High potential contribution of intercropping to soybean and maize self-sufficiency in Europe

Authors & affiliations

Mathilde CHEN [a,b,c,*], Nicolas GUILPART [d], David MAKOWSKI [a,*]

[a] Université Paris-Saclay, INRAE, AgroParisTech, UMR MIA PS, 91120 Palaiseau, France

[b] CIRAD, UMR PHIM, F-34398 Montpellier, France.

[c] PHIM, Univ Montpellier, CIRAD, INRAE, Institut Agro, IRD, 34398 Montpellier, France

[d] Université Paris-Saclay, AgroParisTech, INRAE, UMR Agronomie, 91120 Palaiseau, France

Abstract

The European Union is currently not self-sufficient in soybean and maize,[1] thus relying on imports.[2] According to results of fields experiments,[3] the simultaneous cultivation of soybeans and cereals – intercropping – could improve food self-sufficiency without increasing cultivated land, but this strategy has yet to be evaluated at the scale of the European Union. Here, we examine the potential for maize-soybean intercropping to improve the European Union's self-sufficiency in soybean and maize without cropland expansion and by minimizing crop substitution. Our results suggest that achieving 50% (75%) soybean self-sufficiency in the European Union would require 13.1 (20.1) Mha under maize-soybean intercropping. When comparing the areas of cultivated land obtained either by growing the two species separately or together, we demonstrate that intercropping saves 27-30% of land compared with sole crops as soon as more soybean is produced in 1 ha of intercropping than in 0.5 ha of sole soybean. Ensuring European Union’s self-sufficiency in a sustainable way is a challenge requiring multiple solutions. Our results underline that intercropping is an effective strategy for improving the European Union's soybean self-sufficiency, while satisfying maize needs and saving cultivated lands.

Keywords: Intercropping, soybean, maize, food security, self-sufficiency

Introduction

With the onset of multiple geopolitical crises, as well as volatility in food supply and prices,[4] improving self-sufficiency became a key priority of agricultural policies in the European Union (EU).[5,6] Every year, the EU uses large amounts of maize and soybean, especially for livestock feed [7,8]. Although maize self-sufficiency is relatively high (81%), soybean self-sufficiency did not exceed 16% in 2021-2022.[1] Moreover, EU's imports of soybean are mainly sourced from a small number of countries. In 2023-2024, 98% of soybean imports came from Brazil (45.4%), the United-States (40.7%), Ukraine (7.4%), and Canada (4.0%).[2] Increasing domestic soybean production is thus crucial to reduce EU's dependency on massive imports and their negative environmental impacts in both exporting and importing countries.[9,10]

Previous studies suggest that satisfying 50% of EU's consumption would require to grow 11.0-14.5 Mha of soybean,[11] representing a substantial increase compared to the 1 Mha currently grown on average over 2018-2022 in the EU.[12] Expanding croplands by converting natural ecosystems is unlikely, due to the scarcity of suitable land and the significant negative environmental impacts it would cause. Alternatively, soybean could substitute other crops, especially other spring crops with similar environmental niches such as maize.[11,13] However, substituting maize for soybean would lead to a reduction of the total maize production in the EU. Additionally, this strategy is expected to increase water deficit and irrigation needs because soybean has a relatively shallow rooting system compared to maize.[14] It is thus crucial to identify sustainable strategies that foster EU's soybean self-sufficiency without compromising maize production.

So far, various scenarios of soybean area expansion in Europe have been explored in several studies, but they either overlooked the impact of soybean expansion on the production of other crops,[8,11,15,16] or neglected intercropping[13,17] – a practice still underdeveloped in Europe which consists in growing simultaneously multiple crops in the same field. Intercropping enhances land and nutrient use efficiency, making it a promising strategy for sustainable agricultural intensification.[18-20] In China, intercropping maize with soybean was found to double soybean production.[21] An analysis of the potential of intercropping to sustainably boost the EU's soybean self-sufficiency is still lacking.

In numerous field studies, the efficiency of intercropping over sole cropping is examined using the land equivalent ratio (LER), which corresponds to the sum of the ratios of intercrop to sole crop yields over the different species of the crop mixture. The ratio obtained for a given species, called the partial LER (pLER), represents the sole crop area that would be needed to obtain the same production as the intercrop.[22] A global meta-analysis of 88 field studies estimated that 0.56 ha of soybean and 0.79 ha maize grown separately (i.e., a total of 1.35 ha) were required to produce as

much as 1 ha of maize-soybean intercropping,[3] suggesting high potential of intercropping for land-saving compared to sole cropping. However, these field-scale estimates ignore the variability in maize[23] and soybean[11,13,15] yields across areas of contrasted productivity (e.g., due to climate conditions). Compared to intercropping, single cropping systems offer greater flexibility in terms of spatial distribution, as they allow production to be optimized by assigning each crop to its most productive area. If high-yielding areas in Europe are partly distinct for two crops, a large-scale implementation of intercropping would probably involve growing at least one crop in low-yielding areas, while single cropping would allow farmers to allocate each crop to its highest-yielding region. It is therefore uncertain whether the large-scale adoption of intercropping would result in higher total production and land-use efficiency compared with sole cropping.

