotranspiration across China over the past 34 years. *Earth's Future* **2022**, *10*, e2021EF002564. https://doi.org/10.1029/2021ef002564.
49. Seleiman, M.F.; Al-Suhaibani, N.; Ali, N.; Akmal, M.; Alotaibi, M.; Refay, Y.; Dindaroglu, T.; Abdul-Wajid, H.H.; Battaglia, M.L. Drought stress impacts on plants and different approaches to alleviate its adverse effects. *Plants* **2021**, *10*, 259. https://doi.org/10.3390/plants10020259.
50. Littell, J.S.; Peterson, D.L.; Riley, K.L.; Liu, Y.; Luce, C.H. A review of the relationships between drought and forest fire in the United States. *Glob. Chang. Biol.* **2016**, *22*, 2353–2369. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13275.
51. Hernandez, J.O.; Maldia, L.S.J.; Park, B.B. Research trends and methodological approaches of the impacts of windstorms on forests in tropical, subtropical, and temperate zones: Where are we now and how should research move forward? *Plants* **2020**, *9*, 1709. https://doi.org/10.3390/plants9121709.
52. Luan, X.; Vico, G. Canopy temperature and heat stress are increased by compound high air temperature and water stress and reduced by irrigation—A modeling analysis. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.* **2021**, *25*, 1411–1423. https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-25-1411-2021.
53. Hatfield, J.L.; Prueger, J.H. Temperature extremes: Effect on plant growth and development. *Weather Clim. Extrem.* **2015**, *10*, 4–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wace.2015.08.001.
54. Hassan, M.U.; Chattha, M.U.; Khan, I.; Chattha, M.B.; Barbanti, L.; Aamer, M.; Iqbal, M.M.; Nawaz, M.; Mahmood, A.; Ali, A.; et al. Heat stress in cultivated plants: Nature, impact, mechanisms, and mitigation strategies—A Review. *Plant Biosyst.* **2020**, *155*, 211–234. https://doi.org/10.1080/11263504.2020.1727987.
55. Cruz de Carvalho, M.H. Drought stress and reactive oxygen species. *Plant Signal. Behav.* **2008**, *3*, 156–165. https://doi.org/10.4161/psb.3.3.5536.
56. Sachdev, S.; Ansari, S.A.; Ansari, M.I.; Fujita, M.; Hasanuzzaman, M. Abiotic stress and reactive oxygen species: Generation, signaling, and defense mechanisms. *Antioxidants* **2021**, *10*, 277. https://doi.org/10.3390/antiox10020277.
57. Pospíšil, P. Production of reactive oxygen species by Photosystem II as a response to light and temperature stress. *Front. Plant Sci.* **2016**, *7*, 1950. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2016.01950.
58. Chauhan, J.; Prathibha, M.; Singh, P.; Choyal, P.; Mishra, U.N.; Saha, D.; Kumar, R.; Anuragi, H.; Pandey, S.; Bose, B.; et al. Plant photosynthesis under abiotic stresses: Damages, adaptive, and signaling mechanisms. *Plant Stress* **2023**, *10*, 100296. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stress.2023.100296.
59. Murata, N.; Takahashi, S.; Nishiyama, Y.; Allakhverdiev, S.I. Photoinhibition of Photosystem ii under environmental stress. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta (BBA)-Bioenerg.* **2007**, *1767*, 414–421. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbabio.2006.11.019.
60. Brockerhoff, E.G.; Barbaro, L.; Castagneyrol, B.; Forrester, D.I.; Gardiner, B.; González-Olabarria, J.R.; Lyver, P.O.; Meurisse, N.; Oxbrough, A.; Taki, H.; et al. Forest Biodiversity, ecosystem functioning and the provision of ecosystem services. *Biodivers. Conserv.* **2017**, *26*, 3005–3035. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-017-1453-2.
61. Veridiano, R.K.; Schröder, J.M.; Come, R.; Baldos, A.; Günter, S. Towards forest landscape restoration programs in the Philippines: Evidence from logged forests and mixed-species plantations. *Environments* **2020**, *7*, 20. https://doi.org/10.3390/environments7030020.
62. Halme, P.; Allen, K.A.; Auniņš, A.; Bradshaw, R.H.W.; Brūmelis, G.; Čada, V.; Clear, J.L.; Eriksson, A.-M.; Hannon, G.; Hyvärinen, E.; et al. Challenges of Ecological Restoration: Lessons from forests in Northern Europe. *Biol. Conserv.* **2013**, *167*, 248–256. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2013.08.029.
63. Novacek, M.J.; Cleland, E.E. The current biodiversity extinction event: Scenarios for mitigation and Recovery. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **2001**, *98*, 5466–5470. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.091093698.

64. Vilhar, U.; Kermavnar, J.; Kozamernik, E.; Petrič, M.; Ravbar, N. The effects of large-scale forest disturbances on hydrology—An overview with special emphasis on Karst Aquifer Systems. *Earth-Sci. Rev.* **2022**, *235*, 104243. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earscirev.2022.104243.
65. Qiu, L.; Zhang, Q.; Zhu, H.; Reich, P.B.; Banerjee, S.; van der Heijden, M.G.; Sadowsky, M.J.; Ishii, S.; Jia, X.; Shao, M.; et al. Erosion reduces soil microbial diversity, network complexity and multifunctionality. *ISME* **2021**, *15*, 2474–2489. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41396-021-00913-1.
66. Lucier, A.; Ayres, M.; Karnosky, D.; Thompson, I.; Loehle, C.; Percy, K.; Sohngen, B. Forest responses and vulnerabilities to recent climate change. In *Adaptation of Forests and People to Climate Change—A Global Assessment Report*; Seppälä, R., Buck, A., Katila, P., Eds.; IUFRO: Vienna, Austria; Helsinki, Finland, 2009; pp. 29–52.
67. Margono, B.A.; Potapov, P.V.; Turubanova, S.; Stolle, F.; Hansen, M.C. Primary Forest cover loss in Indonesia over 2000-2012. *Nat. Clim. Chang.* **2014**, *4*, 730–735. https://doi.org/10.22146/ijg.12496.
68. Stokstad, E.; Grullon, G. Infographic: Pesticide planet. *Science* **2013**, *341*, 730–731.
69. Humphries, T.; Florentine, S.K.; Dowling, K.; Turville, C.; Sinclair, S. Weed management for landscape scale restoration of global temperate grasslands. *Land Degrad. Dev.* **2020**, *32*, 1090–1102. https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.3802.
70. Kubiak, A.; Wolna-Maruwka, A.; Niewiadomska, A.; Pilarska, A.A. The problem of weed infestation of agricultural plantations vs. the assumptions of the European Biodiversity Strategy. *Agronomy* **2022**, *12*, 1808. https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy12081808.
