

Soybean Supply Chain Management and Sustainability: A Systematic Literature Review

Fu Jia, PhD (First author)
Chair Professor of Supply Chain Management
The York Management School
University of York
Heslington, York YO10 5DD
Tel: +44 (0)1904 324855
Email: fu.jia@exeter.ac.uk

Sujie Peng
The York Management School
University of York
Heslington, York YO10 5DD
Email: sp1539@york.ac.uk

Jonathan Green
Stockholm Environment Institute
Department of Environment and Geography
Third Floor, Environment Building
University of York, York
YO10 5NG, UK
Email: jonathan.green@york.ac.uk

Lenny Koh
The University of Sheffield
Management School
Conduit Road
Sheffield S10 1FL
Email: S.C.L.Koh@sheffield.ac.uk
Tel: +44 (0) 114 222 3395

Xiaowei Chen (correspondence author)
Zhejiang Gongshang University,
No.18 Xuezheng St.
Hangzhou 310018, China P.R.
Email: chenxiaowei@zjgsu.edu.cn
Tel: +86 (0) 13958080203

Acknowledgement

This research was supported by Zhejiang Provincial Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. LY19E080006, China Postdoctoral Science Foundation Funded Project (No.: 2018M642391); The Ministry of Education of Humanities and Social Sciences project (Grant number: 17YJA630034) and the Natural Science Foundation of Fujian Province of China (No. 2017J01519).

*Declaration of Interest Statement

Declaration of conflict of interest statement

The authors whose names are listed immediately below certify that they have NO affiliations with or involvement in any organization or entity with any financial interest (such as honoraria; educational grants; participation in speakers' bureaus; membership, employment, consultancies, stock ownership, or other equity interest; and expert testimony or patent-licensing arrangements), or non-financial interest (such as personal or professional relationships, affiliations, knowledge or beliefs) in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript.

Author names: Fu Jia; Sujie Peng; Jonathan Green; Lenny Koh; Xiaowei Chen

Soybean Supply Chain Management and Sustainability: A Systematic Literature Review

Abstract

As a globally consumed agricultural product, soybeans have long been one of the most important commodities in the current international market. In this regard, the governance of the global soybean supply chain has become one of the central themes in both industry and academia. However, existing scholarly works focusing on sustainability issues and mechanisms for better governance in the soybean chain are rare. Moreover, the relationship among soybean supply chain governance mechanisms remains unclear. In this study, we conducted a systematic review of the existing literature to identify key themes or topics and to develop a conceptual framework to guide future research. Based on our inclusion criteria and by considering the Scopus database, we identified and reviewed 55 articles published between 2000 and 2019. In our analysis, four themes were identified in soybean supply chain management: drivers (e.g., land-use conflict), global value chain governance (e.g., REDD+), consequences (e.g., reduced CO₂ emissions) and potential barriers (e.g., low market demand). Finally, a conceptual model was proposed that elaborates the linkage of the themes, and a research agenda was proposed to direct studies in the future.

Keywords: Soybean; Sustainability; Supply Chain Management; Value Chain Governance

1. Introduction

Soybeans are a widely consumed agricultural commodity around the world in many forms, such as the whole soybean, soy oil and soy meal markets (Fearnside, 2001). However, only 6% of the world's total soy production is used in the form of whole beans, while the remaining 94% is crushed (Oliveira and Schneider, 2016). Whole soybeans may be processed for industrial usage (e.g., biofuel and edible oils) or crushed to produce food products (e.g., soy milk, animal feed, and soy sauce) (WWF, 2014). In addition, compared with the other crops, soybean has the potential for greater resource efficiency. Taking land-use efficiency, for instance, a soy yield of 3000 kg per hectare can be used to produce 343 kg of cattle meat, 600 kg of pork or 1200 kg of poultry (Garrett and Rausch, 2016). Otherwise, without soy meal, cattle production can only produce one head and 250 kg of cattle meat on average on one hectare of land (Walker et al., 2013).

Agricultural production has long attracted concerns related to environmental sustainability (Silva et al., 2010). The soybean supply chain requires a much longer transportation distance to meet global demand (He et al., 2019). The long-distance transportation route finally leads to environmental and social challenges, such as Green House Gas (GHG) emissions (He et al., 2019) and food insecurity for local people (Federación Agraria, 2007). This contrasts with the short food supply chain (SFSC), where a shorter distance within the chain improves sustainability by developing the local economy, reducing diesel fuel consumption and building closer relationships between stakeholders (Schmid et al., 2014; Sellitto et al., 2018). Engagement with stakeholders to tackle environmental and social issues is easier in an SFSC as the relationship is closer (i.e., stakeholders are more willing to pay for sustainable products in SFSC) (Hinrichs, 2003; Schäufele and Hamm, 2017). Hence, in this context, a more facilitated mechanism is required for better governance in the soybean chain.

In the existing literature, many research findings have associated soy production with ecological problems, such as excessive water usage (Ercin, 2012) and

1 deforestation (Ferreira et al., 2013). Additionally, social impact concerns, including
2 the loss of livelihoods and increased rural conflicts (Espíndola and Cunha, 2015;
3 McKay, 2018), have drawn the attention of scholars and stakeholders. Again, the
4 challenges caused by unsustainable soy production may vary among the various
5 producing countries. For instance, the GHG emissions concerns in Brazil mainly
6 come from deforestation and land-use conflict rather than from fossil fuel use
7 (Borzoni, 2011). In this sense, numerous problems have arisen: what are the main
8 challenges of unsustainable soy expansion in soy-producing countries, and what are
9 the management implications? To the best of our knowledge, these issues have yet to
10 be addressed holistically in the extant literature.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 On the other hand, concerns regarding the governance of the soy global value
22 chain (GVC) have arisen. In this context, the governance of value chains refers to the
23 collaboration between actors and their activities as well as the relative powers among
24 stakeholders within the chain (Humphrey and Schmitz, 2002). Many initiatives have
25 been implemented by actors in the public and private sectors to improve governance
26 practices in soy value chains. The governance of the soybean value chain is the
27 management by actors related to soy cultivation, which may raise questions about the
28 mechanisms that are effective for governing the actors in the soybean supply chain
29 and the drivers and potential barriers behind these mechanisms.

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40 In many tropical countries, both governmental and non-governmental
41 organisations have implemented numerous initiatives to enhance sustainability in the
42 agricultural sector (Newton et al., 2013). Examples include the Roundtable on
43 Responsible Soy (RTRS) and the Brazilian Soja Plus (Heron, 2018). Such initiatives
44 seek to change production practices throughout the chain by engaging multiple
45 stakeholders to tackle environmental or social issues (e.g., deforestation) (Meijer,
46 2015). Additionally, Heron et al. (2018) discussed both public and private certificate
47 schemes in global soy value chains to address environmental or social concerns. Still,
48 the weaknesses in the sustainability initiatives (e.g., low coverage rate) (RTRS, 2017;
49 Virah-Sawmy et al., 2019) have yet to be thoroughly discussed. Thus, a study
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 focusing on a holistic understanding of the mechanisms of soybean chain governance
2 is important but uncommon. Additionally, the relationships among these mechanisms
3 remain unclear.
4
5

6 Some previous studies have reviewed the extant literature on sustainable and
7 agricultural value chain governance. Under the context of value chain governance,
8 Bush et al. (2015) reviewed the mechanisms used in value chain governance and
9 classified them into three types: governance in chains, governance of chains and
10 governance through chains. Lambin et al. (2003), in a similar vein, reviewed private
11 and public deforestation initiatives under a sustainable supply chain management
12 context. They suggested that public and private initiatives need to reinforce each other
13 to create collective efforts for complex ecosystems. Again, considering the complexity
14 of the soybean chain, Heron et al. (2018) and Waldman and Kerr (2014) reviewed the
15 current certification schemes and argued that customer-focused certification schemes
16 were required to adopt practices and tackle environmental pollution. Nonetheless, the
17 relationship between governance mechanisms has not received any significant
18 attention. Collectively, prior works only presented how soybean production is
19 governed, while a systematic review of this topic is missing. Hence, the aim of this
20 study was to analyse the existing literature to present an overview as well as the
21 strengths and weaknesses of the existing works. The following research questions are
22 proposed:
23

24 RQ1: What are the drivers and barriers to sustainable soy production and their
25 relationships?
26

27 RQ2: What are the value chain governance mechanisms available for the soybean
28 chain?
29

30 RQ3: What are the consequences of the implementation of these mechanisms?
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 The remainder of this article is structured in five sections: first, the systematic
55 review process adopted in this work with descriptive analysis is described in the next
56 section of the research methodology; second, in the thematic analysis section, we
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 present the key themes identified; third, we propose a conceptual framework based on
2 the identified themes; fourth, we show and discuss the implications of the study; fifth,
3 in the conclusions, we summarise the paper and suggest potential areas for further
4 research.
5
6
7
8
9

10 **2. Research methodology**

11 In this study, a systematic literature review (SLR) was adopted. The systematic
12 literature review methodology is presented in this section.
13
14
15

16 **2.1 Reviewing process**

17 We adopted Scopus, the largest database of peer-reviewed literature with
18 holistic coverage of academic articles, as the database for searching the literature
19 (Elsevier.com, 2019). To define the scope of the study, we identified three clusters of
20 keywords (Figure 1). We searched the articles by using the following portfolio: soy
21 and sustainability-related keywords; soy and supply chain-related keywords; and soy,
22 sustainability and supply chain-related keywords to ensure that the terms used in this
23 study better identified articles (i.e., the scope could not be too broad to search the
24 literature). Specifically, we used the “advanced search” on Scopus to search for the
25 following keywords: First, we used soy OR soybean OR “soy meal” OR “soybean
26 meal” OR “soy conflict” OR “soy moratorium” OR “soy frontier” OR “soy complex”
27 OR “sustainable soy sector” OR “soy meat” as terms to search for articles related to
28 soybeans. Second, following Jia et al. (2018), we adopted “corporate social
29 responsibility” OR CSR OR “triple bottom line” OR TBL OR sustainab* to search the
30 literature related to sustainability. Finally, the supply chain-related keywords were
31 “supply chain” OR “value chain” OR procurement OR purchas* (Jia et al., 2018). In
32 this process, we chose “Article” as the document type, “English” as the language of
33 the articles, and “Peer Reviewed Journal” as the article type for searching.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Initially, the search result yielded 795 relevant articles in the database. We
55 then used the following criteria to select articles for inclusion: articles focusing on
56 supply chain management (SCM), certifications, and public regulatory standards for
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 soybean production. Of these, the articles that focused on SCM but not on soy
2 production were excluded. We also excluded papers related to soybean cultivation
3 technologies (e.g., no-till cultivation). After reviewing the title and abstract when
4 searching for the articles, we found 168 potential articles for review. Then, adopting
5 the same criteria, we reviewed the full text and finally identified 55 articles to include
6 in the study. The final article search was conducted in December 2019.
7
8
9

10
11
12 Although these articles may provide new perspectives on more sustainable
13 soybean production, limited insights regarding sustainable production mechanisms in
14 operations management were highlighted in these studies.
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **Insert Figure 1 about Here**
22
23
24

25 In the following sections, the descriptive analysis and thematic analysis are
26 presented to evaluate the literature according to the publication information and key
27 themes.
28
29
30
31

32 **2.1 Descriptive analysis** 33

34 The 55 papers identified in this study were published between 2000 and 2019.
35 The distribution of the papers by year is illustrated in Figure 2. The first publication
36 identified was published in 2000. We noticed that gaps existed between 2002 and
37 2008. In addition, 10 works were published in 2018, followed by 7 articles in 2019.
38 Of the 55 articles reviewed, 37 were published between 2014 and 2019. For the
39 distribution of papers in journals, 7 papers were published in the Journal of Cleaner
40 Production, which contributed the most papers, followed by 5 articles in The Journal
41 of Peasant Studies (Table 1).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 **Insert Figure 2 about Here**
53

54 **Insert Table 1 about Here**
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 As shown in Figure 3, among the reviewed articles, the majority (34) were case
2 studies, followed by modelling (15), secondary data analyses (2), experiments (2),
3 surveys (1) and literature reviews (1) (Figure 3).
4
5
6
7

8 **Insert Figure 3 about Here**
9

10 **3. Thematic findings**

11 The soy supply chain is a complex network that creates significant economic
12 profits in many countries, but it requires a large number of supporting services (e.g.,
13 infrastructure and processing) (Garrett et al., 2013). In Brazil, for instance, the tax rate
14 on soy-related products is fairly low, and soybean, soy oil or oil exports enjoy a
15 zero-tax rate (Garrett et al., 2013). Such preferential policies enacted by governmental
16 institutions have become a trigger of growth in the production of soy. In this regard,
17 the “side effects” of such initiatives have raised sustainability concerns. Thus, in this
18 paper, our focus is on sustainable soy supply chain management. In line with this
19 focus, in the next section, we adopt Elkington’s (1998) triple bottom line (TBL)
20 approach to identify the challenges or drivers of unsustainable soy production as the
21 first thematic category. Subsequently, we discuss the mechanisms for tackling these
22 challenges, which include public and private initiatives. Additionally, the
23 consequences of and potential barriers to the implementation of the initiatives are
24 presented. Following the thematic findings, in section 4, a conceptual framework was
25 developed to establish the relationships among the identified themes.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **3.1 Drivers**

48 In general, soybean farming systems can be classified into three types:
49 genetically modified (GM), non-genetically modified (non-GM) and organic soybean.
50 In the case of the soybean supply chain, economic, environmental and social issues
51 exist in all farming systems (Kamali et al., 2017). Hence, discussions of these issues
52 are presented in this section.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

3.1.1 Economic challenges

Once again, the soybean supply chain is a complex network and requires many supporting services (e.g., infrastructure and processing), which creates a large amount of economic value (Garrett et al., 2013). For example, in Brazil, the soy supply chain contributed 0.7% of the national GDP in 2007; 45% of this was from soy production (Garrett et al., 2013). Azadi and Ho (2010) discussed the economic performance of soybean cultivation, arguing that the introduction of GM soy could increase the productivity of the soybean sector, while food security and other issues need to be considered.