In this study, we examine the potential of maize-soybean intercropping to improve soybean self-sufficiency in the EU while maintaining maize production. First, we estimate the area requirements under intercropping and sole cropping to meet at least 50% soybean self-sufficiency in the EU. Assuming that this level of soybean self-sufficiency is achieved, we then compare the efficiency of both strategies in maximizing both soybean and maize coproduction at the scale of the EU and quantified the land savings allowed by the most efficient strategy. The sensitivity of our results to variations in intercropping's productive performances, return frequency, and area of cultivation is also explored. Our findings suggest that maize-soybean intercropping could substantially contribute to EU's soybean self-sufficiency without decreasing maize production, while improving land use efficiency compared to sole cropping.

Results

Yield projections in the EU

Using historical (1981-2016) data of crop yield, water management, and climate in major producing areas of soybean and maize (Methods and Supplementary Figure 1), we train machine learning algorithms to predict rainfed yields in the EU as a function of local climate conditions (2000-2023). The developed models show good predictive performances, as illustrated by their mean R^2 values of 0.93 for soybean and 0.91 for maize obtained from two cross-validation procedures assessing temporal and spatial extrapolation (Supplementary Figure 2) and by the symmetry of distribution of their residuals (Supplementary Figure 3). For both models, yield predictions are strongly impacted by total precipitation and water management, followed by temperatures (Supplementary Figure 4). Higher predicted yields are observed for higher precipitations and temperatures across the growing season, while lower yields are expected in dryer conditions (Supplementary Figures 5-9). These results are consistent with current knowledge on crop physiology of maize and soybean.[24,25]

Soybean yield projections for 2000-2023 reveal large areas with good suitability for rainfed soybean in the EU (Figure 1a). Considering a minimum yield of 1.0 t.ha^{-1} (observed in major soybean-producing regions of our training dataset with climate conditions similar to those in the EU), our projections suggest that 103 Mha could be considered as suitable for soybean production in the EU. The median projected soybean yield of 2.1 t.ha^{-1} (75th percentile: 2.6 t.ha^{-1}) is attained across 82 Mha (resp. 36 Mha), largely exceeding the current European production area of 1 Mha (Supplementary Table 1). Compared to previous studies,[11,13,15] we obtain a larger share of soybean-suitable area in northeastern Europe, especially in Germany and Poland, but lower suitability in Spain. For maize, projected rainfed yields are equal or higher than the median historical yield of 6.2 t.ha^{-1} (75th percentile: 6.9 t.ha^{-1}) on 62 Mha (resp. 27 Mha) (Figure 1b). Our projections are consistent with historical maize yields in Europe,[26] excepted for Spain where our projections are slightly lower, maybe because of uncertainties about irrigation. High-yielding areas for both crops encompass a band in central EU stretching from southwestern France to the Balkan region, excluding the Alps (Figure 1c). On the contrary, areas with contrasting productivity between maize and soybean are found in Ireland, northern and southern EU.



Figure 1. Soybean (a) and maize (b) rainfed yield projections (2000-2023 averages), and ratio maize/soybean (c) in the European Union. Projections were obtained from random forest models based on climate inputs (derived from the ERA5-land dataset) covering the crop growing seasons (April-November for soybean and April-December for maize) and irrigated fraction (estimated by SPAM2010, and set to zero for the yield projections). Climate inputs included monthly averages of minimum and maximum temperatures, total precipitation, solar radiation, reference evapotranspiration, and vapor pressure deficit. For each climate variable, the first two scores derived from a principal component analysis were used as climate predictors in the model. For panels (a) and (b), areas with average crop yield ~ 0 $t.ha^{-1}$ are displayed in grey.

How much land could be saved with intercropping?

Combining the yield projections with the productive performances of intercropping estimated from a global meta-analysis,[3] we examine the potential of maize-soybean intercropping to improve soybean self-sufficiency in the EU while maintaining maize production (Figure 2).



Figure 2. Procedure applied to estimate the area requirements under intercropping and sole cropping to meet a target soybean production ( ) in the European Union, to compare the efficiency of both strategies in maximizing both soybean and maize coproduction, and to quantify the land saving allowed by the most efficient strategy at the scale of the European Union.

We estimate the area requirements under intercropping and sole cropping to meet 50% and 75% soybean self-sufficiency in the EU. To represent the current average productive performance of maize-soybean intercropping systems, we assume that 1 ha of intercropping produces as much as 0.56 ha of soybean and 0.79 ha of maize grown separately,[3] corresponding to pLER values of 0.56 and 0.79, respectively. In these conditions, growing maize-soybean intercropping in the highest-yielding soybean areas, i.e. southeastern part of France, North of Italy, Hungary, and Romania (Figure 3a), on 13.1 Mha (Figure 3b) would simultaneously produce 18.2 Mt of soybean and 63.7 Mt of maize (Figure 3c). Compared to actual average productions in the EU over 2018-2022, 6.7 times more soybean would be produced with intercropping, while maintaining maize production at nearly the same level (Supplementary Table 1). In other words, such intercropping system could supply 50% of the soybean and 75% of maize needs in the EU (36.3 Mt and 85.1 Mt, respectively, based on the 2018-2022 yearly demand averages[12]), thereby more than tripling the current self-sufficiency rate of 16% for soybean while leading to a small decrease of the current self-sufficiency rate of 81% for maize.