71. Zareen, S.; Fawad, M.; Haroon, M.; Ahmad, I.; Zaman, A. Allelopathic potential of summer weeds on germination and growth performance of wheat and Chickpea. *J. Nat. Pestic. Res.* **2022**, *1*, 100002. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.napere.2022.100002.
72. Cummings, J.A.; Parker, I.M.; Gilbert, G.S. Allelopathy: A tool for Weed Management in forest restoration. *Plant Ecol.* **2012**, *213*, 1975–1989. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11258-012-0154-x.
73. Cheng, F.; Cheng, Z. Research progress on the use of plant allelopathy in agriculture and the physiological and ecological mechanisms of allelopathy. *Front. Plant Sci.* **2015**, *6*, 1020. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2015.01020.
74. Thiébaut, G.; Tarayre, M.; Rodríguez-Pérez, H. Allelopathic effects of native versus invasive plants on one major invader. *Front. Plant Sci.* **2019**, *10*, 854. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2019.00854.
75. Wiset, K.; Gregorio, N.; Fisher, R.; Mangaoang, E.; Herbohn, J. Assessing the effectiveness of the engagement of local people in restoring degraded forest landscapes in Leyte and Biliran provinces, the Philippines. *Environ. Sci. Policy* **2023**, *148*, 103545. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2023.07.005.
76. Ranjan, R. Optimal mangrove restoration through community engagement on coastal lands facing climatic risks: The case of Sundarbans region in India. *Land Use Policy* **2019**, *81*, 736–749. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2018.11.047.
77. Paudyal, R.; Thapa, B.; Neupane, S.S.; Kc, B. Factors Associated with Conservation Participation by Local Communities in Gaurishankar Conservation Area Project, Nepal. *Sustainability* **2018**, *10*, 3488.
78. Luong, M.-L.N.; Bennell, K.L.; Hall, M.; Harris, A.; Hinman, R.S. The impact of financial incentives on physical activity in adults: A systematic review protocol. *Syst. Rev.* **2018**, *7*, 21. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-018-0687-8.
79. Fu, B.; Liu, Y.; Meadows, M.E. Ecological restoration for sustainable development in China. *Natl. Sci. Rev.* **2023**, *10*, nwad033. https://doi.org/10.1093/nsr/nwad033.
80. Khatimah, F.H.; Fauzi, D.; Chandra, A.; Wicaksono, S.A. Benefits over threats: Understanding Community's motivation to participate in restoration initiatives in Gunung Leuser National Park, Sumatra. *IOP Conf. Ser. Earth Environ. Sci.* **2019**, *298*, 012027. https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/298/1/012027.
81. Cao, S.; Chen, L.; Yu, X. Impact of China's grain for Green Project on the landscape of vulnerable arid and semi-arid agricultural regions: A case study in northern Shaanxi province. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **2009**, *46*, 536–543. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2008.01605.x.
82. Moyo, H.; Slotow, R.; Rouget, M.; Mugwedi, L.; Douwes, E.; Tsvuura, Z.; Tshabalala, T. Adaptive management in Restoration Initiatives: Lessons learned from some of South Africa's projects. *S. Afr. J. Bot.* **2021**, *139*, 352–361. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sajb.2021.03.016.
83. Mills, A.; Blignaut, J.; Cowling, R.; Knipe, A.; Marais, C.; Marais, S.; Powell, M.; Sigwela, A.; Skowno, A. *Investing in Sustainability. Restoring Degraded Thicket, Creating Jobs, Capturing Carbon and Earning Green Credit*; Climate Action Partnership and Wilderness Foundation: Cape Town, South Africa, 2010.
84. Zheng, H.; Wang, G. Achieving ecological restoration by working with local people: A Chinese scholar seeks win-win paths. *Ecol. Soc.* **2014**, 19. https://doi.org/10.5751/es-06995-190335.
85. Ullah, A. Forest Landscape Restoration and Its Impact on Social Cohesion, Ecosystems, and Rural Livelihoods: Lessons Learned from Pakistan. *Reg. Environ. Chang.* **2024**, *24*, 26. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-024-02198-4.
86. Agrawal, A.; Gupta, K. Decentralization and Participation: The Governance of Common Pool Resources in Nepal's Terai. *World Dev.* **2005**, *33*, 1101–1114.

87. Sapkota, R.P.; Stahl, P.D.; Rijal, K. Restoration governance: An integrated approach towards sustainably restoring degraded ecosystems. *Environ. Dev.* **2018**, *27*, 83–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envdev.2018.07.001.
88. Brancalion, P.H.; de Siqueira, L.P.; Amazonas, N.T.; Rizek, M.B.; Mendes, A.F.; Santiami, E.L.; Rodrigues, R.R.; Calmon, M.; Benini, R.; Tymus, J.R.; et al. Ecosystem restoration job creation potential in Brazil. *People Nat.* **2022**, *4*, 1426–1434. https://doi.org/10.1002/pan3.10370.
89. Dockendorff, C.; Fuss, S.; Agra, R.; Guye, V.; Herrera, D.; Kraxner, F. Committed to restoring tropical forests: An overview of Brazil's and Indonesia's restoration targets and policies. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **2022**, *17*, 093002. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ac8ab2.
90. Gan, Y.; Xu, T.; Xu, N.; Xu, J.; Qiao, D. How Environmental Awareness and Knowledge Affect Urban Residents' Willingness to Participate in Rubber Plantation Ecological Restoration Programs: Evidence from Hainan, China. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 1852. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13041852.
91. Idrissou, L.; Aarts, N.; Paassen, A.; Leeuwis, C. The discursive construction of conflict in participatory forest management: The case of the Agoua Forest Restoration in Benin. *Conserv. Soc.* **2011**, *9*, 119–131. https://doi.org/10.4103/0972-4923.83722.
92. Santini, N.S.; Miquelajauregui, Y. The restoration of degraded lands by local communities and Indigenous Peoples. *Front. Conserv. Sci.* **2022**, *3*, 873659. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcosc.2022.873659.
93. Lindenmayer, D. Improving restoration programs through greater connection with ecological theory and better monitoring. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* **2020**, *8*, 50. https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2020.00050.
94. Nilsson, C.; Aradottir, A.L.; Hagen, D.; Halldórsson, G.; Høegh, K.; Mitchell, R.J.; Raulund-Rasmussen, K.; Svavarsdóttir, K.; Tolvanen, A.; Wilson, S.D. Evaluating the process of ecological restoration. *Ecol. Soc.* **2016**, *21*, 41.