Additionally, several studies, such as Reis and Leal (2015) and Silva and Almeida (2013), have developed models to optimise the operational costs in soybean supply chains. Other economic issues include transportation, inventory and logistic costs (Silva and Almeida, 2013). Apart from these issues, the economic value or profitability depends not only on value creation but also on cost reduction. Azadi and Ho (2010) mentioned indicators of economic performance in the soy sector (e.g., yield production), while Reis and Leal (2015), Silva and Almeida (2013) and Garrett et al. (2013) further discussed techniques for cost optimisation, such as techniques or practices adopted for cheaper production. The adoption of GM technology, for example, leads to higher production and therefore results in higher yields and reductions in operating costs. Additionally, compared with other seeds, GM seeds are available at lower prices, which also reduces operating costs (Delvenne et al., 2013; Filomeno, 2013; Pellegrini, 2013).

However, the economic advantages of GM soybean cultivation raise several questions. First, profitability is highly dependent upon the price of the international soybean markets. Second, profitability is impacted by export taxes, and soybean producers may have to reduce prices to improve their competitive advantage in the international soybean market. Third, future yields may decrease because production practices do not follow the recommended crop sequences. Overall, all these studies have addressed

1 how soy cultivation contributes to economic value. The abovementioned articles are
2 illustrated in Table 2.
3

4
5
6 **Insert Table 2 about Here**
7
8
9

10 **3.1.2 Environmental challenges**

11 In addition to profitability, soy production raises ecological concerns (Garrett et
12 al., 2013). In our reviewed papers, a considerable number of studies analysed the
13 ecological effects of soybean cultivation.
14
15
16
17

18 Soybean cultivation has rapidly expanded in the past few decades. The area
19 under soy cultivation in Argentina alone, for example, increased from 6.9 million
20 hectares (Mha) in the 1990s to 19.7 Mha in 2012 (Goldsmith et al., 2004; Mathews
21 and Goldsztein, 2009). Approximately 90% of global soy production is in Brazil and
22 Argentina (Mathews and Goldsztein, 2009). The cultivation of soybeans leads to the
23 loss of natural resources. These include soil erosion and the impact of agricultural
24 chemicals on biodiversity and the environment. For soy production, the environmental
25 effects have been investigated by a considerable number of studies, such as studies
26 about land planning (Garrett et al., 2013), greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (Newton
27 et al., 2013; Reijnders and Huijbregts, 2008), water consumption (Ercin et al., 2011;
28 Taherzadeh and Caro, 2019), deforestation (Cohn and O'Rourke, 2011; Fearnside,
29 2001), and land-use conflict (Garrett et al., 2013; Garrett and Lambin, 2013; Garrett
30 and Naylor, 2013; Tomei et al., 2010; Zak et al., 2008). To produce the same amount
31 of product, soybeans require a larger amount of land than rapeseeds (Mattsson et al.,
32 2000; Garrett and Rausch, 2016; Brown et al. 2014). Tomei et al. (2010) and Zak et al.
33 (2008) found that the cultivation of crops (e.g., soybean) caused land-use conflicts
34 (e.g., deforestation caused by soy expansion).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Soy expansion has long been a threat to the ecological system (Silva et al., 2010),
55 especially deforestation (Ferreira et al., 2013). Taking the most common concerns into
56 account, implications regarding land consumption (Weinhold et al., 2013) and
57
58
59
60

1 deforestation need to be addressed (Ferreira et al., 2013; Gollnow and Lakes, 2014).
2 In the Amazon, for instance, deforestation is caused by large-scale soy cultivation
3 (Arima et al., 2011; Macedo et al., 2012; Morton et al., 2006). The industrial scale of
4 soybean production in South America has led to large areas of deforestation (Cohn
5 and O'Rourke, 2011; Fearnside, 2001) and GHG emissions from long-distance
6 transportation routes (He et al., 2019).
7
8
9

10 In addition, deleterious effects on the natural environment caused by soybean
11 production were substantially affected by the technologies used in soy cultivation. For
12 example, in GM soybean production, for instance, the use of endosulfan 8 contributes
13 to the pollution of groundwater (Gonzalez et al., 2010). The introduction of pesticides
14 (e.g., glyphosate) for GM soybean cultivation also impacts soil quality (Astoviza et al.,
15 2016; Burachik, 2010; Urcola et al., 2015).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 In addition, a certain number of indirect impacts on the ecological system have
26 been found by scholars. Deforestation, for instance, can ultimately lead to the loss of
27 carbon, e.g., large-scale usage of mechanical tillage instead of using no-till practices
28 (i.e., a technique to grow crops without disturbing the soil through tillage), cover
29 crops and maximising harvest residues reduce the carbon stock of the soil and,
30 ultimately, leads to more carbon dioxide emissions (Reijnders and Huijbregts, 2008)
31 and climate change (Fearnside et al., 2013). The loss of carbon not only leads to
32 climate change but also impacts water and soil resources. Macedo et al. (2012) and
33 Neill and Coe (2013) found that the deforestation caused by soy cultivation influences
34 the level of water flow, the sediment, and the temperature. Moreover, GHG emissions
35 caused by deforestation also increase the carbon stored in the soil (Lal et al., 2007).
36 Different from those of developed countries, Brazilian GHG emissions (e.g., 58% of
37 carbon dioxide emissions in 2005) mainly come from deforestation and land-use
38 conflict rather than fossil fuel use (Borzoni, 2011).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Ercin et al. (2012) indicated that soy products, such as soymilk and soy burgers,
55 consume a considerable amount of water, which requires better practices in water
56 stewardship. Specifically, this study examined the water footprint (WF) of soybean
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 production in different countries in the forms of blue water (i.e., the amount of rainfall
2 that enters lakes, rivers and groundwater), green water (i.e., the amount of rainfall that
3 is either intercepted by vegetation or enters the soil and is taken up by plants and
4 evapotranspired back into the atmosphere) and grey water (i.e., the consumption of
5 water used to absorb pollutants based on current water quality standards). Overall, 93%
6 of the WF for 1 litre of soy milk is green water, while the WF to produce a 150 g soy
7 burger includes approximately 100 g (69%) of green water and 40 g (27%) of grey
8 water. In these estimations, it can be seen that the production of soy burgers consumes
9 more water to address pollution.
10

11 Ercin et al. (2012) also suggested that excessive water usage in soy cultivation
12 leaves soil with a reduced capacity to absorb water and, ultimately, leads to flooding
13 in some areas. From an international trade perspective, Taherzadeh and Caro (2019)
14 found that approximately one-third of the water and land consumption of soybean
15 production was driven by international trade, of which 70% was used for animal feed,
16 one-fourth (24%) was used in food products and only 2% was lost in the distribution
17 of soybean (i.e., the transportation of soy products). This indicates that in international
18 trade, land-use conflict and water consumption are driven by soy production to meet
19 the demand for animal feed. These studies showed that the challenges existing in
20 soybean cultivation are complex and interlinked and sometimes conflict with one
21 another.
22

23 The deleterious effects of soy cultivation on natural environments vary in
24 different national contexts. In Brazil, according to Delgado (2012), Oliveira (2016)
25 and Sauer and Leite (2012), such ecological effects include the deforestation of the
26 Cerrado and Amazon biomes and widespread pollution caused by pesticides and
27 herbicides. Additionally, in China, the effects can be degradation of water and soil,
28 greenhouse gas emissions and biodiversity losses (Schneider, 2014; Yan et al., 2016;
29 Liu et al., 2019). To better illustrate these impacts, the environmental challenges are
30 summarised in Table 3.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Insert Table 3 about Here

3.1.3 Social challenges

Compared with the economic and environmental aspects of sustainability, the social impacts have received less attention. In this section, discussions regarding the social challenges from soy production are presented.

In some soy-producing countries, such as Paraguay, farmers are more likely to depend on agriculture for income (Elgert, 2016). Although the agricultural sector contributes significantly to job creation in Paraguay due to the high rural population, large-scale soy production offers a limited number of employment opportunities, as it requires more skilful managers and machine operators (Masi and Ruiz Diaz, 2017). Growth in the production of soy can often be seen among a small number of producers. In Bolivia, more than 80% of the soybean processing and storage markets are owned by foreign capital, which means that the soybean market is more likely to be controlled by a small number of large-scale producers (McKay, 2018). In Brazil, soybeans cultivation occupies 30 Mha of land (Espíndola and Cunha, 2015). In 2006, approximately three-quarters of the privately owned land was occupied by 0.8 million medium- and large-scale farmers (Medina et al., 2016). Approximately 75% of Brazilian farm householders make less than the minimum wage, while family farmers face the most severe financial difficulties (i.e., over 80% of family farmers have an insufficient amount of land and only 20% have sufficient access to a market) (Medina et al., 2015).

As a crop with relatively little direct consumption, increasing soy production raises important questions about food poverty and food security (Garrett et al., 2013). Reis (2012) found that due to increases in soy production, approximately 90% of food-insufficient families in Brazil run out of food before their incomes are received, which leads to the purchase of cheap foods for children. Similarly, new positions created in the soy sector often go to immigrants rather than to locals, as these positions require particular skills (Zoomers, 2010; Fearnside, 2008; Sawyer, 2008).

1 This issue, especially in rural areas, not only leads to poverty but also causes social
2 conflict between local people and migrants (Garrett et al., 2013). With mechanisation
3 in Argentina, for instance, much of the demand for labour has been replaced by the
4 use of sophisticated machines, while access to the job market for local low-skilled
5 farmers is limited (Phélias and Choumert, 2017). With fewer jobs available,
6 lower-skilled labourers are likely to be replaced by more skilled immigrants
7 (Phélias and Choumert, 2017). To summarise, these social issues are illustrated in
8 Table 4.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 **Insert Table 4 about Here**
20
21
22

23 **3.1.4 Linkages among economic, environmental and social challenges**

24 In our reviewed works, we found that both economic and environmental drivers
25 could result in social risks.
26
27

28 First, large-scale soy expansion driven by economic profits is associated with
29 environmental challenges. In many studies (Arima et al. 2011, Ferreira et al., 2013;
30 Gollnow and Lakes, 2014), deforestation has been linked with large-scale soy
31 expansion. Deforestation caused by soy expansion can lead to the loss of carbon
32 (Reijnders and Huijbregts, 2008), impact the level of water flow (Macedo et al. 2012;
33 Neill and Coe, 2013) and contribute to climate change (Fearnside et al., 2013).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Second, numerous social concerns have been raised as a result of the pursuit of
42 profit due to the utilisation of large areas of land for soy cultivation. In Argentina, for
43 instance, approximately 60,000 small farmers left the agricultural sector between
44 1992 and 2002, as government policy favoured larger producers (Tomei and Upham,
45 2011). As a result, approximately 60% of the soy products were produced by no more
46 than 5% of farmers (Corregido, 2008). Additionally, criticism over “land-grabbing”
47 driven by economic profitability has caused another social conflict in which land has
48 been controlled by foreigners rather than local investors (Garrett et al., 2016). Like a
49 doubled-edged sword, “land-grabbing” can be both positive and negative in some
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 circumstances.