With sole cropping systems, the same quantity of soybean could be produced by cultivating only 7.1 Mha of sole soybean (Figure 3a-b). However, growing sole maize on the remaining 6.0 Mha (i.e., 13.1-7.1 Mha) would yield 39.0 Mt of maize only, i.e., 39% less than under intercropping for the same total area of 13.1 Mha (Figure 3c). To match the total co-production of 18.2 Mt of soybean and 63.7 Mt of maize achieved on 13.1 Mha of maize-soybean intercropping, an additional 3.4 Mha of sole maize would be required, increasing the total land required by sole cropping to 16.5 Mha. These results indicate that intercropping can achieve similar co-production of both crops using 30% less land compared to sole cropping, while covering 50% EU soybean self-sufficiency. Similar results are observed when considering the soybean self-sufficiency levels of 25% and 75%, for which intercropping allowed for 27% and 29% land saving compared to sole cropping, respectively (Supplementary Table 2).



Figure 3. Comparison of maize-soybean intercropping (Int) and sole cropping (SC) for 50% soybean self-sufficiency in the European Union (EU). Maize-soybean intercropping was sequentially allocated in highest yielding sites, ranked by soybean productivity based on mean average production over 2000-2023 period in rainfed conditions, until 50% soybean self-sufficiency (i.e., 18.1 Mt) is reached. Sole soybean was sequentially allocated in the highest yielding sites until reaching 50% soybean self-sufficiency, then sole maize was allocated to the remaining sites so that the total covered area is equal in both strategies. Panel (a) displays the geographical allocation of crops with the Int. (left map) and with the SC (three maps on the right) strategies. Panels (b) and (c) show the corresponding area requirements and maize-soybean co-production, respectively. All simulations are based on (i) yield projections from a random-forest model based on the two first principal components of climate variables and irrigation fraction (set to zero here), (ii) crop return frequency of one year in four, and (iii) partial land equivalent ratios equal to 0.56 and 0.79 for soybean and maize, respectively.[3] The maximum total allocated area was set at 25% of croplands in EU, indicated as dotted line in the panel (b). Self-sufficiency levels of 50% corresponds to soybean, indicated as horizontal dotted line in the panel (c).

Potential contribution of a widespread deployment of intercropping to EU's self-sufficiency

Finally, we quantify the land savings allowed by intercropping at the scale of the EU. Our findings suggest that growing maize-soybean intercropping in soybean-suitable area every four years could substantially contribute to both soybean and maize self-sufficiency in the EU, while improving land use efficiency.

Considering that the total intercropping area could be as high as 25 Mha, corresponding to 25% of the 100 Mha total cropland in the EU in 2018,[27] our estimations indicate that maximum self-sufficiency levels of 91% for soybean and 145% for maize could be achieved with a conventional intercropping system (i.e., one-in-four years cultivation, with a soybean pLER of 0.56 and a maize pLER of 0.79) (Supplementary Table 2). In these conditions, 33.1 Mt of soybean and 123.6 Mt of maize would be produced, representing a total coproduction of 156.7 Mt. Considering the same cropland area of 25 Mha, we estimate that allocating 14.8 Mha to pure soybean cultivation could achieve 100% soybean self-sufficiency in the EU. However, growing maize as sole crop on the remaining 10.2 Mha would result in 56% lower maize production compared to intercropping. Maize-soybean intercropping would thus benefit to EU's self-sufficiency not only in soybean, but also in maize.

The sensitivity of these results to variations in intercropping's productive performances, return frequency, and area of cultivation is also explored. Providing that 25 Mha is allocated to intercropping, we estimate that 29-100% soybean and 53-165% maize self-sufficiency are potentially achievable through intercropping, depending on return frequency and pLER values (Figure 4). In particular, more than 50% and 84% self-sufficiency for each crop are achievable when pLER values remain equal to 0.56 for soybean and 0.79 for maize, respectively, regardless of intercropping's frequency in crop sequences. When maintaining maize pLER at 0.79 while reducing soybean pLER to 0.5, 0.4, or 0.3, a minimum frequency of one year in six, five, or three is required to meet 50% soybean self-sufficiency, respectively (Figure 4a). With a one-in-four years frequency, 48-100% soybean self-sufficiency could be reached when soybean pLER varies from 0.3 to 0.7. It is worth noting that potential self-sufficiency rates achievable with intercropping always exceeds the current level in the EU for soybean, even in the least productive intercropping scenario (i.e., one-in-seven years frequency and 0.3 soybean pLER). To exceed the current maize self-sufficiency level in the EU, growing maize-soybean intercropping every six, five, and four years would be required with maize pLER values of 0.5, 0.6, and 0.7, respectively, assuming a 0.56 soybean pLER (Figure 4b).



Figure 4. Levels of soybean (a) and maize (b) self-sufficiency in the European Union (EU) achieved from intercropping for different assumptions of partial land equivalent ratio (pLER) and crop return frequency. Crop frequencies of one year in seven, six, five, four, three, or two correspond to allocating maize-soybean intercropping on 14%, 16%, 20%, 25%, 33%, or 50% of cropland area in each grid-cell. Intercropping was first allocated to soybean highest-yielding grid-cells, and in all cases total intercropping area was constrained to not exceed 25% of croplands in the EU (i.e., 25 Mha). Squares represent the results obtained with average productive performances of maize-soybean intercropping systems (i.e., pLER of 0.56 for soybean and 0.79 for maize) estimated in a previous meta-analysis.[3]

The above-results are obtained assuming that soybean could be cultivated in all areas with a soybean yield higher than 1 $t.ha^{-1}$. If we restrict soybean cultivation to the 25% most productive sites only (i.e., sites with soybean yield ≥2.6 $t.ha^{-1}$), 11-98% soybean self-sufficiency could be achieved, depending on cropping frequency and soybean pLER (Supplementary Figures 10-11). On the opposite, extending soybean cultivation in several third countries and candidates for accession to the EU (Azerbaijan, Belarus, Norway, Switzerland, United-Kingdom, Albania, Bosnia

and Herzegovina, Georgia, Moldova, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia, Türkiye, Ukraine, and Kosovo) improves the potential soybean self-sufficiency levels attainable through intercropping (43-100%), especially in case of low return frequency (i.e., one-in-seven to one-in-four years cultivation) (Supplementary Figure 12). In this case, intercropping area shifts from northern and southern Europe to eastern Europe, especially in Ukraine, compared to the allocations performed for the EU only (Supplementary Figures 13).