95. Williams, B.K. Adaptive management of natural resources—Framework and issues. *J. Environ. Manag.* **2011**, *92*, 1346–1353.
96. Le, H.D.; Smith, C.; Herbohn, J.; Harrison, S.; More than just trees: Assessing reforestation success in tropical developing countries. *J. Rural Stud.* **2012**, *28*, 5–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2011.07.006.
97. Evans, K.; Guariguata, M.R.; Brancalion, P.H.; Participatory monitoring to connect local and global priorities for forest restoration. *Conserv. Biol.* **2018**, *32*, 25–34. https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13110.
98. Jinger, D.; Kaushal, R.; Kumar, R.; Paramesh, V.; Verma, A.; Shukla, M.; Chavan, S.B.; Kakade, V.; Dobhal, S.; Uthappa, A.R.; et al. Degraded land rehabilitation through agroforestry in India: Achievements, current understanding, and future prospectives. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* **2023**, *11*, 1088796. https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2023.1088796.
99. Keesstra, S.; Mol, G.; De Leeuw, J.; Okx, J.; Molenaar, C.; De Cleen, M.; Visser, S. Soil-related sustainable development goals: Four concepts to make land degradation neutrality and restoration work. *Land* **2018**, *7*, 133. https://doi.org/10.3390/land7040133.
100. Katsir, S.; Biswas, A.K.; Urs, K.; Lenka, N.K.; Jha, P.; Arora, K. Governing soils sustainably in India: Establishing policies and implementing strategies through local governance. *Soil Secur.* **2024**, *14*, 100132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soisec.2024.100132.
101. Mansuy, N.; Hwang, H.; Gupta, R.; Mooney, C.; Kishchuk, B.; Higgs, E. Forest landscape restoration legislation and policy: A Canadian perspective. *Land* **2022**, *11*, 1747. https://doi.org/10.3390/land11101747.
102. Buta, M.; Blaga, G.; Paulette, L.; Păcurar, I.; Roșca, S.; Borsai, O.; Grecu, F.; Sînziana, P.E.; Negrușier, C. Soil reclamation of abandoned mine lands by revegetation in northwestern part of Transylvania: A 40-year retrospective study. *Sustainability* **2019**, *11*, 3393. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11123393.
103. Dlamini, P.; Chaplot, V. The impact of land degradation on the quality of soils in a South African communal rangeland. In *Land Degradation and Desertification—A Global Crisis*; InTechOpen: Rijeka, Croatia, 2016. https://doi.org/10.5772/63128.
104. Rodriguez-Franco, C.; Page-Dumroese, D.S. Woody Biochar potential for abandoned mine land restoration in the U.S.: A Review. *Biochar* **2021**, *3*, 7–22. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42773-020-00074-y.
105. Peltz, C.D.; Harley, A. Biochar application for Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation. In *Agricultural and Environmental Applications of Biochar: Advances and Barriers*; Wiley: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 2015; pp. 325–339. https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaspecpub63.2014.0047.5.
106. Ahmad Bhat, S.; Kuriqi, A.; Dar, M.U.; Bhat, O.; Sammen, S.S.; Towfiqul Islam, A.R.; Elbeltagi, A.; Shah, O.; AI-Ansari, N.; Ali, R.; et al. Application of biochar for improving physical, chemical, and hydrological soil properties: A systematic review. *Sustainability* **2022**, *14*, 11104. https://doi.org/10.3390/su141711104.
107. Gadallah, N.A.H.; Adewole, N.A.; Ajayi, D.D. Potential of agroforestry as forest landscape restoration tool to solve forest cover loss cum food security in Sennar and Gedaref States, Sudan. *Int. J. Dev. Sustain.* **2019**, *8*, 199–210.

108. de Mendonça, G.C.; Costa, R.C.; Parras, R.; de Oliveira, L.C.; Abdo, M.T.; Pacheco, F.A.; Pissarra, T.C. Spatial indicator of priority areas for the implementation of agroforestry systems: An optimization strategy for Agricultural Landscapes Restoration. *Sci. Total Environ.* **2022**, *839*, 156185. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.156185.
109. Vieira, D.L.; Holl, K.D.; Peneireiro, F.M. Agro-successional restoration as a strategy to facilitate tropical forest recovery. *Restor. Ecol.* **2009**, *17*, 451–459. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1526-100x.2009.00570.x.
110. Huang, W.; Kanninen, M.; Xu, Q.; Huang, B. Agroforestry in China: Present State and Future Potential. *Ambio* **1997**, *26*, 394–398.
111. Li, X.; Zhang, L.; Zhang, Z. Soil Bioengineering, and the ecological restoration of riverbanks at the Airport Town, Shanghai, China. *Ecol. Eng.* **2006**, *26*, 304–314. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2005.10.011.
112. da Silva, G.O.; Southam, G.; Gagen, E.J. Accelerating soil aggregate formation: A review on microbial processes as the critical step in a post-mining rehabilitation context. *Soil Res.* **2022**, *61*, 209–223. https://doi.org/10.1071/sr22092.
113. Docherty, K.M.; Gutknecht, J.L. Soil Microbial Restoration Strategies for promoting climate-ready Prairie Ecosystems. *Ecol. Appl.* **2019**, *29*, e01858. https://doi.org/10.1002/eap.1858.
114. Mao, Z.; Harris, J.; Zhang, Z. Responses of natural microorganisms to land reclamation and applications of functional microorganisms in biorestoration of coal mining area. *Diversity* **2024**, *16*, 86. https://doi.org/10.3390/d16020086.
115. Cardoso, E.J.; Vasconcellos, R.L.; Bini, D.; Miyauchi, M.Y.; Santos, C.A.; Alves, P.R.; Paula, A.M.; Nakatani, A.S.; Pereira, J.d.; Nogueira, M.A. Soil Health: Looking for suitable indicators. *Sci. Agric.* **2013**, *70*, 274–289. https://doi.org/10.1590/s0103-90162013000400009.
116. Coban, O.; De Deyn, G.B.; van der Ploeg, M. Soil Microbiota as game-changers in restoration of degraded lands. *Science* **2022**, *375*, abe0725. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abe0725.
117. Maron, P.-A.; Sarr, A.; Kaisermann, A.; Lévêque, J.; Mathieu, O.; Guigue, J.; Karimi, B.; Bernard, L.; Dequiedt, S.; Terrat, S.; et al. High microbial diversity promotes soil ecosystem functioning. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **2018**, *84*, e02738-17. https://doi.org/10.1128/aem.02738-17.