2 On the one hand, it allows farmers to settle in urban areas or seek new
3 employment opportunities. On the other hand, it might lead to financial losses when
4 they pay more for new land or cannot find new employment opportunities (Baletti,
5 2014; Zoomers, 2010). In this sense, farmers may suffer more financial difficulties. In
6 Argentina, soy expansion led to the concentration of land ownership; the
7 concentration process resulted in a decrease in the number of smallholder farmers and
8 expansion by producers who sought to enlarge their farms (Leguizamón, 2016;
9 Murmis and Murmis, 2012). Similar examples of such issues include the
10 Brazilian-controlled land on the agro-industrial soy frontiers in Bolivia and Paraguay
11 (Hecht, 2005; Nagel, 1999).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 These investments not only lead to an increased land price but also food security
24 issues due to the production of a commodity rather than food for the local people
25 (Federación Agraria, 2007). In addition, as discussed earlier, soy cultivation
26 influences resident health, e.g., increases the risk of birth malformations, cancers, skin
27 and respiratory diseases, and other chronic illnesses due to the adoption of pesticides
28 (Tomei et al., 2010; Benachour et al., 2007). Such impacts not only influence land
29 usage but also create concerns about local employment.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Finally, in our reviewed articles, environmental challenges were linked with
38 social issues. Coalition (2016) suggested that the techniques for improving natural
39 capital should support the social licence to operate. In the context of soybean
40 production, Fearnside (2001) noticed that soy expansion affects land use for
41 subsistence agriculture and contributes little to reducing local unemployment.
42 Nevertheless, our reviewed articles also indicated that environmental challenges can
43 influence society at large. For example, Ercin (2012) found that excessive water usage
44 in soy cultivation leaves the soil with a reduced capacity to absorb water and,
45 ultimately, leads to flooding in some areas, which may influence residents' lives.
46 Furthermore, the usage of pesticides in soybean production can ultimately lead to
47 other issues (e.g., food safety and rural conflicts) that may harm the natural
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 environment (e.g., soil quality) as well as farmer health (Waldman and Kerr, 2014;
2 Mora, 2006).
3
4
5

6 **3.2 Global value chain governance** 7

8 Generally, the mechanisms that govern value chains or supply chains can be
9 classified into three types: governance through chains, governance in chains and
10 governance of chains (Bush et al., 2015).
11
12
13

14 First, normalisation needs to be considered in supply chain governance (Ponte
15 and Gibbon, 2005). That is, stakeholders external to the supply chains or value chains
16 (e.g., nongovernmental organisations (NGOs), government and suppliers) can shape
17 the chains based on the norms and practices of firms (Gibbon et al., 2008; Ponte, 2009
18 Safarzadeh and Rasti-Barzoki, 2019a, b; Sinayi and Rasti-Barzoki, 2018).
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Second, governing sustainability in chains largely emphasises the influence of
26 private firms' activities, which refers to the managerial systems based upon
27 performance indicators designed to improve the efficient governance of suppliers to
28 reduce environmental (e.g., ISO 14001) and social (e.g., SA8000) risks (Bush et al.,
29 2015; Kautto, 2006).
30
31
32
33
34

35 Finally, governance of chains refers to the conditions for market access set by
36 lead firms (e.g., downstream buyers in developed countries) to drive changes in the
37 production practices of upstream actors (e.g., smallholders in developing countries)
38 (Humphrey and Schmitz, 2002; Jeppesen and Hansen, 2004). Overall, a wide range of
39 governance mechanisms have been adopted in practice. In this paper, the first and
40 third methods of governing supply chains are discussed.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Indeed, knowledge regarding sustainability in value chains opens avenues for
49 understanding critical questions around the forms, functions, and impacts of
50 governance mechanisms (Bush et al., 2015). Therefore, both public and private actors
51 collaborate to pursue shared goals. More recently, the global value chain has been
52 increasingly concerned with transnational private governance practices and standards
53 for sustainable production in developing nations (Schouten and Bitzer, 2015).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Ingram et al. (2018: p.130) suggested that value chain analysis “provides a
2 framework for mapping and categorising the interactions, relationships, and power
3 between chain actors and the economic, social and environmental processes in chains,
4 to create a better understanding of how and where actors are positioned and benefit or
5 lose out.” In the GVC, due to production failure, buyers are playing a central role in
6 setting and enforcing standards (Humphrey and Schmitz, 2002). In such a context,
7 governance over value chains refers to the collaboration among the actors within the
8 chains and the activities and relative powers among the stakeholders within the chain
9 (Humphrey and Schmitz, 2002). Hence, such practices require a united platform for
10 actors, which allows them to implement collective standards.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Similarly, standards regarding sustainability can be found in business, civil
22 society or multi-stakeholder initiatives (MSI) for products such as cocoa, soy and
23 palm oil (Ingram et al., 2018; Schouten and Bitzer, 2015). Regulatory standards,
24 broadly, contain government or public standards and self-governance or private
25 standards. More specifically, public standards concern public goals, whereas private
26 standards concern common goals that might potentially be public (Ingram et al., 2018).
27 In other studies (Henson, 2008; Henson and Reardon, 2005; Humphrey, 2008),
28 standards in the agri-food sector perform three different functions: first, standards can
29 be adopted as mechanisms by which the public or private sector regulates their food
30 system; second, standards are a mechanism to ensure that customer demand for
31 high-quality food is satisfied or to meet environmental and ethical standards; third,
32 standards differentiate food products in food markets (Henson, 2008; Henson and
33 Reardon, 2005; Humphrey, 2008). In addition, managerial tools, such as the
34 lexicographic semi-order model (LSM) (Safarzadeh and Rasti-Barzoki, 2018) and the
35 novel linear programming model based on the flexible job-shop scheduling problem
36 (FJSP) (Safarzadeh et al., 2018), are available to improve efficiency in sustainable
37 chain governance. Overall, initiatives proposed by both public and private actors
38 promote standards for better practices.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Based on our reviewed papers, we suggest that governance mechanisms can be
2 initiated by public (i.e., national policies) or private (i.e., certification schemes) bodies.
3
4 In the following sections, both public and private certificates regarding the
5 governance of soy chains will be discussed.
6
7
8
9

10 **3.3 Public governance of soy supply chains**

11
12 In Latin American countries, soy generates considerable economic value.
13 Many laws and policies have encouraged soy expansion (Cohn and O'Rourke, 2011).
14 In Brazil's Mato Grosso state, for instance, a large amount of foreign investment to
15 expand the soy enterprise has been secured by governmental institutions (Fearnside,
16 2001). In our reviewed articles, regulations that specifically focused on regulating soy
17 production were limited. Other forms of laws are then required to regulate soy
18 production. In the following section, the national environmental regulations relevant
19 to soy production that are used for soybean chain governance are discussed.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **3.3.1 Brazilian forest code**

32
33 In Brazil, the national government aims to reduce gross deforestation in the Legal
34 Amazon by 80% by 2020 (Presidência da República, 2010). To achieve this goal, the
35 government enacted the national Forest Code (FC) to regulate the conversion of
36 forested land to agricultural land. The code requires private landowners in the
37 Amazon to maintain native plant coverage of at least 80% in forests, 35% in the
38 cerrado, and 20% in other areas (Presidência da República, 2012). Even so, the code
39 has been criticised due to its weak enforcement and because it allowed for 88 Mha of
40 legal deforestation, and the restoration requirement was reduced from 50 million to 21
41 Mha in 2012 (Gibbs et al., 2015; Soares-Filho et al., 2014). The legal deforestation in
42 the Amazon decreased from approximately 27,000 km² in 2004 to 5000 km² in 2012
43 (Tomes et al., 2017).
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 **3.3.2 REDD+**

1 In contrast to Brazil's national regulations, Reducing Emissions from
2 Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) is an international framework created
3 by the United Nations in 2013 to reduce deforestation (Meyer and Miller, 2015).
4 REDD+ is a set of policies that allow governments in countries with high GHG
5 emissions to dedicate funds to countries that seek to reduce GHG emissions by
6 maintaining or reinstating forests (Angelsen, 2008). However, the initiative has been
7 criticised since many countries have not been able to access REDD+ funding (Meyer
8 and Miller, 2015).
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 **3.4 Private governance initiatives**

20
21 Currently, due to the high transaction costs and low returns for interest groups,
22 increasing demand by customers for specific producer attributes, and increased
23 concentration of food markets, the number of certifications, standards, labels and
24 initiatives to promote sustainable production practices continues to grow (Waldman
25 and Kerr, 2014).
26
27
28
29
30

31 Different from public governance mechanisms, private multi-stakeholder
32 initiatives build dialogue across boundaries (Roberts, 2003). Similarly, García-López
33 and Arizpe (2010) suggested that these mechanisms can be classified into top-down
34 initiatives mainly conducted by large multinationals and international NGOs or
35 bottom-up initiatives organised by actors directly involved in production
36 (García-López and Arizpe, 2010). Previous studies have found that top-down
37 initiatives are less effective due to state-oriented decisions, while bottom-up
38 initiatives are more motivated to reduce the potential risks of production (Waldman
39 and Kerr, 2014; Agrawal and Chhatre, 2007; Jollands and Harmsworth, 2007).
40 Nevertheless, pressures from private interest groups are increasingly becoming
41 powerful in promoting favourable initiatives, which has been referred to as the “new
42 form of governance” (Waldman and Kerr, 2014). In coordinating with businesses,
43 NGOs are capable of establishing rules that include more responsible business
44 behaviour (Fransen and Kolk, 2007).
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 In our study, private initiatives refer to the certification schemes initiated by
2 private actors. In the soy sector, such a mechanism may include RTRS, which is used
3 to foster sustainability (e.g., deforestation reduction) (Forest Trends, 2015). However,
4 this mechanism has been criticised due to problems related to definitions, criteria, and
5 indicators that are not effectively implemented (Neeff and Linhares-Juvenal, 2017).
6 Additionally, such initiatives led by private actors are also criticised due to their
7 limited scope and geographic coverage, which makes them difficult to adopt widely
8 (Elgert, 2013). In this section, the certification schemes or standards initiated by
9 private bodies are discussed.

20 **3.4.1 Amazon Soy Moratorium**

21 The Amazon soy moratorium (ASM) was announced in 2006 and is the first
22 voluntary agreement on zero deforestation in tropical areas and has been celebrated as
23 very effective at containing Amazonian deforestation (Gibbs et al., 2015). Before
24 selling soy-related products, farmers are required to meet the criteria of the ASM
25 (ABIOVE, 2010). As a “hybrid” governance mechanism, deforestation caused by soy
26 expansion in the Amazon is prohibited by international market actors complying with
27 the regulatory tools of the states (Brown and Koeppe, 2013; Brannstrom et al., 2012).
28 Most soy producers have either complied with the soy moratorium or exited the soy
29 industry (Macedo et al., 2012; Rudorff et al., 2011; Baletti, 2014). Even so, the ASM
30 has also been criticised because its impacts on the national soy sector are limited (e.g.,
31 the ASM does not apply to the Cerrado biome, which is suffering from a higher soy
32 expansion rate than other biomes) (Gibbs et al., 2014).

33 Moratoria, as agreements between actors in the soy industry, can be very
34 effective at the local or regional scale, but it is also challenging to identify ineffective
35 activities in particular regions.

56 **3.4.2 The Round Table on Responsible Soy (RTRS)**

57 A significant number of the reviewed studies analysed the RTRS scheme. The

1 RTRS was a two-year certificate scheme developed based on the involvement of
2 multiple stakeholders that was established by the WWF in 2006 (Lernoud et al., 2016;
3 Garrett and Rausch, 2006). The certificate scheme sets generic principles and criteria
4 that can be applied to GMO, non-GMO and organic soy (Heron et al., 2018). This
5 standard concerns both environmental and social issues, which include legal
6 compliance and good business practices, responsible labour conditions, responsible
7 community relations, environmental responsibility and good agricultural practices
8 (RTRS, 2009).
9

10
11 The RTRS is a voluntary multi-stakeholder initiative intended to address social
12 and environmental issues. The RTRS creates standards that adopt third-party
13 certification to verify that producers comply with criteria and to encourage firms to
14 purchase certified products. There are five principles: “environmental responsibility”,
15 “good agricultural practices”, “responsible community relations”, “responsible labour
16 conditions” and “legal compliance and good business practices” (RTRS, 2009).
17 According to the RTRS (2009), the criteria include employee rights, land rights,
18 respect for small-scale and traditional land use, the well-being of the local population,
19 the protection of biodiversity and environmental impact mitigation, the maintenance
20 of water quality and quantity, the maintenance and improvement of soil quality, and
21 the elimination of certain banned agrochemicals.
22
23

24
25 Nevertheless, similar to other governance mechanisms, the RTRS faces
26 several challenges, including engagement with global development NGOs in a
27 standard-setting process and limited stakeholder involvement (Heron et al., 2018).
28 Although the RTRS has made an effort to promote standards by engaging small farm
29 holders, the certificate scheme was still skewed towards large-scale or well-capitalised
30 farmers (Garrett et al., 2013).
31
32