Discussion

High potential of maize-soybean intercropping to soybean self-sufficiency in the EU

Our study is the first providing evidence on the benefits of intercropping to improve EU's self-sufficiency in soybean, while maintaining high production of maize, and to quantify land saved by this strategy over sole cropping at a continental scale. Our results suggest that maize-soybean intercropping has the potential to enhance EU soybean and maize self-sufficiency, thus substantially reducing Europe's dependency to imported supplies. Based on geographical patterns of sole crops' yields, a one-in-four-year return frequency, and assuming that 1 ha of intercropping produces as much as 0.56 ha of soybean and 0.79 ha of maize in pure stands,[3] 13.1 Mha of intercropping could cover 50% and 75% of the EU's consumption in soybean and maize (i.e., 18.1 Mt of soybean and 63.7 Mt of maize), respectively. Intercropping outperformed sole cropping in maximizing maize-soybean co-production, allowing substantial land savings. For instance, to simultaneously produce 18.1 Mt of soybean and 63.7 Mt of maize, intercropping required 3.4 Mha (30%) less land than sole cropping, corresponding to an area slightly higher than the combined agricultural areas of Belgium and the Netherlands (1.4 and 1.8 Mha, respectively).[27] Thus, maize-soybean intercropping emerges as a powerful strategy for improving food security and land use efficiency in the EU.

On the productive performance of intercropping

Previous research has shown that the productive performances of intercropping are highly variable, with LER values ranging from less than 0.5 to more than 2.0 for maize-soybean intercropping on the global scale.[3] However, our results suggest that intercropping maize and soybean in the EU remains an interesting option to improve self-sufficiency compared to sole crops even in the least productive intercropping scenario. Nevertheless, more productive intercropping scenarios (i.e., soybean pLER >0.5) lead to higher improvements in self-sufficiency and land savings, highlighting the importance of identifying combinations of environmental conditions and management practices that maximize the benefits of this strategy.

Many factors affecting the performances of intercropping have been identified in previous research. For example, in a meta-analysis of field trials conducted in China,[28] increased sunshine hours and temperatures were found to reduce the performance of maize-soybean intercropping compared to sole crops. It has been shown that due to interspecific competition, soybean often underperforms relative to maize in intercropping,[29] particularly under increased nitrogen fertilization[3] and nutrients availability.[28] However, wider strip distance,[30] moderate maize planting density, or shorter growth periods' overlap[28] were identified as potential levers which could contribute in reducing the competition between species in intercrops. In Europe, the performance of cereals-legumes mixtures is also affected by climate condition, especially rainfall, and farming

practices such as tillage, and nature and quantity of applied fertilizers.[31] Given the limited information on the interaction between soybean productivity in intercropping and other farming practices in Europe, additional trials are required to refine maize-soybean intercropping performances and to help identifying the best combinations of field configuration, fertilization, and water management which maximizes the productivity of intercropping in the EU context.

Barriers to intercropping expansion and perspectives to overcome them

Although several studies suggest that deploying intercropping in Europe could provide agroecological benefits while maintaining crop productivity,[32] its development is hampered by numerous barriers[33,34] throughout the food value chain, but predominantly faced by farmers.[35] Tackling only the farmer-specific barriers is necessary but insufficient to promote widespread adoption across the EU.[33,35] For instance, intercropping requires specific machinery for sowing, harvesting, and sorting of grains of the different crops to comply with collectors and processors purity standards. Large-scale introduction of intercropping could create a significant market, driving the development of affordable, specialized machinery. However, such equipment will not be sufficient to make intercropping a viable system if purity standards are not adapted to intercropping products. Given the systemic nature of these barriers, involving all stakeholders across the value chain is essential for designing effective policies to unlock the full potential of legume-cereal intercropping in Europe. On the positive side, since genetically modified crops are only marginally grown in the EU, the soybean produced in EU will be non-genetically modified, and will therefore address a specific market, different from that for genetically modified soybean from North and South America.

Potential impacts of climate change

Our results highlight that maize-soybean intercropping performs well under current climate, but the suitability of this cropping strategy in future climate conditions has not been examined in our analysis. Previous studies[11,15] suggest that by 2050, climate change may shift soybean-suitable area in Europe, with northern regions becoming more favorable and lower latitudes increasingly less suitable.[36,37] Overall, it has been shown soybean production in Europe is likely to increase under various climate change scenarios compared to historical conditions.[11,37] On the contrary, maize yields are expected to decline, with an estimated 10% loss per degree Celsius increase if no adaptation strategies are implemented.[38] However, maize was found to be highly responsive to adaption strategies, such as irrigation and cultivar adaptation, which could mitigate future yield losses, especially in higher latitudes like Europe.[38,39] More research is needed to assess the

robustness of our findings in light of these potential changes in the spatial yield patterns of soybean and maize.