118. Singh Rawat, V.; Kaur, J.; Bhagwat, S.; Arora Pandit, M.; Dogra Rawat, C. Deploying microbes as drivers and indicators in ecological restoration. *Restor. Ecol.* **2022**, *31*, e13688. https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.13688.
119. Contos, P.; Wood, J.; Murphy, N.; Gibb, H. Rewilding with Invertebrates and Microbes to Restore Ecosystems: Present Trends and Future Directions. *Ecol. Evol.* **2021**, *11*, 7187–7200. https://doi.org/10.22541/au.161769200.03519677/v1.
120. Moreira-Grez, B.; Muñoz-Rojas, M.; Kariman, K.; Storer, P.; O'Donnell, A.G.; Kumaresan, D.; Whiteley, A.S. Reconditioning degraded mine site soils with exogenous soil microbes: Plant fitness and soil microbiome outcomes. *Front. Microbiol.* **2019**, *10*, 1617. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2019.01617.
121. Sáez-Sandino, T.; Delgado-Baquerizo, M.; Egidi, E.; Singh, B.K. New Microbial Tools to boost restoration and soil organic matter. *Microb. Biotechnol.* **2023**, *16*, 2019–2025. https://doi.org/10.1111/1751-7915.14325.
122. Elliott, S.; Tucker, N.I.; Shannon, D.P.; Tiansawat, P. The Framework Species Method: Harnessing natural regeneration to restore tropical forest ecosystems. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **2022**, 378. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2021.0073.
123. Shryock, D.F.; DeFalco, L.A.; Esque, T.C. Seed menus: An integrated decision-support framework for Native Plant Restoration in the Mojave Desert. *Ecol. Evol.* **2022**, *12*, 20210073. https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.8805.
124. Larson, J.E.; Agneray, A.C.; Boyd, C.S.; Bradford, J.B.; Kildisheva, O.A.; Suding, K.N.; Copeland, S.M. A recruitment niche framework for improving seed-based restoration. *Restor. Ecol.* **2023**, *31*, e13959. https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.13959.
125. Krainovic, P.M.; de Resende, A.F.; Amazonas, N.T.; de Almeida, C.T.; de Almeida, D.R.; Silva, C.C.; de Andrade, H.S.; Rodrigues, R.R.; Brancalion, P.H. Potential native timber production in tropical forest restoration plantations. *Perspect. Ecol. Conserv.* **2023**, *21*, 294–301. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pecon.2023.10.002.
126. Rachmat, H.H.; Ginoga, K.L.; Lisnawati, Y.; Hidayat, A.; Imanuddin, R.; Fambayun, R.A.; Yulita, K.S.; Susilowati, A. Generating multifunctional landscape through reforestation with native trees in the tropical region: A case study of gunung dahu research forest, Bogor, Indonesia. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 11950. https://doi.org/10.3390/su132111950.
127. Tolentino, E.L. Restoration of Philippine Native Forest by Smallholder Tree Farmers. In *Smallholder Tree Growing for Rural Development and Environmental Services*; Advances in Agroforestry; Snelder, D.J., Lasco, R.D., Eds.; Springer: Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 2008; Volume 5. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-8261-0_15.

128. Yuwati, T.W.; Rachmanadi, D.; Qirom, M.A.; Santosa, P.B.; Kusin, K.; Tata, H.L. Peatland Restoration in Central Ka-limantan by Rewetting and Rehabilitation with Shorea balangeran. In *Tropical Peatland Eco-Management*; Osaki, M., Tsuji, N., Foead, N., Rieley, J., Eds.; Springer: Singapore, 2021; pp. 595–611, ISBN 978-981-33-4654-3.
129. Jensen, D.A.; Rao, M.; Zhang, J.; Grøn, M.; Tian, S.; Ma, K.; Svenning, J.-C. The potential for using rare, native species in reforestation—A case study of yews (Taxaceae) in China. *For. Ecol. Manag.* **2021**, *482*, 118816. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2020.118816.
130. Fernández, M.; Alaejos, J.; Andivia, E.; Madejón, P.; Díaz, M.J.; Tapias, R. Short rotation coppice of legu-minous tree leucaena spp. improves soil fertility while producing high biomass yields in Mediterranean environment. *Ind. Crops Prod.* **2020**, *157*, 112911. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indcrop.2020.112911.
131. Koutika, L.-S.; Richardson, D.M. *Acacia M*angium Willd: Benefits and threats associated with its increasing use around the world. *For. Ecosyst.* **2019**, *6*, 2. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40663-019-0159-1.
132. Ouyang, P.; Narayanan, M.; Shi, X.; Chen, X.; Li, Z.; Luo, Y.; Ma, Y. Integrating biochar and bacteria for sustainable remediation of metal-contaminated soils. *Biochar* **2023**, *5*, 63.
133. Heringer, G.; Bueno, M.L.; Meira-Neto, J.A.; Matos, F.A.; Neri, A.V. Can *Acacia mangium* and *Acacia auriculiformis* hinder restoration efforts in the Brazilian Atlantic Forest under current and future climate conditions? *Biol. Invasions* **2019**, *21*, 2949–2962. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-019-02024-7.
134. Kato-Noguchi, H.; Kurniadie, D. Allelopathy and Allelochemicals of Leucaenaleucocephala as an Invasive Plant Species. *Plants* **2022**, *11*, 1672. https://doi.org/10.3390/plants11131672.
135. Lobón, N.; González Félix, M.; Alías Gallego, J.C. Comparison of the allelopathic potential of non-native and native species of Mediterranean ecosystems. *Plants* **2023**, *12*, 972. https://doi.org/10.3390/plants12040972.
136. Zhalnina, K.; Louie, K.B.; Hao, Z.; Mansoori, N.; da Rocha, U.N.; Shi, S.; Cho, H.; Karaoz, U.; Loqué, D.; Bowen, B.P.; et al. Dynamic root exudate chemistry and microbial substrate preferences drive patterns in Rhizosphere Microbial Community Assembly. *Nat. Microbiol.* **2018**, *3*, 470–480. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-018-0129-3.
137. Gao, Z.; Du, M.; Cao, N.; Hou, M.; Wang, W.; Lyu, S. Application of hyperspectral imaging technology to digitally protect murals in the Qutan Temple. *Herit. Sci.* **2023**, *11*, 8. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40494-022-00847-7.
138. Picollo, M.; Cucci, C.; Casini, A.; Stefani, L. Hyper-spectral imaging technique in the Cultural Heritage Field: New possible scenarios. *Sensors* **2020**, *20*, 2843. https://doi.org/10.3390/s20102843.
139. Yel, S.G.; Tunc Gormus, E. Exploiting hyperspectral and multispectral images in the detection of tree species: A Review. *Front. Remote Sens.* **2023**, *4*, 1136289. https://doi.org/10.3389/frsen.2023.1136289.