33 **3.4.3 ProTerra**

34 ProTerra is a certificate scheme developed by Cer-ID and Genetic ID in 2004
35 and 2005 and is based upon the Basel Criteria for Sustainable Soy Production (Heron
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 et al., 2018; Meyer and Cederberg, 2013). Essentially, ProTerra is a certification
2 scheme with a quality management approach, and in collaboration with the leading
3 actors in the agri-food industry, it designs standards to prevent the unsustainable use
4 of soil, pesticides, water and land (Garrett et al., 2013). The scheme requires that all
5 actors within supply chains be inspected, audited, sampled and tested before being
6 certified.
7
8
9

10
11
12 Similarly, ProTerra includes numerous common criteria for assessing
13 environmental and social performance (e.g., waste and pollution management, gender
14 equity, child labour and labour conditions) (Heron et al., 2018). However, unlike
15 RTRS, ProTerra does not allow any GM soy. Another difference lies in the methods
16 adopted for governance: ProTerra adopted the Basel Criteria principles implemented
17 by Cert-ID, while RTRS follows a “consensus-building” approach with stakeholder
18 dialogue and engagement (Heron et al., 2018; Meyer and Cederberg, 2013).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **3.4.4 Soja Plus**

30
31 Nearly one year after the adoption of the RTRS principles and criteria, another
32 major Brazilian player announced its withdrawal from the RTRS: ABIOVE. This
33 withdrawal was a serious matter for the RTRS for two reasons. First, ABIOVE had
34 been on the board of RTRS since its commencement. Second, the nine members of
35 ABIOVE (including large multinationals such as ADM, Bunge, Cargill and Louis
36 Dreyfus) together processed 72% of Brazil’s soybeans. ABIOVE left RTRS and, at the
37 same time, launched a plan to organise a new voluntary scheme in 2011 for soybean
38 producers of Brazil: Soja Plus.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Similar to RTRS, Soja Plus adopted a multi-stakeholder approach to address
49 the legal, environmental, social and agricultural dimensions of soy farming systems.
50 By referencing the RTRS standards, Soja Plus provides a methodology for regulating
51 the environmental and social practices in Brazil’s soybean sector (ABIOVE, 2010).
52 Soja Plus is a private initiative with close linkages to governmental regulations. In
53 addition to referencing the RTRS, the indicators of Soja Plus were developed on the
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 basis of the Brazilian environmental and social legislation, the ASM and the
2 International Soybean Growers Alliance (ABIOVE, 2010). Soja Plus provides tools
3 for producers in rural areas to comply with current regulations and provides technical
4 support and training for farmers to achieve social and environmental goals (ABIOVE,
5 2010). The scheme has been promoted as a private initiative to enhance national
6 regulations.
7
8
9
10
11

12 Soja Plus is different from the RTRS in three ways. First, since it lacks
13 economic viability, Soja Plus also promotes economic opportunities to avoid
14 nonessential costs and to promote economic motivations in the soy sector (ABIOVE,
15 2010). Second, unlike the RTRS, the criteria regarding reductions in GHG emissions,
16 land-use conflicts and the resolution of complaints from local communities and other
17 traditional land users are not included (Hospes, 2014). Third, unlike the RTRS, Soja
18 Plus defines itself as a standard designed for the Brazilian context rather than the
19 global context (Schouten and Bitzer, 2015).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **3.4.5 Forest-Friendly Soy Pilot Project**

32 The Nature Conservancy's (TNC) Forest-Friendly Soy Pilot Project was
33 developed to address environmental and socioeconomic issues and certify
34 forest-friendly soy for major soy buyers in Brazil in 2004 (TNC, 2004). The initiative
35 seeks to tackle deforestation in the Amazon by ensuring that soy producers comply
36 with relevant regulations (TNC, 2004). Additionally, the initiative requires farmers to
37 follow Brazil's Forest Code to tackle potential threats and secure themselves against
38 reputational risks (TNC, 2004). As this initiative mainly addresses deforestation, it is
39 limited to considering non-forest areas in agribusiness. As a result, the initiative does
40 not effectively solve the high forest bias problem or environmental issues in
41 secondary forest areas (Steward, 2007).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 In summary, as many negative issues exist in soy cultivation, efforts have been
55 made by both public and private bodies. Collectively, studies addressing the
56 relationships among these initiatives, especially the relationship between public and
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 private initiatives, are still lacking. It is unclear whether a linkage between these
2 initiatives exists. If such a linkage exists, how are the initiatives collaborating? Both
3 issues are displayed in Table 5.
4
5
6
7

8
9 **Insert Table 5 about Here**

10
11
12 Given that NGOs may provide guidelines and policies for companies to comply
13 with, implementation cannot be ensured. When governments are engaged in such
14 initiatives, the enforcement and implementation of such standards may be improved
15 and, ultimately, lead to better compliance (Kantz, 2005).
16
17
18
19
20
21

22
23 **3.5 Consequence**

24
25 Taken as a whole, the certification schemes discussed above are all designed to
26 improve the sustainability of soy production. In this section, the outcomes of the
27 initiatives are discussed.
28
29
30

31 In our reviewed certification schemes, generally, all sought to contribute to
32 sustainable and responsible soy production by promoting standards to mitigate
33 environmental and social risks (e.g., legal compliance, labour conditions, and
34 pollution management) (Heron et al., 2018). In terms of the environmental impacts,
35 these schemes are effective in making positive environmental impacts. The
36 consumption standards for agrochemicals proposed by the RTRS, for instance, are
37 reducing risks to human and animal health and the natural environment. However, the
38 macro impacts of soy cultivation (e.g., GHG calculations) cannot be mitigated by
39 certification schemes alone (Tomei et al., 2010). Likewise, the land-use conflicts
40 caused by soy production cannot be resolved by implementing voluntary standards
41 alone (Tomei et al., 2010). In summary, given that the initiatives or certification
42 schemes are attempting to promote more sustainable soy production practices, their
43 improvement of sustainability at the macro level is still questionable. It is therefore
44 suggested that future research explore how such initiatives can be more effective in
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 making macro impacts.

2 The implementation of sustainability initiatives leads to mitigation of potential
3 social risks, such as the loss of reputation or public creditability (Waldman and Kerr,
4 2014). However, it is still suggested that certification schemes (e.g., RTRS) alone are
5 insufficient to create appropriate public policies that protect health and food security
6 for the broader society without long-term policy development (Tomei et al., 2010). It
7 is challenging to measure the efficiency of certificate schemes (Cohn and D.
8 O'Rourke, 2011). Generally, the efficiency and impact of certificate schemes are
9 determined by the enforcement and implementation rate. On the one hand, from the
10 perspective of policymakers, limited funding leads to the short-term adjustment of
11 policy development, which means that private interests are usually ignored (Tomei et
12 al., 2010).

13 In addition, local priority are another influential factor in policy development and
14 implementation (Tomei et al., 2010). In Brazil, for instance, limited enforcement of
15 regulations and private supply chain initiatives led to legal deforestation (i.e., limited
16 outcomes) (Gibbs et al., 2015). Likewise, from the perspective of producers, the
17 effectiveness of supply chain initiatives depends on the degree to which supply chain
18 actors participate in collaborative efforts. In this regard, the efficiency of improving
19 environmental and social sustainability through collaborative efforts can be
20 influenced by customer awareness (Gertz, 2005), farmers' willingness to stick to the
21 scheme when the profits are more than the costs of implementation (Campbell, 2005),
22 producers' knowledge on certification schemes (Meijer, 2005) and other influential
23 factors. As producers need to consider the unclear benefits of the RTRS (Meijer,
24 2005), they may not be willing to adhere to the scheme. For these reasons, the
25 certificate adoption rate for soybeans remains low, which limits its impacts on both
26 production and policy-making processes. Following the discussions above, potential
27 barriers still exist when implementing the initiatives.

28 **3.6 Potential barriers**

1 As discussed above, in our reviewed articles, both public and private initiatives
2 can lead to more sustainable governance of soy production. However, such practices
3 are still constrained by numerous barriers that are internal or external to the
4 mechanisms. In this section, the potential barriers to these mechanisms are discussed.
5
6

7
8 The first potential barrier might be that private initiatives lack downstream
9 demand from customers (Heron et al., 2018). In this way, the organisations that
10 represent the demand of “customers” (e.g., NGOs) are making efforts to develop
11 certification schemes for soy to tackle sustainability issues (e.g., deforestation) and
12 other activities that have put pressure on supply chain actors (e.g., ASM). Even so, it
13 is still challenging to address the complex demands of various stakeholder groups
14 (Heron et al., 2018). For instance, the RTRS lacks requirements on segregation and
15 has been criticised concerning its skew towards large-scale producers (e.g., Grupo
16 Maggi), while small-scale actors are comparatively ignored due to the costly
17 certification and auditing process provided by the certificate body (Bennett, 2017).
18
19

20
21 Second, soy is a low-visibility commodity; there is no requirement for
22 identification on meat labels of the source of the soy used in raising the meat (Heron
23 et al., 2018). The coverage of sustainable certificate schemes is still limited. To date,
24 ProTerra and the RTRS are the largest and most influential soy certification schemes
25 (Van der Van et al., 2008). RTRS, for instance, only certified 1% of the soybeans in
26 the global marketplace (RTRS, 2017; Virah-Sawmy et al., 2019). In Brazil, less than 1%
27 of soy production (in terms of both production area and volume) was RTRS certified
28 in 2013 (RTRS, 2017). In a similar vein, of the total non-GMO soybean production in
29 the global agricultural market, approximately 9% was certified by ProTerra, as the
30 certification cost accounts for 5% to 10% of the price of soybeans (Garrett et al.,
31 2013). However, because the benefits (especially financial benefits) are uncertain,
32 producers are not willing to certify their products (Meijer, 2005). Additionally, as the
33 implementation of sustainability initiatives can be pushed by supply chain actors, the
34 coverage rate can be improved if the actors in the soybean chain are more willing to
35 purchase products from certified suppliers or push their suppliers to certify their
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 products. However, although a large number of soy products are used for animal feed
2 (i.e., a large number of supply chain actors can be identified in the soybean chain),
3
4 meat producers are not willing to change their upstream supply chains, as soybeans
5
6 are invisible to their consumers (i.e., they are not making efforts to certify their
7
8 suppliers) (Schouten and Glasbergen, 2012). A similar situation also occurs in other
9
10 crops (e.g., WWF's RSPO initiative for sustainable palm oil production) (Meijer,
11
12 2005). Therefore, from the customer perspective, there might be low awareness of the
13
14 certification schemes or questions about why such certification schemes are necessary.
15
16 Hence, there is a broad marketplace for uncertified soy, meaning incentives for a
17
18 transition to certified soy are undermined. Additionally, certified products are not well
19
20 differentiated from those with no labels. That said, the low demand or weak
21
22 awareness of the certification schemes and sustainable soy production in the
23
24 marketplace is another barrier to the implementation of such schemes.
25
26

27 In other studies, a potential barrier from the external institutional environment
28
29 might be that MSIs (especially private initiatives) can conflict with national
30
31 regulations or other existing standards. One example of this is that in Brazil, the
32
33 planned reform of the national forestry code (NFC) increases the cost for soybean
34
35 producers to participate in the RTRS. In this sense, once again, small-scale soy
36
37 producers have more difficulties complying with the certificate scheme due to the
38
39 higher costs of compliance (Schleifer, 2016). Likewise, a conflict might occur when
40
41 the regulations conflict with the definitions in the current legislation or industrial
42
43 standards when producers adopt or comply with more sustainable practices (Meyer
44
45 and Miller, 2015). In these cases, the compliance or implementation of MSIs,
46
47 especially private initiatives, can be "constrained" by existing formal institutions.
48
49 However, the understanding of how certificate designers can identify and mitigate the
50
51 risks of conflicting with existing institutions is still limited.
52
53
54
55

56 **4. Towards a conceptual framework**

58 Based on the above discussions, in the following section, a conceptual
59
60

1 framework regarding the themes and their relationships is demonstrated in our
2 proposed framework.
3

4
5
6 **Insert Figure 4 about Here**
7
8
9

10 As shown in Figure 4, on the left side of the framework, the drivers of
11 implementation of sustainable value chain governance mechanisms (i.e., economic,
12 environmental and social challenges) are illustrated. The proposed model also
13 indicates the linkage between economic and environmental challenges (e.g.,
14 deforestation is mainly caused by soy expansion for economic profits). Additionally,
15 we found that both economic and environmental drivers lead to numerous social risks
16 (e.g., soy expansion driven by cost reduction leads to the employment of forced
17 labour, while land-use conflict leads to negative impacts on the livelihood of farmers
18 in rural areas).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Both public and private initiatives have been used to tackle these challenges.
30 As both types of mechanisms have their advantages and drawbacks, they also
31 influence each other. Soja Plus, for instance, was developed by referencing national
32 regulations. Vermeulen et al. (2008) and Altenburg (2007) suggested that among
33 public regulations, taxation policies, national regulations, trade policies and
34 regulations of property rights may influence firms' attitudes towards sustainability
35 initiatives. That said, an external institutional environment can affect or shape the
36 acceptance or implementation of non-state standards.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Based on the discussions above, it was found that both mechanisms interacted
47 with each other. On the one hand, as a traditional governance mechanism, country
48 policy provides an institutional environment before the implementation of standards
49 initiated by private bodies. On the other hand, private initiatives fill the gaps existing
50 in public initiatives, while public regulations provide an institutional environment for
51 private initiatives. Therefore, we suggest that there is an inter-linkage between public
52 and private initiatives. On the right side of this framework, the outcome of these
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 practices (i.e., sustainability) is presented. However, the outcomes are potentially
2 influenced by the two moderating factors of the limitations of market conditions and
3 the mechanisms.
4
5
6
7