Impacts on land use

Our findings suggest that to achieve 91% soybean self-sufficiency, more than 25 Mha of maize-soybean intercropping would be required, corresponding to an increase of 15 Mha compared to the current harvested areas of maize and soybean in the EU.[12] Although maize-soybean intercropping offers advantages in terms of productivity,[40] a large-scale deployment of this type of intercrop would compete with other crops that play an important role in feed and food production, such as barley and sunflower. To limit this problem, it would be advisable to diversify the types of intercropping and consider the use of double cropping systems, i.e. systems with two crop harvests per year, in regions where this system could be implemented.[11,41,42] Potential production from other intercropping systems and double cropping systems deserves further research.

An alternative strategy to reduce EU dependency on soybean imports is to decrease the soybean demand. This could be achieved by growing other legume crop species (e.g., broad bean, pea, and lupin) as feeds[17] or by switching to a less meat-based diet with lower meat consumptions by humans.[8] The latter was found to reduce the demand for soybean-based protein in the EU through lower meat consumption, and free up land to produce more legume crops for human consumption rather than livestock feed. In the future, an integrated strategy combining both an increase in supply through intercropping and a reduction in demand through a partial change in diet would enable Europe to reduce its dependence on imports of agricultural commodities without too much impact on its cultivated areas.

Methods

For both soybean and maize, we built training datasets including gridded data on historical worldwide yields collected in major producing areas,[43] irrigated fraction from the SPAM2010 database,[44] daily minimum and maximum temperature (°C), total precipitations (mm), solar radiations ($MJ.m^{-2}$), evapotranspiration ($mm.day^{-1}$), and vapor pressure deficit (kPa) from the ERA5-Land database.[45] Further details on data pre-processing steps are provided in Supplementary Material 1. The total number of sites (resp. number of site-year) included in the soybean and maize datasets reached 3,286 (116,516) and 2,064 (72,964), respectively. In producing sites, detrended yield ranged from 0.1 to 6.7 $t.ha^{-1}$ for soybean and from 0.5 to 20.0 $t.ha^{-1}$ for maize (Supplementary Figure 14). Mean (standard deviation) yield was 2.6 $t.ha^{-1}$ (1.1 $t.ha^{-1}$) for soybean and 9.5 $t.ha^{-1}$ (3.8 $t.ha^{-1}$) for maize. Exclusively rainfed soybean or maize

were grown in 45% and 24% of sites, respectively. Within sites with fractional area of irrigated soybean or maize exceeding 0%, irrigated soybean and maize represented 1-22% and 1-30% of cultivated area of each crop, respectively.

Separate models were built to forecast soybean and maize yields in the EU – referring as the EU from February 1^{srt} 2020, when the United Kingdom withdrew – as a function of climate conditions and water management (Supplementary Material 2). The choice of the model was guided by previous works comparing various techniques to aggregate climate predictors and various algorithms to predict soybean yield.[11,46] These studies showed that the first two principal components (PCs) were able to capture large variations in monthly climate averages and using these PCs in a random forest algorithm provided highly accurate predictions of soybean yield. Following this methodology, distinct predictive models were built for each crop. Variants of these models using different climate data aggregation methods (i.e., monthly average, seasonal average, or a higher number of PCs) were also developed for comparison. For each crop, the model based on the first two PCs showed the best transferability in time and space according to two cross-validation procedures (Supplementary Material 2). This approach was selected to predict the annual yields of rainfed soybean and maize in pure stands for each site-year in the EU over 2000-2023 using climate and irrigation data from the ERA5-Land database[45] and water management from the SPAM2010 database[44] as predictors. Except for soybean yields ≥3.0 t.ha^{-1} and maize yields ≥7.0 t.ha^{-1}, projections were not sensitive to the models selected (Supplementary Figure 15).

The reference pLER values used in this study – 0.56 for soybean and 0.79 for maize – come from a meta-analysis of soybean-maize intercropping trials based on 654 field observations at the global scale.[3] For each site, soybean production in intercropping was estimated by multiplying annual predicted soybean yield by the soybean pLER,[3] the cropland area in the site from the SASAM dataset,[47] and a coefficient representing the return frequency of intercropping in crop sequences (e.g., 1/4 for one-in-four frequency). To limit the risk of pests and diseases,[48,49] a one-in-four years frequency was considered, corresponding to allocating each year 25% of the cropland area in each site. Sites with unsuitable conditions for soybean production (i.e., yields <1 t.ha^{-1}, corresponding to the minimum yield observed in the US and Italy in the training dataset) were excluded. Maize production through intercropping was estimated following a similar procedure.

Over 2018-2022, 36.3 Mt soybean were on average consumed in the EU.[12]. The area required by intercropping to produce a target soybean production (P_S^*) covering 25%, 50%, 75%, or 100% of the average annual soybean consumption in the EU was estimated. For each self-sufficiency scenario, maize-soybean intercropping was sequentially allocated to highest yielding sites, ranked by soybean productivity (i.e., projected soybean yields), until P_S^* was reached or until the

total area allocated to intercropping reached 25 Mha, corresponding to 25% of EU croplands in 2018 [27]. This maximum value of 25 Mha was chosen to limit competition with other crops. This allocation yielded to simultaneously produce P_S^* Mt of soybean and P_M^i Mt of maize, co-produced through intercropping. The total co-production (i.e, $P_S^* + P_M^i$) was calculated and compared to the one obtained with a sole cropping strategy applied over the same total cropping area (i.e., the area required to reach P_S^* with intercropping). For the sole cropping strategy, we first allocated sole soybean to the highest yielding sites until reaching P_S^* or 25 Mha. Second, we allocated sole maize to the remaining sites and computed the resulting maize production in maize monocrop P_M^m. Note that, in this approach, the sum of the sole soybean area and the sole maize area is equal to the intercropping area obtained with the intercropping allocation strategy previously described.