140. Bodner, G.; Nakhforoosh, A.; Arnold, T.; Leitner, D. Hyperspectral Imaging: A novel approach for plant root phenotyping. *Plant Methods* **2018**, *14*, 84. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13007-018-0352-1.
141. Rane, J.; Basavaraj, P.S.; Jangid, K.K.; Hegde, V.; Mamrutha, H.M. Root Phenotyping for Improved Resource Use Efficiency in Crops. In *Translating Physiological Tools to Augment Crop Breeding*; Harohalli Masthigowda, M., Gopalareddy, K., Khobra, R., Singh, G., Pratap Singh, G., Eds.; Springer: Singapore, 2023. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-7498-4_10.
142. de Almeida, D.R.A.; Zambrano, A.M.A.; Ferreira, M.P.; Brancalion, P.H.S. Fusion of Lidar and Hyperspectral Data from Drones for Ecological Questions: The Gatoreye Atlantic Forest Restoration Case Study. In Proceedings of the 2021 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium IGARSS, Brussels, Belgium, 11–16 July 2021; pp. 714–715. https://doi.org/10.1109/IGARSS47720.2021.9554023.
143. Ahimbisibwe, V.; Zhunusova, E.; Kassa, H.; Günter, S. Technical efficiency drivers of farmer-led restoration strategies, and how substantial is the unrealised potential for farm output? *Agricultural Systems* **2024**, 213, 103799. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2023.103799
144. Alves de Almeida, D. R.; Broadbent, E.; Almeyda Zambrano, A. M.; Ferreira, M. P.; Santin Brancalion, P. H. Fusion of lidar and hyperspectral data from drones for ecological questions: The Gatoreye Atlantic Forest Restoration Case Study. 2021 IEEE International Geoscience and Remote Sensing Symposium IGARSS **2021**, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1109/igarss47720.2021.9554023
145. Araújo, A. S.; Borges, C. D.; Tsai, S. M.; Cesarz, S.; Eisenhauer, N. Soil bacterial diversity in degraded and restored lands of Northeast Brazil. *Antonie van Leeuwenhoek* **2014**, 106(5), 891–899. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10482-014-0258-5
146. Asmelash, F.; Bekele, T.; Birhane, E. The potential role of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi in the restoration of degraded lands. *Frontiers in Microbiology* **2016**, 7, 1095. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2016.01095
147. Ballesteros, M.; Cañadas, E. M.; Foronda, A.; Fernández-Ondoño, E.; Peñas, J.; Lorite, J. Vegetation recovery of gypsum quarries: Short-term sowing response to different soil treatments. *Applied Vegetation Science* **2011**, 15(2), 187–197. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1654-109x.2011.01166.x
148. Baradwal, H.; Ghosh, A.; Kumar, A.; Singh, P. D.; Sannagoudar, M. S.; Ahamad, S.; Jha, P.; Singh, A. K.; Bhattacharyya, R.; Manna, M. C.; Kumar, S.; Kumar, R. V. Ecological restoration of degraded lands with alternate

land use systems improves soil functionality in semiarid tropical India. *Land Degradation & Development* **2022**, 33(7), 1076–1087. https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.4225
149. Barliza, J. C.; Rodríguez, O. B.; León Peláez, J. D.; Chávez, L. F. Planted forests for open coal mine spoils rehabilitation in Colombian drylands: Contributions of fine litterfall through an age chronosequence. *Ecological Engineering* **2019,** 138, 180–187. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2019.07.018
150. Berihun, T.; Bekele, T.; Lulekal, E.; Asfaw, Z. Study of the soil seed bank composition in Arjo-diga humid Afromontane forest under different land use types and its implications for the restoration of degraded lands in western Ethiopia. *International Journal of Ecology* **2024**, 2024, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1155/2024/5119487
151. Bonet, A. Secondary succession of semi-arid Mediterranean old-fields in south-eastern Spain: Insights for conservation and restoration of degraded lands. *Journal of Arid Environments* **2004**, 56(2), 213–233. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-1963(03)00048-x
152. Budiharta, S.; Meijaard, E.; Wells, J. A.; Abram, N. K.; Wilson, K. A. Enhancing feasibility: Incorporating a socio-ecological systems framework into restoration planning. *Environmental Science & Policy* **2016**, 64, 83–92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2016.06.014
153. Cao, S.; Ma, H.; Yuan, W.; Wang, X. Interaction of ecological and social factors affects vegetation recovery in China. *Biological Conservation* **2014**, 180, 270–277. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2014.10.009
154. Celentano, D.; Zahawi, R. A.; Finegan, B.; Ostertag, R.; Cole, R. J.; Holl, K. D. Litterfall dynamics under different Tropical Forest Restoration Strategies in Costa Rica. *Biotropica* **2010**, 43(3), 279–287. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7429.2010.00688.x
155. Chambi-Legoas, R.; Ortega Rodriguez, D. R.; Figueiredo, F. de; Peña Valdeiglesias, J.; Zevallos Pollito, P. A.; Marcelo-Peña, J. L.; Rother, D. C. Natural regeneration after gold mining in the Peruvian amazon: Implications for restoration of tropical forests. *Frontiers in Forests and Global Change* **2021**, 4, 594627. https://doi.org/10.3389/ffgc.2021.594627
156. Chaves Lobón, N.; González Félix, M.; Alías Gallego, J. C. Comparison of the allelopathic potential of non-native and native species of Mediterranean ecosystems. *Plants* **2023**, 12(4), 972. https://doi.org/10.3390/plants12040972
157. Chen, J.; Xiao, H.; Li, Z.; Liu, C.; Wang, D.; Wang, L.; Tang, C. Threshold effects of vegetation coverage on soil erosion control in small watersheds of the red soil hilly region in China. *Ecological Engineering* **2019**, 132, 109–114. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2019.04.010
158. Conrado da Cruz, D.; Rey Benayas, J. M.; Costa Ferreira, G.; Santos Ribeiro, S. Tree communities in three-year-old post-mining sites under different forest restoration techniques in the Brazilian Amazon. *Forests* **2020**, 11(5), 527. https://doi.org/10.3390/f11050527
159. Coradini, K.; Krejčová, J.; Frouz, J. Potential of vegetation and woodland cover recovery during primary and secondary succession, a Global Quantitative Review. *Land Degradation & Development* **2021**, 33(3), 512–526. https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.4166
160. Costantini, E. A.; Branquinho, C.; Nunes, A.; Schwilch, G.; Stavi, I.; Valdecantos, A.; Zucca, C. Soil indicators to assess the effectiveness of restoration strategies in dryland ecosystems. *Solid Earth* **2016**, 7(2), 397–414. https://doi.org/10.5194/se-7-397-2016