8 **5. Managerial implications and research agenda**

9

10 Based on our review of the existing literature, thematic analyses are illustrated
11 above. However, this study sought to develop a holistic review of the existing
12 literature as well as to open avenues for future studies. In this section, directions for
13 future research and implications for policymakers and managers are presented.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **5.2 Future research directions**

22

23 Many of the abovementioned certificate schemes (e.g., RTRS) were designed
24 to tackle environmental and social issues in soybean production. In this context, a
25 considerable number of studies have focused on the ecological system surrounding
26 soybean production, and many of these issues (e.g., deforestation) have been
27 explicitly discussed, while research on the social aspects of sustainability lags behind.
28 More specifically, in our reviewed articles, food safety, loss of reputation, child labour
29 and other social issues still exist in the soybean sector (Waldman and Kerr, 2014;
30 Newton et al., 2013). Although a couple of social impacts have been identified, few
31 studies have investigated the strategies for how these impacts can be mitigated.
32 Therefore, we suggest that more studies can focus on social sustainability in the
33 soybean supply chain.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 First, as discussed earlier, the challenges caused by soybean production in
47 Brazil and China are numerous. In our reviewed works, comparative studies
48 addressing the challenges caused by unsustainable soybean production in
49 multinational contexts were absent. Thus, it is suggested in this study that future
50 research should attempt to investigate such complex phenomena more holistically and
51 to discuss the issues caused by unsustainable soybean production in a global context.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Second, most of the studies in our reviewed literature, such as Heron (2018),
2 Fearnside (2001) and Fearnside (2003), were conducted based on the Brazilian
3 context, followed by Argentina. However, other producing countries, such as the USA,
4 China, and Bolivia, are major soybean producers, and research in these countries is
5 still limited. Cross-country comparisons are rarely observed. Hence, we argued that
6 the studies conducted in these countries and across different countries were important
7 directions for future research.
8
9

10 Third, although many studies have addressed the negative impacts of soy
11 cultivation, questions regarding how positive influences are initiated by these
12 activities and regulatory standards remain unanswered. Additionally, as mentioned
13 earlier, both public and private initiatives have their advantages and drawbacks. After
14 reviewing the existing literature, we noticed that private initiatives play a
15 supplementary role in sustainable soy supply chain management at the early stages,
16 while public initiatives provide guidance for the private initiatives (i.e., private
17 initiatives need to be developed under regulations proposed by governmental
18 organisations). However, questions regarding how public and private initiatives are
19 making collaborative efforts to promote sustainability in the soy sector remain
20 unanswered.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Fourth, in our reviewed literature, we noticed that WWF's RTRS certificate
38 scheme was the most studied, followed by ProTerra and Soja Plus. In existing works,
39 we noticed that TNC's Forest-Friendly Soy Pilot Project, the Danube Soy Initiative
40 and other initiatives were rarely covered. However, studies have shown that TNC's
41 initiative in the sustainable soy sector is one of the main initiatives improving
42 environmental protection practices (Steward, 2007). Nonetheless, the studies related
43 to this certification scheme are limited. Hence, we suggest that more studies can be
44 conducted on other alternative initiatives rather than the ones we reviewed in this
45 work. In addition, studies addressing the relationships among these initiatives,
46 especially in the multinational context and those between public and private initiatives,
47 are still lacking. It is unclear whether there is a linkage between these initiatives. If
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 there is a linkage, how do these initiatives collaborate? Future research can investigate
2 these topics.
3

4 Fifth, according to the proposed conceptual model and reviewed literature, it
5 was illustrated that the market demand and limitations of the sustainability initiatives
6 in the soybean sector influenced the implementation of public and private initiatives.
7 However, it is still unclear how these barriers influence the effectiveness of the
8 initiatives and the consequences. Hence, in line with this, more studies may be
9 devoted to addressing the potential barriers to sustainability initiatives in the soybean
10 sector and the degree to which these barriers influence the efficiency of value chain
11 governance. Similarly, as discussed earlier, three types of challenges were identified
12 as the drivers of sustainable value chain governance. The reviewed articles did not
13 provide detailed discussions about the relationship between economic, environmental
14 and social challenges. In this regard, more studies can be carried out to explore the
15 relationship between these aspects of the challenges.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Sixth, as a tool to assess the environmental impacts of a product, life cycle
30 assessment (LCA) can also be used to assess soybean production. Griffing et al. (2006)
31 carried out an LCA case study on processing soybeans into soybean oil and suggested
32 the utilisation of LCA as a tool for material selection and process improvement.
33 However, as for other agricultural products, the application of LCA to estimate all
34 aspects of production is challenging due to the complicated agricultural system and
35 dynamic external issues (e.g., climate and soil quality) (Eranksi et al., 2019). Under the
36 context of soybean production, as soybeans can be processed into a wide range of
37 products, future studies might pay more attention to the application of LCA for
38 cleaner production of soybean products (e.g., soy sauce) and better assessments of the
39 production process for soybean products (e.g., transportation of soy milk).
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Finally, in our reviewed articles, we found that prior works largely adopted
53 case studies and modelling as methodologies, while other methods (e.g., surveys) or
54 quantitative secondary data were relatively rarely used. Therefore, we also suggest
55 that more studies adopt other methods rather than case studies and modelling in the
56
57
58
59
60

1 future. To summarise, the research gaps and directions for future study are illustrated
2 in Table 6.
3
4
5

6 **Insert Table 6 about Here**
7
8
9

10 **5.2 Managerial implications**

11 As discussed earlier, the challenges in soy-producing countries vary. Hence, the
12 dimensions of “sustainability” can be defined by policymakers and managers in
13 different ways.
14
15
16
17

18 First, from an international trade perspective, Taherzadeh and Caro (2019) found
19 that approximately one-third of the water and land consumption of soybean
20 production was driven by international trade, of which 70% was used for animal feed,
21 one-fourth (24%) was used in food products and only 2% was lost in the distribution
22 of the soybeans. In this regard, “sustainability” under the context of international trade
23 stands for mechanisms that reduce water wastage during the process of animal feed
24 and food production. Additionally, in South America (especially in Brazil),
25 unsustainable soy expansion has led to deforestation, land-use conflict and other
26 relevant issues (e.g., GHG emissions, centralisation of land and financial difficulties
27 for farmers). In line with this, “sustainability” refers to cleaner production tackling
28 deforestation and well-balanced land use considering the ecological and social
29 impacts.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Second, in Argentina, as more labour-replacing positions have been introduced
44 during soy expansion, access to land (Leguizamón, 2016; Murmis and Murmis, 2012)
45 and the job market for low-skilled local farmers are limited (Phélias and Choumert,
46 2017). Hence, in Argentina, “sustainability” for policymakers refers to more
47 well-balanced land use regulations, more opportunities for low-skill farmers and a
48 “smooth” transition for farmers (e.g., from low-skilled to high-skilled labour) and the
49 soybean industry (e.g., from a labour intensive to capital intensive industry). Likewise,
50 land-use conflict also occurs in Bolivia and Paraguay and requires policymakers to
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 develop more effective regulations. In China, large-scale soy production led to the
2 degradation of water and soil, GHG emissions and biodiversity losses (Schneider,
3 2014; Yan et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2019), which means that shifting to cleaner or more
4 sustainable soy production poses the main challenge.
5
6

7
8 Third, from the perspective of the managers in the soybean sector, public and
9 private initiatives have their advantages and drawbacks. Specifically, public standards
10 are more likely to concern public goals, while private initiatives are more likely to
11 address the concerns that could be potentially addressed by the public (Ingram et al.,
12 2018). In these senses, public initiatives are more powerful to implement, whereas
13 private initiatives are more customer oriented. In this sense, managers can take
14 advantage of two types of sustainability initiatives to develop well-balanced and
15 certified production systems. Additionally, a wide range of techniques has been
16 adopted to increase yields and achieve more sustainable production, which includes
17 GM soybean production (Qaim and Traxler, 2005; Zak et al., 2008) and no-till
18 cultivation (Huggins and Reganold, 2008). Hence, overall, managers in the soybean
19 sector can use existing standards and techniques to improve the yields and
20 sustainability of their production, while the application of LCA is desirable to
21 promote cleaner production.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 38 39 **6. Conclusions** 40

41 In this study, we performed a systematic review of sustainable soybean supply
42 chain management. After reviewing the existing literature, this study identified the
43 following themes: drivers (i.e., economic, environmental and social challenges), soy
44 value chain governance, mechanisms (i.e., public and private initiatives),
45 consequences and potential barriers. Furthermore, as the relationships among the
46 themes were identified, a conceptual framework was proposed. Finally, several gaps
47 and implications for the existing knowledge have been identified to provide directions
48 for future research.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 The theoretical contribution of this study was threefold. First, it might be the
2 first holistic literature review to discuss sustainable soybean supply chains. Second,
3 after reviewing the existing literature, a conceptual framework was proposed, which
4 contributes to deepening the understanding of sustainability issues in soybean supply
5 chain management. Finally, considering the gaps identified in existing knowledge,
6 this review paper also provided numerous directions for future studies.
7
8
9

10
11
12 However, this study is not without limitations. First, our reviewed certification
13 and other regulatory standards only consisted of initiatives developed in soy exporting
14 countries, and we did not consider those developed by soy importing countries.
15
16 Second, in terms of language selection, our selected literature was limited to English.
17
18 However, a certain number of studies in other languages (e.g., Portuguese) were
19 excluded from this paper. Therefore, future studies should include existing literature
20 written in these languages. Third, our proposed conceptual framework was developed
21 based on the reviewed articles rather than on empirical data. Hence, it is suggested
22 that future work can carry out empirical studies to test the proposed conceptual model.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **Acknowledgements**

33
34 This research was supported by Zhejiang Provincial Natural Science Foundation of
35 China under Grant No. LY19E080006; the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation
36 (No.: 2018M642391); the Ministry of Education of Humanities and Social Sciences
37 project (Grant number: 17YJA630034) and the Natural Science Foundation of Fujian
38 Province of China (No. 2017J01519).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **References**

- 47
48 Agrawal, A. and Chhatre, A., 2007. State involvement and forest co-governance:
49 evidence from the Indian Himalayas. *Studies in Comparative International*
50 *Development*, 42(1-2), pp.67-86.
51
52 Altenburg, T., 2007. Donor approaches to supporting pro-poor value chains. Report
53 prepared for the Donor Committee for Enterprise Development: Working Group
54 of Linkages and Value Chains, German Development Institute, [www.](http://www.enterprise-development.org)
55 [enterprise-development.org](http://www.enterprise-development.org).
56
57 Angelsen, 2008 *Moving Ahead with REDD: Issues, Options and Implications*. CIFOR
58
59 Arima, E.Y., Richards, P., Walker, R. and Caldas, M.M., 2011. Statistical confirmation
60
61
62
63
64
65