Since both allocation procedures were designed to produce P_S^* Mt soybean, the most efficient strategy among intercropping (i.e., simultaneous cultivation of maize and soybean in the same area) or sole cropping (i.e., separate cultivation in different areas) was the one leading to the largest production of maize in the region of interest. Finally, land saving allowed by the most efficient strategy over the least efficient one was estimated as the difference between the area required by the least efficient strategy to reach the same level of co-production than the most efficient strategy, divided by the area required by the most efficient strategy. Further details regarding procedure to allocate and compare sole and intercropping strategies are provided in Supplementary Material 3.

To assess the sensitivity of our results to cropping frequency and intercropping efficiency compared to sole cropping, analyses were repeated in scenarios specified by combining different values of soybean pLER (0.3 to 0.7, by 0.1-increment), maize pLER (0.5 to 0.9, by 0.1-increment), and crop frequency (one-in-seven to one-in-two years, by yearly increment). To explore the impact of concentrating intercropping in the high-yield sites, allocation procedures were repeated for sites where the average soybean yield exceeded 2.6 $t.ha^{-1}$ (instead of 1 $t.ha^{-1}$) representing the 75th percentile of projected soybean yields. The impact of expanding soybean cultivation in several third countries and candidates for accession to the EU was explored as well.

All relevant R (version 4.3.1 http://www.r-project.org) scripts, python script used to run and set parameters of the Copernicus Climate Data Store API, and documentation are available via the project repository on Github at https://github.com/MathildeChen/Maize_Soybean_Intercropping_Europe.

References

1 EFSCM. State of Food Security in the EU (Autumn 2023). A qualitative assessment of food supply and food security within the framework of the EFSCM. (2023).

2 European Commission. Food supply and security [Accessed in December 2024].

3 Xu, Z. *et al.* Intercropping maize and soybean increases efficiency of land and fertilizer nitrogen use; A meta-analysis. *Field Crops Research* **246**, 107661, doi:10.1016/j.fcr.2019.107661 (2020).

4 Wegren, S. K. Challenges to global food security: A policy approach to the 2021–2022 food crisis. *World Food Policy* **9**, 127-148, doi:10.1002/wfp2.12057 (2023).

5 European Commission. Contingency plan for ensuring food supply and food security in times of crisis. Vol. 52021DC0689 (Brussels, 2021).

6 Pellizzoni, L., Centemeri, L., Benegiamo, M. & Panico, C. A new food security approach? Continuity and novelty in the European Union's turn to preparedness. *Agriculture and Human Values*, doi:10.1007/s10460-024-10633-9 (2024).

7 European Commission. *Cereals, oilseeds, protein crops and rice. Protection of EU farmers and the agricultural sector through policy on market intervention, trade measures, legislation, and monitoring the market.* , <https://agriculture.ec.europa.eu/farming/crop-productions-and-plant-based-products/cereals_en> (2024).

8 Debaeke, P., Tibi, A., Forslund, A., Guyomard, H. & Schmitt, B. Could domestic soybean production avoid Europe's protein imports in 2050? *OCL Oilseeds and fats crops and lipids* **29**, 38 (2022).

9 Sun, J. *et al.* Importing food damages domestic environment: Evidence from global soybean trade. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **115**, 5415-5419, doi:doi:10.1073/pnas.1718153115 (2018).

10 Villoria, N., Garrett, R., Gollnow, F. & Carlson, K. Leakage does not fully offset soy supply-chain efforts to reduce deforestation in Brazil. *Nature Communications* **13**, 5476, doi:10.1038/s41467-022-33213-z (2022).

11 Guilpart, N., Iizumi, T. & Makowski, D. Data-driven projections suggest large opportunities to improve Europe's soybean self-sufficiency under climate change. *Nature Food* **3**, 255-265, doi:10.1038/s43016-022-00481-3 (2022).

12 FAOSTATS. (ed FAO) (2024).

13 Rotundo, J. L. *et al.* European soybean to benefit people and the environment. *Scientific Reports* **14**, 7612, doi:10.1038/s41598-024-57522-z (2024).

14 Lauerwald, R., Guilpart, N., Ciais, P. & Makowski, D. Impact of a large-scale replacement of maize by soybean on water deficit in Europe. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **343**, 109781, doi:10.1016/j.agrformet.2023.109781 (2023).

15 Nendel, C. *et al.* Future area expansion outweighs increasing drought risk for soybean in Europe. *Global Change Biology* **29**, 1340-1358, doi:10.1111/gcb.16562 (2023).

16 van Loon, M. P. *et al.* Grain legume production in Europe for food, feed and meat-substitution. *Global Food Security* **39**, 100723, doi:10.1016/j.gfs.2023.100723 (2023).