161. Deng, J.; Bai, X.; Zhou, Y.; Zhu, W.; Yin, Y. Variations of soil microbial communities accompanied by different vegetation restoration in an open-cut iron mining area. *Science of The Total Environment* **2020**, 704, 135243. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.135243
162. Etter, A.; Andrade, A.; Nelson, C. R.; Cortés, J.; Saavedra, K. Assessing restoration priorities for high-risk ecosystems: An application of the IUCN Red List of ecosystems. *Land Use Policy* **2020,** 99, 104874. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.104874
163. Fernández Montoni, M. V.; Fernández Honaine, M.; del Río, J. L. An assessment of spontaneous vegetation recovery in aggregate quarries in coastal sand dunes in Buenos Aires Province, Argentina. *Environmental Management* **2014**, 54(2), 180–193. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-014-0275-1
164. Figueiredo, M. A.; Messias, M. C.; Leite, M. G.; Kozovits, A. R. Direct seeding in the restoration of post-mined Campo Rupestre: Germination and establishment of 14 native species. *Flora* **2021**, 276–277, 151772. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.flora.2021.151772
165. Fleisher, K. R.; Hufford, K. M. Assessing habitat heterogeneity and vegetation outcomes of geomorphic and traditional linear-slope methods in post-mine reclamation. *Journal of Environmental Management* **2020**, 255, 109854. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.109854
166. Flores-Alvarez, J. L.; Ladd, B.; Velez-Azañero, A.; de Mola, U. L.; Bonser, S. Using knowledge of plant persistence traits to optimize strategies for post-mine ecological restoration on the Peruvian Altiplano. *Mountain Research and Development* **2018**, 38(2), 135. https://doi.org/10.1659/mrd-journal-d-17-00088.1

167. Ghosh, A.; Kumar, R. V.; Manna, M. C.; Singh, A. K.; Parihar, C. M.; Kumar, S.; Roy, A. K.; Koli, P. Eco-restoration of degraded lands through trees and grasses improves soil carbon sequestration and biological activity in tropical climates. *Ecological Engineering* **2021**, 162, 106176. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2021.106176
168. Giannini, T. C.; Giulietti, A. M.; Harley, R. M.; Viana, P. L.; Jaffe, R.; Alves, R.; Pinto, C. E.; Mota, N. F.; Caldeira, C. F.; Imperatriz-Fonseca, V. L.; Furtini, A. E.; Siqueira, J. O. Selecting plant species for practical restoration of degraded lands using a multiple-trait approach. *Austral Ecology* **2016**, 42(5), 510–521. https://doi.org/10.1111/aec.12470
169. Gwenzi, W. Rethinking restoration indicators and end-points for post-mining landscapes in light of novel ecosystems. *Geoderma* **2021**, 387, 114944. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2021.114944
170. Holl, K. D. Long-term vegetation recovery on reclaimed coal surface mines in the Eastern USA. *Journal of Applied Ecology* **2002**, 39(6), 960–970. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2664.2002.00767.x
171. Hong, F.; He, G.; Wang, G.; Zhang, Z.; Peng, Y. Monitoring of land cover and vegetation changes in Juhugeng coal mining area based on Multi-Source Remote Sensing Data. Remote Sensing 2023, 15(13), 3439. https://doi.org/10.3390/rs15133439
172. Hu, P.; Xiao, J.; Zhang, W.; Xiao, L.; Yang, R.; Xiao, D.; Zhao, J.; Wang, K. Response of soil microbial communities to natural and managed vegetation restoration in a subtropical karst region. *CATENA* **2020**, 195, 104849. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2020.104849
173. Hu, P.; Zhang, W.; Kuzyakov, Y.; Xiao, L.; Xiao, D.; Xu, L.; Chen, H.; Zhao, J.; Wang, K. Linking bacterial life strategies with soil organic matter accrual by karst vegetation restoration. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* **2023**, 177, 108925. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2022.108925
174. Hu, P.; Zhang, W.; Xiao, L.; Yang, R.; Xiao, D.; Zhao, J.; Wang, W.; Chen, H.; Wang, K. Moss-dominated biological soil crusts modulate soil nitrogen following vegetation restoration in a subtropical karst region. *Geoderma* **2019**, 352, 70–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2019.05.047
175. Hu, P.; Zhao, Y.; Xiao, D.; Xu, Z.; Zhang, W.; Xiao, J.; Wang, K. Dynamics of soil nitrogen availability following vegetation restoration along a climatic gradient of a subtropical karst region in China. *Journal of Soils and Sediments* **2021**, 21(6), 2167–2178. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11368-021-02915-0
176. Hui, J.; Bai, Z.; Ye, B.; Wang, Z. Remote Sensing Monitoring and evaluation of vegetation restoration in grassland mining areas—a case study of the Shengli Mining Area in Xilinhot City, China. *Land* **2021**, 10(7), 743. https://doi.org/10.3390/land10070743
177. Jacob, A. L.; Lechowicz, M. J.; Chapman, C. A. Non-native fruit trees facilitate colonization of native forest on abandoned farmland. *Restoration Ecology* **2016**, 25(2), 211–219. https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.12414
178. Jian-long, C.; Zhao-hua, L. Natural vegetation recovery on waste dump in opencast coalmine area. *Journal of Forestry Research* **2005**, 16(1), 55–57. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02856856
179. Kasaye, M.; Abebe, G.; Abiyu, A.; Wondie, M.; Belay, B. Selection of Different Trees/Shrubs Species for Rehabilitation of Degraded Lands in Wag-Lasta Area, Northeastern Ethiopia. *Forest Research* **2020**, 9(2), 231. https://doi.org/10.35248/2168-9776.20.9.231
180. Khan, S.; Galstyan, H.; Abbas, M.; Wenjing, X. Advanced Biotechnology Strategies for detoxification of persistent organic pollutants and toxic elements in soil. *Chemosphere* **2023**, 345, 140519. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2023.140519
181. König, L. A.; Medina-Vega, J. A.; Longo, R. M.; Zuidema, P. A.; Jakovac, C. C. Restoration success in former Amazonian Mines is driven by Soil Amendment and forest proximity. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **2022**, 378(1867). https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2021.0086
182. Koryś, K. A.; Latawiec, A. E.; Mendes, M. S.; Sansevero, J. B.; Rodrigues, A. F.; Iribarrem, A. S.; Dib, V.; Jakovac, C. C.; Allek, A.; Pena, I. A.; Lino, E.; Strassburg, B. B. Early response of soil properties under different restoration strategies in tropical hotspot. *Land* **2021**, 10(8), 768. https://doi.org/10.3390/land10080768
183. Kuzevic, S.; Bobikova, D.; Kuzevicova, Z. Land cover and vegetation coverage changes in the mining area—a case study from Slovakia. *Sustainability* **2022**, 14(3), 1180. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14031180