- of indirect land use change in the Brazilian Amazon. *Environmental Research Letters*, 6(2), p.024010.
- 1
2
3 Arizpe, N., Ramos-Martín, J. and Giampietro, M., 2014. An assessment of the
4 metabolic profile implied by agricultural change in two rural communities in the
5 North of Argentina. *Environment, development and sustainability*, 16(4),
6 pp.903-924.
7
- 8 Astoviza, M.J., Cappelletti, N., Bilos, C., Migoya, M.C. and Colombo, J.C., 2016.
9 Massive airborne Endosulfan inputs related to intensive agriculture in
10 Argentina's Pampa. *Chemosphere*, 144, pp.1459-1466.
11
- 12 Azadi, H. and Ho, P., 2010. Genetically modified and organic crops in developing
13 countries: A review of options for food security. *Biotechnology advances*, 28(1),
14 pp.160-168.
15
- 16 Baletti, B., 2014. Saving the Amazon? Sustainable soy and the new
17 extractivism. *Environment and Planning A*, 46(1), pp.5-25.
18
- 19 Barry, M., Cashore, B., Clay, J., Fernandez, M., Lebel, L., Lyon, T., Mallet, P., Matus,
20 K.J., Melchett, P., Vandenberg, M. and Vis, J.K., 2012. Toward sustainability:
21 the roles and limits of certification.
22
- 23 Benachour, N., Sipahutar, H., Moslemi, S., Gasnier, C., Travert, C. and Séralini, G.E.,
24 2007. Time-and dose-dependent effects of roundup on human embryonic and
25 placental cells. *Archives of environmental contamination and toxicology*, 53(1),
26 pp.126-133.
27
- 28 Bennett, E.A., 2017. Who governs socially-oriented voluntary sustainability standards?
29 Not the producers of certified products. *World Development*, 91, pp.53-69.
30
- 31 Berry, A., 2017. *Losing ground in the employment challenge: the case of Paraguay*.
32 Routledge.
33
- 34 Biermann, F.; Chan, M.; Mert, A.; Pattberg, P. *Multistakeholder Partnerships for*
35 *Sustainable Development: Does the Promise Hold? In Partnerships, Governance*
36 *and Sustainable Development: Reflections on Theory and Practice*; Glasbergen,
37 P., Biermann, F., Mol, A.P.J., Eds.; Edward Elgar: Cheltenham, UK, 2007; pp.
38 239–260.
39
- 40 Biolchini, J., Mian, P.G., Natali, A.C.C. and Travassos, G.H., 2005. Systematic review
41 in software engineering. *System Engineering and Computer Science Department*
42 *COPPE/UFRJ, Technical Report ES, 679(05)*, p.45.
43
- 44 Bitzer, V.; Glasbergen, P.; Arts, B. Exploring the potential of intersectoral
45 partnerships to improve the position of farmers in global agrifood chains:
46 Findings from the coffee sector in Peru. *Agric. Hum. Values* 2013, 30, 5–20.
47
- 48 Borzoni, M., 2011. Multi-scale integrated assessment of soybean biodiesel in
49 Brazil. *Ecological Economics*, 70(11), pp.2028-2038.
50
- 51 Brannstrom, C., Rausch, L., Brown, J.C., de Andrade, R.M.T. and Miccolis, A., 2012.
52 Compliance and market exclusion in Brazilian agriculture: Analysis and
53 implications for “soft” governance. *Land use policy*, 29(2), pp.357-366.
54
- 55 Brown, J.C. and Koeppe, M., 2013. Debates in the Environmentalist Community: The
56 soy moratorium and the construction of illegal soybeans in the Brazilian
57 Amazon.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Burachik, M., 2010. Experience from use of GMOs in Argentinian agriculture,
2 economy and environment. *New biotechnology*, 27(5), pp.588-592.
- 3 Buratti, C., Barbanera, M. and Fantozzi, F., 2012. A comparison of the European
4 renewable energy directive default emission values with actual values from
5 operating biodiesel facilities for sunflower, rape and soya oil seeds in
6 Italy. *Biomass and bioenergy*, 47, pp.26-36.
- 7
8 Bush, S.R., Oosterveer, P., Bailey, M. and Mol, A.P., 2015. Sustainability governance
9 of chains and networks: A review and future outlook. *Journal of Cleaner
10 Production*, 107, pp.8-19.
- 11
12 Campbell, H., 2005. The rise and rise of EurepGAP: European (re) invention of
13 colonial food relations. *International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and
14 Food*, 13(2), pp.1-19.
- 15
16 Coalition, N.C., 2016. Natural capital protocol. More info on the Natural Capital
17 Protocol <http://naturalcapitalcoalition.org/protocol/>: ICAEW.
- 18
19 Cohn, A.S. and O'Rourke, D., 2011. Agricultural certification as a conservation tool in
20 Latin America. *Journal of Sustainable Forestry*, 30(1-2), pp.158-186.
- 21
22 Corregido, E.M., 2008. A speech to the Argentine senate.
- 23
24 Cunha, R.C. and Espíndola, C.J., 2015. A dinâmica geoeconômica recente da cadeia
25 produtiva da soja no Brasil e no mundo. *GeoTextos*, 11(1).
- 26
27 da Silva, M.A.V. and Marcio de Almeida, D.A., 2013. A model to estimate the
28 origin–destination matrix for soybean exportation in Brazil. *Journal of Transport
29 Geography*, 26, pp.97-107.
- 30
31 Da Silva, V.P., van der Werf, H.M., Spies, A. and Soares, S.R., 2010. Variability in
32 environmental impacts of Brazilian soybean according to crop production and
33 transport scenarios. *Journal of environmental management*, 91(9), pp.1831-1839.
- 34
35 Dellas, E. Partnerships for Sustainable Development in the Water Sector:
36 Privatization, Participation and Legitimacy. In *Public-Private Partnerships for
37 Sustainable Development: Emergence, Influence and Legitimacy*; Pattberg, P.,
38 Delvenne, P., Vasen, F. and Vara, A.M., 2013. The “soy-ization” of Argentina: The
39 dynamics of the “globalized” privatization regime in a peripheral
40 context. *Technology in Society*, 35(2), pp.153-162.
- 41
42 Elgert, L., 2016. ‘More soy on fewer farms’ in Paraguay: challenging neoliberal
43 agriculture's claims to sustainability. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 43(2),
44 pp.537-561.
- 45
46 Elkington, J., 1998. Partnerships from cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of
47 21st- century business. *Environmental quality management*, 8(1), pp.37-51.
- 48
49 Elsevier.com. (2019). Scopus | The largest database of peer-reviewed literature |
50 Elsevier. [online] Available at: <https://www.elsevier.com/en-gb/solutions/scopus>.
- 51
52 Eranki, P.L., Devkota, J. and Landis, A.E., 2019. Carbon footprint of corn-soy-oats
53 rotations in the US Midwest using data from real biological farm management
54 practices. *Journal of cleaner production*, 210, pp.170-180.
- 55
56 Ercin, A.E., Aldaya, M.M. and Hoekstra, A.Y., 2012. The water footprint of soy milk
57 and soy burger and equivalent animal products. *Ecological indicators*, 18,
58 pp.392-402.
- 59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Ercin, A.E., Aldaya, M.M. and Hoekstra, A.Y., 2012. The water footprint of soy milk
2 and soy burger and equivalent animal products. *Ecological indicators*, 18,
3 pp.392-402.
- 4 FCO Programme Budget Project Bidding Form: Amazonian Deforestation – Tackling
5 a Root Cause and Contributing to Brazil’s Economic Prosperity through Soya
6 Certificatio. (2014). Arlington, Virginia: TNC (The Nature Conservancy).
- 7 Fearnside, P.M., 2001. Soybean cultivation as a threat to the environment in
8 Brazil. *Environmental Conservation*, 28(1), pp.23-38.
- 9 Fearnside, P.M., 2008. The roles and movements of actors in the deforestation of
10 Brazilian Amazonia. *Ecology and society*, 13(1).
- 11 Fearnside, P.M., Figueiredo, A.M. and Bonjour, S.C., 2013. Amazonian forest loss and
12 the long reach of China’s influence. *Environment, Development and*
13 *Sustainability*, 15(2), pp.325-338.
- 14 Ferreira, M.E., Ferreira Jr, L.G., Latrubesse, E.M. and Mizziara, F., 2016.
15 Considerations about the land use and conversion trends in the savanna
16 environments of Central Brazil under a geomorphological perspective. *Journal of*
17 *Land Use Science*, 11(1), pp.33-47.
- 18 Filomeno, F.A., 2013. State capacity and intellectual property regimes: Lessons from
19 South American soybean agriculture. *Technology in Society*, 35(2), pp.139-152.
- 20 Fransen, L.W. and Kolk, A., 2007. Global rule-setting for business: A critical analysis
21 of multi-stakeholder standards. *Organization*, 14(5), pp.667-684.
- 22 García-López, G.A. and Arizpe, N., 2010. Participatory processes in the soy conflicts
23 in Paraguay and Argentina. *Ecological Economics*, 70(2), pp.196-206.
- 24 Garrett, R.D. and Rausch, L.L., 2016. Green for gold: social and ecological trade-offs
25 influencing the sustainability of the Brazilian soy industry. *The Journal of*
26 *Peasant Studies*, 43(2), pp.461-493.
- 27 Garrett, R.D., Lambin, E.F. and Naylor, R.L., 2013. The new economic geography of
28 land use change: Supply chain configurations and land use in the Brazilian
29 Amazon. *Land Use Policy*, 34, pp.265-275.
- 30 Garrett, R.D., Rueda, X. and Lambin, E.F., 2013. Globalization’s unexpected impact
31 on soybean production in South America: linkages between preferences for
32 non-genetically modified crops, eco-certifications, and land use. *Environmental*
33 *Research Letters*, 8(4), p.044055.
- 34 Gertz, R., 2005. Eco-labelling—a case for deregulation? *Law, Probability and*
35 *Risk*, 4(3), pp.127-141.
- 36 Gibbs, H.K., Rausch, L., Munger, J., Schelly, I., Morton, D.C., Noojipady, P.,
37 Soares-Filho, B., Barreto, P., Micol, L. and Walker, N.F., 2015. Brazil's soy
38 moratorium. *Science*, 347(6220), pp.377-378.
- 39 Goldsmith, P.D., Li, B., Fruin, J.E. and Hirsch, R., 2004. Global shifts in
40 agro-industrial capital and the case of soybean crushing: implications for
41 managers and policy makers. *International Food and Agribusiness Management*
42 *Review*, 7(1030-2016-82664), pp.87-115.
- 43 Gollnow, F. and Lakes, T., 2014. Policy change, land use, and agriculture: The case of
44 soy production and cattle ranching in Brazil, 2001–2012. *Applied Geography*, 55,

pp.203-211.

- 1
2 Gonzalez, M., Miglioranza, K.S., Aizpún, J.E., Isla, F.I. and Peña, A., 2010. Assessing
3 pesticide leaching and desorption in soils with different agricultural activities
4 from Argentina (Pampa and Patagonia). *Chemosphere*, 81(3), pp.351-358.
- 5 Gregoratti, C. Global nuts and local mangoes: A critical reading of the UNDP
6 Growing Sustainable Business Initiative in Kenya. *Agric. Hum. Values* 2011, 28,
7 369–383.
- 8
9 Gryson, N., Eeckhout, M., Trouillier, A., Le Bail, M. and Soler, L.G., 2009. Strategies
10 for coexistence of GM and non-GM soy from import to feed
11 processing. *Environmental biosafety research*, 8(3), pp.153-159.
- 12
13 Hairong, Y., Yiyuan, C. and Bun, K.H., 2016. China's soybean crisis: the logic of
14 modernization and its discontents. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 43(2),
15 pp.373-395.
- 16
17 He, R., Zhu, D., Chen, X., Cao, Y., Chen, Y. and Wang, X., 2019. How the trade
18 barrier changes environmental costs of agricultural production: An implication
19 derived from China's demand for soybean caused by the US-China trade
20 war. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 227, pp.578-588.
- 21
22 Hecht, S.B., 2005. Soybeans, development and conservation on the Amazon
23 frontier. *Development and Change*, 36(2), pp.375-404.
- 24
25 Heron, T., Prado, P. and West, C., 2018. Global Value Chains and the Governance of
26 'Embedded' Food Commodities: The Case of Soy. *Global Policy*, 9, pp.29-37.
- 27
28 Hinrichs, C.C., 2003. The practice and politics of food system localization. *Journal of*
29 *rural studies*, 19(1), pp.33-45.
- 30
31 Hospes, O., 2014. Marking the success or end of global multi-stakeholder governance?
32 The rise of national sustainability standards in Indonesia and Brazil for palm oil
33 and soy. *Agriculture and human values*, 31(3), pp.425-437.
- 34
35 Huggins, D.R. and Reganold, J.P., 2008. No-till: the quiet revolution. *Scientific*
36 *American*, 299(1), pp.70-77.
- 37
38 Humphrey, J. and Schmitz, H., 2002. How does insertion in global value chains affect
39 upgrading in industrial clusters? *Regional studies*, 36(9), pp.1017-1027.
- 40
41 Humphrey, J., 2008. Private standards, small farmers and donor policy: EUREPGAP
42 in Kenya.
- 43
44 Ingram, V., van Den Berg, J., van Oorschot, M., Arets, E. and Judge, L., 2018.
45 Governance options to enhance ecosystem services in cocoa, soy, tropical timber
46 and palm oil value chains. *Environmental management*, 62(1), pp.128-142.
- 47
48 Jeppesen, S. and Hansen, M.W., 2004. Environmental upgrading of third world
49 enterprises through linkages to transnational corporations. *Theoretical*
50 *perspectives and preliminary evidence. Business Strategy and the*
51 *Environment*, 13(4), pp.261-274.
- 52
53 Jia, F., Zuluaga-Cardona, L., Bailey, A. and Rueda, X., 2018. Sustainable supply chain
54 management in developing countries: An analysis of the literature. *Journal of*
55 *Cleaner Production*, 189, pp.263-278.
- 56
57 Jollands, N. and Harmsworth, G., 2007. Participation of indigenous groups in
58 sustainable development monitoring: Rationale and examples from New
59