17 Karlsson, J. O., Parodi, A., van Zanten, H. H. E., Hansson, P.-A. & Röös, E. Halting European Union soybean feed imports favours ruminants over pigs and poultry. *Nature Food* **2**, 38-46, doi:10.1038/s43016-020-00203-7 (2021).

18 Bedoussac, L. *et al.* Ecological principles underlying the increase of productivity achieved by cereal-grain legume intercrops in organic farming. A review. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development* **35**, 911-935, doi:10.1007/s13593-014-0277-7 (2015).

19 Li, C. *et al.* The productive performance of intercropping. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **120**, e2201886120, doi:doi:10.1073/pnas.2201886120 (2023).

20 Tang, X. *et al.* Intercropping legumes and cereals increases phosphorus use efficiency; a meta-analysis. *Plant and Soil* **460**, 89-104, doi:10.1007/s11104-020-04768-x (2021).

21 Wu, Y. *et al.* Soybean yield variations and the potential of intercropping to increase production in China. *Field Crops Research* **291**, 108771, doi:10.1016/j.fcr.2022.108771 (2023).
22 van der Werf, W. *et al.* Comparing performance of crop species mixtures and pure stands. *Frontiers of Agricultural Science and Engineering* **8**, 481-489 (2021).
23 Lecerf, R., Ceglar, A., López-Lozano, R., Van Der Velde, M. & Baruth, B. Assessing the information in crop model and meteorological indicators to forecast crop yield over Europe. *Agricultural Systems* **168**, 191-202, doi:10.1016/j.agsy.2018.03.002 (2019).
24 Grassini, P. *et al.* in *Crop physiology case histories for major crops* 282-319 (Elsevier, 2021).
25 Otegui, M. E., Cirilo, A. G., Uhart, S. A. & Andrade, F. H. in *Crop physiology case histories for major crops* 2-43 (Elsevier, 2021).
26 Rosenzweig, C. *et al.* Assessing agricultural risks of climate change in the 21st century in a global gridded crop model intercomparison. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **111**, 3268-3273, doi:doi:10.1073/pnas.1222463110 (2014).
27 Eurostats. (2024).
28 Chen, G. *et al.* Potential crop yield gains under intensive soybean/maize intercropping in China. *Plant and Soil*, doi:10.1007/s11104-023-06423-7 (2023).
29 Zhang, R. *et al.* Yield and nutrient uptake dissected through complementarity and selection effects in the maize/soybean intercropping. *Food and Energy Security* **10**, e282, doi:10.1002/fes3.282 (2021).
30 Yang, S. *et al.* Yield performance response to field configuration of maize and soybean intercropping in China: A meta-analysis. *Field Crops Research* **306**, 109235, doi:10.1016/j.fcr.2023.109235 (2024).
31 Brooker, R. W. *et al.* Positive effects of intercrop yields in farms from across Europe depend on rainfall, crop composition, and management. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development* **44**, 35, doi:10.1007/s13593-024-00968-2 (2024).
32 Yan, E., Munier-Jolain, N., Martin, P. & Carozzi, M. Intercropping on French farms: Reducing pesticide and N fertiliser use while maintaining gross margins. *European Journal of Agronomy* **152**, 127036, doi:10.1016/j.eja.2023.127036 (2024).
33 Mamine, F. & Farès, M. h. Barriers and Levers to Developing Wheat–Pea Intercropping in Europe: A Review. *Sustainability* **12**, 6962 (2020).
34 Meynard, J.-M. *et al.* Socio-technical lock-in hinders crop diversification in France. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development* **38**, 54, doi:10.1007/s13593-018-0535-1 (2018).
35 Chevalier, C., Leclère, M., Morelle, C., Baret, P. & Justes, E. How to design “intercrops friendly” policies? Lessons from the analysis of the barriers to intercropping in Europe. (2024).
36 Soares, J. R. S., Ramos, R. S., da Silva, R. S., Neves, D. V. C. & Picanço, M. C. Climate change impact assessment on worldwide rain fed soybean based on species distribution models. *Tropical Ecology* **62**, 612-625, doi:10.1007/s42965-021-00174-1 (2021).
37 Marteau-Bazouni, M., Jeuffroy, M.-H. & Guilpart, N. Grain legume response to future climate and adaptation strategies in Europe: A review of simulation studies. *European Journal of Agronomy* **153**, 127056, doi:10.1016/j.eja.2023.127056 (2024).
38 Abramoff, R. Z. *et al.* Adaptation Strategies Strongly Reduce the Future Impacts of Climate Change on Simulated Crop Yields. *Earth's Future* **11**, e2022EF003190, doi:10.1029/2022EF003190 (2023).
39 Parent, B. *et al.* Maize yields over Europe may increase in spite of climate change, with an appropriate use of the genetic variability of flowering time. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **115**, 10642-10647 (2018).
40 Martin-Guay, M.-O., Paquette, A., Dupras, J. & Rivest, D. The new Green Revolution: Sustainable intensification of agriculture by intercropping. *Science of The Total Environment* **615**, 767-772, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.10.024 (2018).
41 Guilpart, N., Grassini, P., Sadras, V. O., Timsina, J. & Cassman, K. G. Estimating yield gaps at the cropping system level. *Field Crops Research* **206**, 21-32, doi:10.1016/j.fcr.2017.02.008 (2017).

42 Pitchers, J. *et al.* Opportunities and risks of double cropping in southwestern France with a focus on soybean and sunflower crops. *OCL* **30**, 16 (2023).