184. Lei, H.; Peng, Z.; Yigang, H.; Yang, Z. Vegetation and soil restoration in refuse dumps from open pit coal mines. Ecological *Engineering* **2016**, 94, 638–646. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2016.06.108
185. Lemenih, M.; Teketay, D. Restoration of native forest flora in the degraded highlands of Ethiopia: Constraints and opportunities. *SINET: Ethiopian Journal of Science* **2005**, 27(1). https://doi.org/10.4314/sinet.v27i1.18225
186. León, J. D.; Osorio, N. W. Role of litter turnover in soil quality in tropical degraded lands of Colombia. The Scientific World Journal 2014, 2014, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/693981
187. Li, D.; Wen, L.; Jiang, S.; Song, T.; Wang, K. Responses of soil nutrients and microbial communities to three restoration strategies in a karst area, Southwest China. *Journal of Environmental Management* **2018**, 207, 456–464. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2017.11.067

188. Li, D.; Wen, L.; Xiao, K.; Song, T.; Wang, K. Responses of soil gross nitrogen transformations to three vegetation restoration strategies in a subtropical karst region. *Land Degradation & Development* **2021**, 32(8), 2520–2527. https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.3907
189. Liu, Yan; Zuo, R. Monitoring mining activity and vegetation recovery in rare earth element mining areas. *Mathematical Geosciences* **2023**, 56(4), 811–839. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11004-023-10113-6
190. Liu, Yunxuan; Xie, M.; Liu, J.; Wang, H.; Chen, B. Vegetation disturbance and recovery dynamics of different surface mining sites via the LANDTRENDR algorithm: Case study in Inner Mongolia, China. *Land* **2022**, 11(6), 856. https://doi.org/10.3390/land11060856
191. Luna, L.; Pastorelli, R.; Bastida, F.; Hernández, T.; García, C.; Miralles, I.; Solé-Benet, A. The combination of quarry restoration strategies in semiarid climate induces different responses in biochemical and microbiological soil properties. *Applied Soil Ecology* **2016**, 107, 33–47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2016.05.006
192. Luo, J.; Ma, L.; Li, G.; Deng, D.; Chen, D.; Zhang, L.; Zhu, X.; Zhou, J. The effects of land degradation on plant community assembly: Implications for the restoration of the Tibetan Plateau. *Land Degradation & Development* **2020**, 31(18), 2819–2829. https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.3613
193. Maiti, P.; Kuniyal, J. C.; Sekar, K. C.; Satish, K. V.; Singh, D.; Bisht, N.; Kumar, A.; Arya, S. C.; Nand, M.; Sundriyal, R. C. Landscape level ecological assessment and eco-restoration strategies for alpine and sub-alpine regions of the Central Himalaya. *Ecological Engineering* **2022**, 180, 106674. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2022.106674
194. Martins, W. B.; Rodrigues, J. I.; de Oliveira, V. P.; Ribeiro, S. S.; Barros, W. dos; Schwartz, G. Mining in the Amazon: Importance, impacts, and challenges to restore degraded ecosystems. Are we on the right way? *Ecological Engineering* **2022**, 174, 106468. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2021.106468
195. Massante, J. C.; de Castro, A. F.; de Medeiros Sarmento, P. S.; da Silva, G. M.; Caldeira, C. F.; Ramos, S.; Gastauer, M. Species selection for optimizing mine land rehabilitation: Integrating functional traits with the minimum set prioritization technique. *Ecological Engineering* **2023**, 194, 107039. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2023.107039
196. McIver, J.; Starr, L. Restoration of degraded lands in the interior Columbia River Basin: Passive vs. active approaches. *Forest Ecology and Management* **2001**, 153(1–3), 15–28. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-1127(01)00451-0
197. McKenna, P.; Phinn, S.; Erskine, P. D. Fire severity and vegetation recovery on mine site rehabilitation using worldview-3 imagery. *Fire* **2018**, 1(2), 22. https://doi.org/10.3390/fire1020022
198. Mi, J.; Liu, R.; Zhang, S.; Hou, H.; Yang, Y.; Chen, F.; Zhang, L. Vegetation patterns on a landslide after five years of natural restoration in the Loess Plateau mining area in China. *Ecological Engineering* **2019**, 136, 46–54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2019.05.022
199. Misebo, A. M.; Pietrzykowski, M.; Woś, B. Soil Carbon Sequestration in novel ecosystems at post-mine sites—a new insight into the determination of key factors in the restoration of terrestrial ecosystems. *Forests* **2022**, 13(1), 63. https://doi.org/10.3390/f13010063
200. Morrison, E. B.; Lindell, C. A. Active or passive forest restoration? Assessing restoration alternatives with avian foraging behavior. *Restoration Ecology* **2010**, 19(2), 170–177. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1526-100x.2010.00725.x
201. Motosugi, N.; Nakamura, F.; Nakajima, S.; Takahata, C.; Kawamura, K.; Morimoto, J. Factors determining vegetation recovery after abandonment of coal-mining villages. *Landscape and Ecological Engineering* **2021**, 17(2), 95–106. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11355-020-00438-3
202. Mponela, P.; Aynekulu, E.; Ebrahim, M.; Abate, T.; Abera, W.; Zaremba, H.; Elias, M.; Tamene, L. Gender gap in perspectives of the impacts of degradation and restoration on ecosystem services in Ethiopia. *Land Degradation & Development* **2023**, 34(15), 4503–4516. https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.4764
203. Mudau, H. S.; Msiza, N. H.; Sipango, N.; Ravhuhali, K. E.; Mokoboki, H. K.; Moyo, B. Veld Restoration Strategies in South African semi-arid rangelands. Are there any successes?—A review. *Frontiers in Environmental Science* **2022**, 10, 960345. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2022.960345
204. Noonan, M.; Leroux, S. J.; Hermanutz, L. Evaluating forest restoration strategies after herbivore overbrowsing. *Forest Ecology and Management* **2021**, 482, 118827. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2020.118827
205. Pandit, R.; Parrotta, J. A.; Chaudhary, A. K.; Karlen, D. L.; Vieira, D. L.; Anker, Y.; Chen, R.; Morris, J.; Harris, J.; Ntshotsho, P. A framework to evaluate land degradation and restoration responses for improved planning and decision-making. *Ecosystems and People* **2019**, 16(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/26395916.2019.1697756