- Zealand. *Ecological Economics*, 62(3-4), pp.716-726.
- 1 Kamali, F.P., Meuwissen, M.P., de Boer, I.J., van Middelaar, C.E., Moreira, A. and
2 Lansink, A.G.O., 2017. Evaluation of the environmental, economic, and social
3 performance of soybean farming systems in southern Brazil. *Journal of cleaner
4 production*, 142, pp.385-394.
- 5
6
7 Kantz, C. 2005. *The Kimberley Process: Public-Private Partnerships as Effective
8 Tools for Regulating Transnational Conflicts?*
- 9
10 Kautto, P., 2006. New instruments–old practices? The implications of environmental
11 management systems and extended producer responsibility for design for the
12 environment. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 15(6), pp.377-388.
- 13
14 Lal, R., Reicosky, D.C. and Hanson, J.D., 2007. Evolution of the plow over 10,000
15 years and the rationale for no-till farming.
- 16
17 Lambin, E.F., Gibbs, H.K., Heilmayr, R., Carlson, K.M., Fleck, L.C., Garrett, R.D., de
18 Waroux, Y.L.P., McDermott, C.L., McLaughlin, D., Newton, P. and Nolte, C.,
19 2018. The role of supply-chain initiatives in reducing deforestation. *Nature
20 Climate Change*, 8(2), p.109.
- 21
22 Leguizamón, A., 2016. Disappearing nature? Agribusiness, biotechnology and
23 distance in Argentine soybean production. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 43(2),
24 pp.313-330.
- 25
26 Lernoud, J., Potts, J., Sampson, G., Voora, V., Willer, H. and Wozniak, J., 2016. *The
27 state of sustainable markets-statistics and emerging trends 2015*.
- 28
29 Li, Y., Griffing, E., Higgins, M. and Overcash, M., 2006. Life cycle assessment of
30 soybean oil production. *Journal of food process engineering*, 29(4), pp.429-445.
- 31
32 Linhares-Juvenal, T. and Neeff, T.I.L.L., 2017. Definitions matter: Zero deforestation
33 concepts and performance indicators. *Zero Deforestation: A Commitment to
34 Change*; Pasiecznik, N., Savenije, H., Eds, pp.3-10.
- 35
36 Liu, W., Wang, J., Sun, L., Wang, T., Li, C. and Chen, B., 2019. Sustainability
37 evaluation of soybean-corn rotation systems in the Loess Plateau region of
38 Shaanxi, China. *Journal of cleaner production*, 210, pp.1229-1237.
- 39
40 Macedo, M.N., DeFries, R.S., Morton, D.C., Stickler, C.M., Galford, G.L. and
41 Shimabukuro, Y.E., 2012. Decoupling of deforestation and soy production in the
42 southern Amazon during the late 2000s. *Proceedings of the National Academy of
43 Sciences*, 109(4), pp.1341-1346.
- 44
45 Macedo, M.N., DeFries, R.S., Morton, D.C., Stickler, C.M., Galford, G.L. and
46 Shimabukuro, Y.E., 2012. Decoupling of deforestation and soy production in the
47 southern Amazon during the late 2000s. *Proceedings of the National Academy of
48 Sciences*, 109(4), pp.1341-1346.
- 49
50
51 Marcelino, L., 2013. *Shifting the debate about ‘responsible soy production in
52 Paraguay. A critical analysis of five claims about environmental, economic, and
53 social sustainability*. Department for International Development, London, UK.
- 54
55 Markelova, H.; Meinzen-Dick, R.; Hellin, J.; Dohrn, S. *Collective action for
56 smallholder market access*. *Collect. Action Smallhold. Mark. Access* 2009, 34,
57 1–7.
- 58
59 Masi, F. and Díaz, F.R., 2017. The role of international trade in growth and
60

- 1 employment generation in Paraguay. In *Losing Ground in the Employment*
2 *Challenge* (pp. 215-239). Routledge.
- 3 Mathews, J.A. and Goldsztein, H., 2009. Capturing latecomer advantages in the
4 adoption of biofuels: the case of Argentina. *Energy Policy*, 37(1), pp.326-337.
- 5 Mattsson, B., Cederberg, C. and Blix, L., 2000. Agricultural land use in life cycle
6 assessment (LCA): case studies of three vegetable oil crops. *Journal of Cleaner*
7 *Production*, 8(4), pp.283-292.
- 8
9
10 McCarthy, J. *Devolution in the Woods: Community forestry as hybrid neoliberalism.*
11 *Environ. Plan. A* 2005, 37, 995–1014.
- 12 McKay, B.M., 2018. Control grabbing and value-chain agriculture: BRICS, MICs and
13 Bolivia's soy complex. *Globalizations*, 15(1), pp.74-91.
- 14
15 Medina, G. and dos Santos, A.P., 2017. Curbing enthusiasm for Brazilian agribusiness:
16 The use of actor-specific assessments to transform sustainable development on
17 the ground. *Applied Geography*, 85, pp.101-112.
- 18
19 Medina, G., Almeida, C., Novaes, E., Godar, J. and Pokorny, B., 2015. Development
20 conditions for family farming: lessons from Brazil. *World Development*, 74,
21 pp.386-396.
- 22
23 Meijer, K.S., 2015. A comparative analysis of the effectiveness of four supply chain
24 initiatives to reduce deforestation. *Tropical Conservation Science*, 8(2),
25 pp.583-597.
- 26
27 Meyer, C. and Miller, D., 2015. Zero deforestation zones: The case for linking
28 deforestation-free supply chain initiatives and jurisdictional REDD+. *Journal of*
29 *Sustainable Forestry*, 34(6-7), pp.559-580.
- 30
31 Meyer, D. and Cederberg, C., 2013. Certification Schemes (RTRS and ProTerra) in
32 Brazilian Soy, Use of pesticides and cropping systems. SIK Research Report 865.
- 33
34 Morton, D.C., DeFries, R.S., Shimabukuro, Y.E., Anderson, L.O., Arai, E., del Bon
35 Espirito-Santo, F., Freitas, R. and Morissette, J., 2006. Cropland expansion
36 changes deforestation dynamics in the southern Brazilian Amazon. *Proceedings*
37 *of the National Academy of Sciences*, 103(39), pp.14637-14641.
- 38
39
40 Murmis, M. and Murmis, M.R., 2012. Land concentration and foreign land ownership
41 in Argentina in the context of global land grabbing. *Canadian Journal of*
42 *Development Studies/Revue canadienne d'études du développement*, 33(4),
43 pp.490-508.
- 44
45 Nagel, B.Y., 1999. "Unleashing the fury": The cultural discourse of rural violence and
46 land rights in Paraguay. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 41(1),
47 pp.148-181.
- 48
49 Neill, C., Coe, M.T., Riskin, S.H., Krusche, A.V., Elsenbeer, H., Macedo, M.N.,
50 McHorney, R., Lefebvre, P., Davidson, E.A., Scheffler, R. and Figueira,
51 A.M.E.S., 2013. Watershed responses to Amazon soya bean cropland expansion
52 and intensification. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B:*
53 *Biological Sciences*, 368(1619), p.20120425.
- 54
55
56 Newton, P., Agrawal, A. and Wollenberg, L., 2013. Enhancing the sustainability of
57 commodity supply chains in tropical forest and agricultural landscapes. *Global*
58 *Environmental Change*, 23(6), pp.1761-1772.
- 59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Oliveira, G.D.L. and Schneider, M., 2016. The politics of flexing soybeans: China,
2 Brazil and global agro-industrial restructuring. *The Journal of Peasant*
3 *Studies*, 43(1), pp.167-194.
- 4 Oliveira, G.D.L., 2016. The geopolitics of Brazilian soybeans. *The Journal of Peasant*
5 *Studies*, 43(2), pp.348-372.
- 6
7 Pellegrini, P.A., 2013. What risks and for whom? Argentina's regulatory policies and
8 global commercial interests in GMOs. *Technology in Society*, 35(2), pp.129-138.
- 9
10 Pengue, W.A., 2009. Economic–environmental issues of the agricultural
11 transformations in the Pampas. *Problemas del desarrollo*, 40(157), pp.137-161.
- 12
13 Phélinas, P. and Choumert, J., 2017. Is GM Soybean cultivation in Argentina
14 sustainable? *World Development*, 99, pp.452-462.
- 15
16 Ponte, S. and Gibbon, P., 2005. Quality standards, conventions and the governance of
17 global value chains. *Economy and society*, 34(1), pp.1-31.
- 18
19 Ponte, S., 2009. Governing through quality: conventions and supply relations in the
20 value chain for South African wine. *Sociologia ruralis*, 49(3), pp.236-257.
- 21
22 Qaim, M. and Traxler, G., 2005. Roundup Ready soybeans in Argentina: farm level
23 and aggregate welfare effects. *Agricultural economics*, 32(1), pp.73-86.
- 24
25 Reijnders, L. and Huijbregts, M.A.J., 2008. Biogenic greenhouse gas emissions linked
26 to the life cycles of biodiesel derived from European rapeseed and Brazilian
27 soybeans. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 16(18), pp.1943-1948.
- 28
29 Reis, M., 2012. Food insecurity and the relationship between household income and
30 children's health and nutrition in Brazil. *Health economics*, 21(4), pp.405-427.
- 31
32 Reis, S.A. and Leal, J.E., 2015. A deterministic mathematical model to support
33 temporal and spatial decisions of the soybean supply chain. *Journal of transport*
34 *geography*, 43, pp.48-58.
- 35
36 Roberts, S., 2003. Supply chain specific? Understanding the patchy success of ethical
37 sourcing initiatives. *Journal of business ethics*, 44(2-3), pp.159-170.
- 38
39 Roe, B. and Teisl, M.F., 2007. Genetically modified food labeling: The impacts of
40 message and messenger on consumer perceptions of labels and products. *Food*
41 *Policy*, 32(1), pp.49-66.
- 42
43 Roundtable on Responsible Soy (RTRS) 2013. Standard for responsible soy
44 production, version 2.0. [online] RTRS Int. Tech. Group. Available at:
45 [http://www.responsiblesoy.org/documentos/rtrs-standard-for-responsible-soy-](http://www.responsiblesoy.org/documentos/rtrs-standard-for-responsible-soy-production-pdf/)
46 [production-pdf/](http://www.responsiblesoy.org/documentos/rtrs-standard-for-responsible-soy-production-pdf/).
- 47
48 RTRS, 2017. Certified Volumes and Producers - RTRS - Round Table Responsible Soy.
49 [online] Available at:
50 [http://www.responsiblesoy.org/mercado/volumenes-y-productores-certificados/?l](http://www.responsiblesoy.org/mercado/volumenes-y-productores-certificados/?lang=en)
51 [ang=en](http://www.responsiblesoy.org/mercado/volumenes-y-productores-certificados/?lang=en).
- 52
53 Rudorff, B.F.T., Adami, M., Aguiar, D.A., Moreira, M.A., Mello, M.P., Fabiani, L.,
54 Amaral, D.F. and Pires, B.M., 2011. The soy moratorium in the Amazon biome
55 monitored by remote sensing images. *Remote Sensing*, 3(1), pp.185-202.
- 56
57 Safarzadeh, S. and Rasti-Barzoki, M., 2018. A modified lexicographic semi-order
58 model using the best-worst method. *Journal of Decision Systems*, 27(2),
59 pp.78-91.
- 60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Safarzadeh, S. and Rasti-Barzoki, M., 2019. A game theoretic approach for assessing
2 residential energy-efficiency program considering rebound, consumer behavior,
3 and government policies. *Applied energy*, 233, pp.44-61.
- 4 Safarzadeh, S. and Rasti-Barzoki, M., 2019. A game theoretic approach for pricing
5 policies in a duopolistic supply chain considering energy productivity, industrial
6 rebound effect, and government policies. *Energy*, 167, pp.92-105.
- 7 Safarzadeh, S. and Rasti-Barzoki, M., 2019a. A game theoretic approach for assessing
8 residential energy-efficiency program considering rebound, consumer behavior,
9 and government policies. *Applied energy*, 233, pp.44-61.
- 10 Safarzadeh, S. and Rasti-Barzoki, M., 2019b. A game theoretic approach for pricing
11 policies in a duopolistic supply chain considering energy productivity, industrial
12 rebound effect, and government policies. *Energy*, 167, pp.92-105.
- 13 Safarzadeh, S., Shadrokh, S. and Salehian, A., 2018. A heuristic scheduling method
14 for the pipe-spool fabrication process. *Journal of Ambient Intelligence and
15 Humanized Computing*, 9(6), pp.1901-1918.
- 16 Safarzadeh, S., Shadrokh, S. and Salehian, A., 2018. A heuristic scheduling method
17 for the pipe-spool fabrication process. *Journal of Ambient Intelligence and
18 Humanized Computing*, 9(6), pp.1901-1918.
- 19 Sauer, S. and Pereira Leite, S., 2012. Agrarian structure, foreign investment in land,
20 and land prices in Brazil. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 39(3-4), pp.873-898.
- 21 Sauer, S., 2018. Soy expansion into the agricultural frontiers of the Brazilian Amazon:
22 The agribusiness economy and its social and environmental conflicts. *Land Use
23 Policy*, 79, pp.326-338.
- 24 Sawyer, D., 2008. Climate change, biofuels and eco-social impacts in the Brazilian
25 Amazon and Cerrado. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B:
26 Biological Sciences*, 363(1498), pp.1747-1752.
- 27 Schäferhoff, M.; Campe, S.; Kaan, C. Transnational Public-Private Partnerships in
28 International Relations: Making Sense of Concepts, Research Frameworks, and
29 Results. *Int. Stud. Rev.* 2009, 11, 451–474.
- 30 Schäufele, I. and Hamm, U., 2017. Consumers' perceptions, preferences and
31 willingness-to-pay for wine with sustainability characteristics: A review. *Journal
32 of Cleaner Production*, 147, pp.379-394.
- 33 Schleifer, P., 2017. Private regulation and global economic change: The drivers of
34 sustainable agriculture in Brazil. *Governance*, 30(4), pp.687-703.
- 35 Schmid, O., Brunori, G., Galli, F., van de Graaf, P., Prior, A. and Ruiz, R., 2014, April.
36 Contribution of short food supply chains to sustainability and health.
37 In *Proceedings of the 11th European IFSA Symposium*, 1-4 April 2014 in
38 Berlin/Germany(pp. 1247-1253). IFSA-International Farming System
39 Association-Europe Group.
- 40 Schneider, M., 2014. Developing the meat grab. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 41(4),
41 pp.613-633.
- 42 Schouten, G. and Bitzer, V., 2015. The emergence of Southern standards in
43 agricultural value chains: A new trend in sustainability governance?. *Ecological
44 economics*, 120, pp.175-184.