43 Iizumi, T. & Sakai, T. The global dataset of historical yields for major crops 1981-2016. *Sci Data* **7**, 97, doi:10.1038/s41597-020-0433-7 (2020).

44 Yu, Q. *et al.* A cultivated planet in 2010 – Part 2: The global gridded agricultural-production maps. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* **12**, 3545-3572, doi:10.5194/essd-12-3545-2020 (2020).

45 Muñoz-Sabater, J. *et al.* ERA5-Land: a state-of-the-art global reanalysis dataset for land applications. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* **13**, 4349-4383, doi:10.5194/essd-13-4349-2021 (2021).

46 Chen, M., Guilpart, N. & Makowski, D. Comparison of methods to aggregate climate data to predict crop yield: an application to soybean. *Environmental Research Letters* **19**, 054049, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/ad42b5 (2024).

47 Lu, M. *et al.* A cultivated planet in 2010 – Part 1: The global synergy cropland map. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* **12**, 1913-1928, doi:10.5194/essd-12-1913-2020 (2020).

48 Hartman, G. L., West, E. D. & Herman, T. K. Crops that feed the World 2. Soybean—worldwide production, use, and constraints caused by pathogens and pests. *Food Security* **3**, 5-17, doi:10.1007/s12571-010-0108-x (2011).

49 Pannecoucque, J. *et al.* Screening for soybean varieties suited to Belgian growing conditions based on maturity, yield components and resistance to Sclerotinia sclerotiorum and Rhizoctonia solani anastomosis group 2-2IIIB. *The Journal of Agricultural Science* **156**, 342-349, doi:10.1017/S0021859618000333 (2018).

Figures legends

Figure 1. Soybean (a) and maize (b) rainfed yield projections (2000-2023 averages), and ratio maize/soybean (c) in the European Union. Projections were obtained from random forest models based on climate inputs (derived from the ERA5-land dataset) covering the crop growing seasons (April-November for soybean and April-December for maize) and irrigated fraction (estimated by SPAM2010, and set to zero for the yield projections). Climate inputs included monthly averages of minimum and maximum temperatures, total precipitation, solar radiation, reference evapotranspiration, and vapor pressure deficit. For each climate variable, the first two scores derived from a principal component analysis were used as climate predictors in the model. For panels (a) and (b), areas with average crop yield ~ 0 $t.ha^{-1}$ are displayed in grey.

Figure 2. Procedure applied to estimate the area requirements under intercropping and sole cropping to meet a target soybean production (P_s^*) in the European Union, to compare the efficiency of both strategies in maximizing both soybean and maize coproduction, and to quantify the land saving allowed by the most efficient strategy at the scale of the European Union.

Figure 3. Comparison of maize-soybean intercropping (Int) and sole cropping (SC) for 50% soybean self-sufficiency in the European Union (EU). Maize-soybean intercropping was sequentially allocated in highest yielding sites, ranked by soybean productivity based on mean average production over 2000-2023 period in rainfed conditions, until 50% soybean self-sufficiency (i.e., 18.1 Mt) is reached. Sole soybean was sequentially allocated in the highest yielding sites until reaching 50% soybean self-sufficiency, then sole maize was allocated to the remaining sites so that the total covered area is equal in both strategies. Panel (a) displays the geographical allocation of crops with the Int. (left map) and with the SC (three maps on the right) strategies. Panels (b) and (c) show the corresponding area requirements and maize-soybean co-production, respectively. All simulations are based on (i) yield projections from a random-forest model based on the two first principal components of climate variables and irrigation fraction (set to zero here), (ii) crop return frequency of one year in four, and (iii) partial land equivalent ratios equal to 0.56 and 0.79 for soybean and maize, respectively.[3] The maximum total allocated area was set at 25% of croplands in EU, indicated as dotted line in the panel (b). Self-sufficiency levels of 50% corresponds to soybean, indicated as horizontal dotted line in the panel (c).

Figure 4. Levels of soybean (a) and maize (b) self-sufficiency in the European Union (EU) achieved from intercropping for different assumptions of partial land equivalent ratio (pLER) and crop return frequency.
Crop frequencies of one year in seven, six, five, four, three, or two correspond to allocating maize-soybean intercropping on 14%, 16%, 20%, 25%, 33%, or 50% of cropland area in each grid-cell. Intercropping was first allocated to soybean highest-yielding grid-cells, and in all cases total intercropping area was constrained to not exceed 25% of croplands in the EU (i.e., 25 Mha). Squares represent the results obtained with average productive performances of maize-soybean intercropping systems (i.e., pLER of 0.56 for soybean and 0.79 for maize) estimated in a previous meta-analysis.[3]

Author Contributions:

Mathilde CHEN: Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Formal analysis, Visualization. Writing – original manuscript.

Nicolas GUILPART: Conceptualization, Supervision, Writing – review & editing.

David MAKOWSKI: Conceptualization, Methodology, Supervision, Funding acquisition, Writing – review & editing.

Competing Interest Statement: The authors declare no competing interest.

Corresponding authors information

Mathilde CHEN, PHIM, Univ Montpellier, CIRAD, INRAE, Institut Agro, IRD, 34398 Montpellier, France. Email: mathilde.chen@cirad.fr

David MAKOWSKI, Université Paris-Saclay, AgroParisTech, INRAE, UMR MIA-PS, 91120 Palaiseau, France. Email: david.makowski@inrae.fr