206. Pang, D.; Cui, M.; Liu, Y.; Wang, G.; Cao, J.; Wang, X.; Dan, X.; Zhou, J. Responses of soil labile organic carbon fractions and stocks to different vegetation restoration strategies in degraded karst ecosystems of Southwest China. *Ecological Engineering* **2019**, 138, 391–402. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2019.08.008
207. Parakhina, E.; Naumova, K. Vegetation recovery in open cast mines of Tver Region. *E3S Web of Conferences* **2021**, 265, 01023. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202126501023
208. Partridge, T. R. Vegetation recovery following sand mining on coastal dunes at Kaitorete Spit, Canterbury, New Zealand. *Biological Conservation* **1992**, 61(1), 59–71. https://doi.org/10.1016/0006-3207(92)91208-a

209. Price, O.; Milne, D.; Tynan, C. Poor recovery of woody vegetation on sand and gravel mines in the Darwin region of the Northern Territory. *Ecological Management & Restoration* **2005**, 6(2), 118–123. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1442-8903.2005.00228.x
210. Raghunathan, K.; Marathe, D.; Singh, A.; Thawale, P. Organic waste amendments for restoration of physicochemical and biological productivity of mine spoil dump for Sustainable Development. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* **2021**, 193(9). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-021-09379-2
211. Rai, P. K. Environmental degradation by invasive alien plants in the anthropocene: Challenges and prospects for sustainable restoration. *Anthropocene Science* **2021**, 1(1), 5–28. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44177-021-00004-y
212. Rojas Briceño, N. B.; Cotrina Sánchez, D. A.; Barboza Castillo, E.; Barrena Gurbillón, M. Á.; Sarmiento, F. O.; Sotomayor, D. A.; Oliva, M.; Salas López, R. Current and future distribution of five timber forest species in Amazonas, Northeast Peru: Contributions towards a restoration strategy. *Diversity* **2020**, 12(8), 305. https://doi.org/10.3390/d12080305
213. Scheper, A. C.; Verweij, P. A.; van Kuijk, M. Post-fire forest restoration in the humid tropics: A synthesis of available strategies and knowledge gaps for effective restoration. *Science of The Total Environment* **2021**, 771, 144647. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.144647
214. Shimamoto, C. Y.; Padial, A. A.; da Rosa, C. M.; Marques, M. C. Restoration of ecosystem services in tropical forests: A global meta-analysis. *PLOS ONE* **2018**, 13(12). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0208523
215. Silva, D. F.; Araujo, A. S. F.; Lima, A. Y. V.; Mota, J. C. A.; Nascimento, Í. V.; Queiroz, A. S.; Medeiros, E. V.; Costa, D. P.; Melo, V. M. M.; Cardoso, E. J. B. N.; Verma, J. P.; Smith, G. R.; Mendes, L. W.; Pereira, A. P. A. Enzymatic stoichiometry in degraded soils after two decades of restoration in a Brazilian semiarid region. *CATENA* **2024**, 236, 107768. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2023.107768
216. Silva, J. L.; Araujo, R. A.; Esteves, V. P.; Loebmann, D. G.; Vicente, L. E.; Paschoal, J. P.; Morgado, C. do. Analysis of vegetation recovery in areas impacted by bauxite mining in the Amazon forest. *Clean Technologies and Environmental Policy* **2021**, 23(5), 1617–1640. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10098-021-02052-9
217. Singh, K.; Byun, C.; Bux, F. Ecological restoration of degraded ecosystems in India: Science and practices. *Ecological Engineering* **2022**, 182, 106708. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2022.106708
218. Singh, S.; Singh, M. K.; Kumar, C. M.; Soni, P.; Ghoshal, N. Impact of tree plantations on the dynamics of soil aggregates in urban degraded lands in the dry tropics. *Land Degradation & Development* **2021**, 32(17), 5108–5117. https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.4097
219. Solis-Gabriel, L.; Mendoza-Arroyo, W.; Boege, K.; del-Val, E. Restoring Lepidopteran diversity in a tropical dry forest: Relative importance of restoration treatment, tree identity and predator pressure. *PeerJ* **2017**, 5, e3344. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.3344
220. Su, W.; Sun, Z.-P.; Li, D.-L.; Ramsankaran, R.; Zhu, X.; Guo, X.-Y. Vegetation recovery monitoring over the waste dump in Haizhou opencast coalmine area, China, during 1975–2000 using NDVI and VF index. *Journal of the Indian Society of Remote Sensing* **2009**, 37(4), 631–645. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12524-009-0059-x
221. Thakur, T. K.; Dutta, J.; Upadhyay, P.; Patel, D. K.; Thakur, A.; Kumar, M.; Kumar, A. Assessment of land degradation and restoration in coal mines of Central India: A time series analysis. *Ecological Engineering* **2022**, 175, 106493. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2021.106493
222. Thomas, C. J.; Shriver, R. K.; Nippgen, F.; Hepler, M.; Ross, M. R. Mines to forests? Analyzing long-term recovery trends for surface coal mines in Central Appalachia. *Restoration Ecology* **2022**, 31(5). https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.13827
223. Timsina, S.; Hardy, N. G.; Woodbury, D. J.; Ashton, M. S.; Cook-Patton, S. C.; Pasternack, R.; Martin, M. P. Tropical Surface Gold Mining: A review of ecological impacts and restoration strategies. *Land Degradation & Development* **2022**, 33(18), 3661–3674. https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.4430
224. Tripathi, N.; Singh, R. S. Ecological restoration of mined-out areas of dry tropical environment, India. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* **2007**, 146(1–3), 325–337. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-007-0083-7
225. Turrión, D.; Morcillo, L.; Alloza, J. A.; Vilagrosa, A. Innovative techniques for landscape recovery after clay mining under Mediterranean conditions. *Sustainability* **2021**, 13(6), 3439. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13063439
226. Valliere, J. M.; Ruscalleda Alvarez, J.; Cross, A. T.; Lewandrowski, W.; Riviera, F.; Stevens, J. C.; Tomlinson, S.; Tudor, E. P.; Wong, W. S.; Yong, J. W.; Veneklaas, E. J. Restoration ecophysiology: An ecophysiological approach to improve restoration strategies and outcomes in severely disturbed landscapes. *Restoration Ecology* **2021**, 30(S1). https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.13571
227. Vaverková, M. D.; Radziemska, M.; Bartoň, S.; Cerdà, A.; Koda, E. The use of vegetation as a natural strategy for landfill restoration. *Land Degradation & Development* **2018**, 29(10), 3674–3680. https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.3119