- 1 Schouten, G. and Glasbergen, P., 2012. Private multi-stakeholder governance in the
2 agricultural market place: An analysis of legitimization processes of the
3 roundtables on sustainable palm oil and responsible soy. *International Food and*
4 *Agribusiness Management Review*, 15(1030-2016-82859), pp.63-88.
- 5 Sellitto, M.A., Vial, L.A.M. and Viegas, C.V., 2018. Critical success factors in Short
6 Food Supply Chains: Case studies with milk and dairy producers from Italy and
7 Brazil. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 170, pp.1361-1368.
- 8 Sinayi, M. and Rasti-Barzoki, M., 2018. A game theoretic approach for pricing,
9 greening, and social welfare policies in a supply chain with government
10 intervention. *Journal of cleaner production*, 196, pp.1443-1458.
- 11 Soja: Informe General. (2008). SAGPyA, Argentina.
- 12 Steward, C., 2007. From colonization to “environmental soy”: a case study of
13 environmental and socio-economic valuation in the Amazon soy
14 frontier. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 24(1), pp.107-122.
- 15 Taherzadeh, O. and Caro, D., 2019. Drivers of water and land use embodied in
16 international soybean trade. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 223, pp.83-93.
- 17 Tomei, J. and Upham, P., 2009. Argentinean soy-based biodiesel: An introduction to
18 production and impacts. *Energy Policy*, 37(10), pp.3890-3898.
- 19 Tomei, J. and Upham, P., 2011. Argentine clustering of soy biodiesel production: the
20 role of international networks and the global soy oil and meal markets. *Open*
21 *Geography Journal*, 4, pp.45-54.
- 22 Tomei, J., Semino, S., Paul, H., Joensen, L., Monti, M. and Jelsøe, E., 2010. Soy
23 production and certification: the case of Argentinean soy-based
24 biodiesel. *Mitigation and adaptation strategies for global change*, 15(4),
25 pp.371-394.
- 26 Torres, S., Moran, E. and Silva, R., 2017. Property rights and the soybean revolution:
27 shaping how China and Brazil are telecoupled. *Sustainability*, 9(6), p.954.
- 28 Urcola, H.A., de Sartre, X.A., Veiga Jr, I., Elverdin, J. and Albaladejo, C., 2015. Land
29 tenancy, soybean, actors and transformations in the pampas: A district
30 balance. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 39, pp.32-40.
- 31 Van der Ven, H., Rothacker, C. and Cashore, B., 2018. Do eco-labels prevent
32 deforestation? Lessons from non-state market driven governance in the soy, palm
33 oil, and cocoa sectors. *Global environmental change*, 52, pp.141-151.
- 34 van Eck, N.J. and Waltman, L., 2013. VOSviewer manual. Leiden: Univeriteit
35 Leiden, 1(1).
- 36 Vermeulen, S., Woodhill, A.J., Proctor, F. and Delnoye, R., 2008. Chain-wide
37 learning for inclusive agri-food market development: a guide to
38 multi-stakeholder processes for linking small-scale producers to modern markets.
39 International Institute for Environment and Development.
- 40 Virah-Sawmy, M., Durán, A.P., Green, J.M., Guerrero, A.M., Biggs, D. and West,
41 C.D., 2019. Sustainability gridlock in a global agricultural commodity chain:
42 Reframing the soy–meat food system. *Sustainable Production and*
43 *Consumption*, 18, pp.210-223.
- 44 Waldman, K.B. and Kerr, J.M., 2014. Limitations of certification and supply chain

standards for environmental protection in commodity crop production. *Annu. Rev. Resour. Econ.*, 6(1), pp.429-449.

Walker, N.F., Patel, S.A. and Kalif, K.A., 2013. From Amazon pasture to the high street: deforestation and the Brazilian cattle product supply chain. *Tropical Conservation Science*, 6(3), pp.446-467.

Weinhold, D., Killick, E. and Reis, E.J., 2013. Soybeans, poverty and inequality in the Brazilian Amazon. *World Development*, 52, pp.132-143.

WWF, 2014. *The growth of soy: Impacts and solutions*.

Zak, M.R., Cabido, M., Cáceres, D. and Díaz, S., 2008. What drives accelerated land cover change in central Argentina? Synergistic consequences of climatic, socioeconomic, and technological factors. *Environmental Management*, 42(2), pp.181-189.

Zoomers, A., 2010. Globalisation and the foreignisation of space: seven processes driving the current global land grab. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 37(2), pp.429-447.




Figure 1. Review Process




Figure 2 Distribution of Reviewed Articles by Year (N=55)

Table 1 Description of Journals with More than Two Reviewed Papers

Journal	Number of Papers	Impact Factor	Quartiles
Journal of Cleaner Production	7	6.395	Q1
The Journal of Peasant Studies	5	4.331	Q1
Land Use Policy	4	3.573	Q1
Ecological Economics	3	4.281	Q1
Applied Geography	2	3.068	Q1
Environment, Development and Sustainability	2	1.676	Q2
Environmental Research Letters	2	4.541	Q1
Global Environmental Change	2	10.427	Q1
Journal of Sustainable Forestry	2	0.747	Q2
Journal of Transport Geography	2	3.560	Q1
World Development	2	2.848	Q1
Agriculture and Human Values	1	2.568	Q1
Annual Review of Resource Economics	1	2.978	Q1
Applied Energy	1	8.426	Q1

Biomass and Bioenergy	1	3.537	Q1
Ecological Indicators	1	4.490	Q1
Energy	1	5.537	Q1
Energy Policy	1	4.880	Q1
Environment and Planning A	1	1.389	Q1
Environmental Biosafety Research	1	N/A	N/A
Environmental Conservation	1	2.759	Q1
Environmental Management	1	4.865	Q1
Global Policy	1	0.603	Q1
Globalizations	1	1.671	Q1
Governance	1	3.833	Q1
Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Humanized Computing	1	1.910	Q2
Journal of Decision System	1	3.847	Q3
Journal of Environmental Management	1	4.865	Q1
Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change	1	2.651	Q1

Nature Climate Change	1	19.181	Q1
Sustainability	1	2.075	Q2
Sustainability Production and Consumption	1	N/A	Q1
Tropical Conservation Science	1	1.149	Q2




Figure 3 Distribution of Reviewed Articles by Method

Table 2 Description of Economic Driver

Drivers	Description	Country Recorded	Reference
Economic value creation	It refers to the economic value created by productions related to soybean cultivation (e.g., infrastructure)	Brazil	Garrett et al. (2013) and Barros et al. (2011)
Economic performance of soybean cultivation	Costs or profitability of different type of soy-related products.	Brazil	Antoniou et al. (2012) and Azadi and Ho (2010)
Cost optimization	It refers to cost reduction or minimization in soy production	Brazil	Reis and Leal (2015), Silva and Marcio de Almeida (2013)

Table 3 Description of Environmental Drivers

Drivers	Description	Country Recorded	Reference
Land consumption and land use conflict	The conflicts between the increasing demand for land while the amount is limited (e.g., increased land price in soy production areas).	Argentina, Bolivia and Brazil	Garrett et al. (2013), Garrett and Lambin (2013), Garrett and Naylor (2013), Tomei et al. (2010), Weinhold et al. (2013) and Zak et al. (2008)
Greenhouse gas emission	The increased amount of GHG emissions (e.g., carbon dioxide) caused by soybean cultivation.	Brazil	Borzoni (2011), He et al. (2019), Newton et al. (2013), Tomei et al. (2010) and Reijnders and Huijbregts (2008)
Deforestation	The reduction of tropical forests due to the increasing amount of land used for soy cultivation.	Brazil	Arima et al., (2011), Cohn and O'Rourke (2011), Delgado (2012), Fearnside (2001), Macedo et al., (2012), Oliveira (2016) and Sauer and Leite (2012)
Loss of carbon and climate change	The GHG emissions and climate change caused by deforestation.	Brazil	Fearnside et al. (2013), Huijbregts (2008) and Liu et al. (2019),
Impact on water quality	Influences levels of water flow, sediment and temperatures.	Brazil	Macedo and Coe, (2013) and Neill et al., (2013)

Water consumption	Soy cultivation consumes a large number of water resources	Brazil, Canada, France, China and United States	Ercin et al., (2011) and Taherzadeh and Caro (2019)
Soil quality	Capacities of soil influenced by water usage in soy production	Brazil	Lal et al., (2007), Marraro (2004) and Monti (2008)

Table 4 Description of Social Drivers

Drivers	Description	Country Recorded	Reference
Reputation	Environmental, social or other issues are affecting soy producers' sales or bottom line.	Brazil	Newton et al. (2013)
Child labour or forced labour	One of the issues affecting employees' well-being.	Brazil	Waldman and Kerr (2014)
Poverty	Food-insecure families were worried that their food would run out before they received more money, could not afford to purchase balanced meals and relied	Brazil	Elgert, 2016, Garrett et al. (2013) and Reis (2012)

on low-cost foods for children.

Rural livelihood	New positions created in soy sector can be acquired by immigrants rather than residents as they require particular skills	Argentina, Bolivia and Brazil	Berry, 2010, Chase (1999), Fearnside (2008), Phélias and Choumert (2017), Sawyer (2008) and Zoomers (2010)
Land use conflict	The land has been controlled by foreigners rather than local investors	Brazil, Bolivia and Uruguay	Garrett et al. (2016), Hecht (2005), McKay (2018), Medina et al. (2016) and Nagel (1999)
Food security	It is on the production of commodities rather than food for local people	Argentina	Federación Agraria (2007);
Health impacts	Soy cultivation increases the risk of birth malformations, cancers, skin and respiratory diseases and other chronic illnesses.	Argentina and Paraguay.	Salomon et al. (2006), Seijo (2008), Tomei et al. (2010), Benachour et al. (2007), WB/FAO (2004), FODEPAL (2005), Waldman and Kerr (2014) and Mora (2006)

Table 5 Comparisons of Reviewed Soy Governance Initiatives

Initiative	Certification Body	Established Year	Geographical Coverage	Purposes of the Initiative	Limitations
Brazilian Forest Code	Brazilian Government	1965	Brazil	A national law to regulate consumptions of forestry land caused by productions (e.g., soy cultivation).	Low enforcement and permission of legal deforestation.
REDD+	United Nations	2013	Global	Is an internationally accepted framework to tackle deforestation	Limited access to obtain funding in many countries.
Amazon Soy Moratorium	Mass soy traders and NGOs	2006	Global	It is the first voluntary agreement on addressing zero-deforestation in the tropical area.	Limited impact on the national soy sector.
RTRS	WWF	2006	Global	It is designed to address environmental and social issues in soy production, which includes, employees' rights, land rights, respect for small-scale and traditional land use, well-being of local population, protection of biodiversity and environmental impact mitigation, maintenance of water quality and quantity, maintenance and improvement of soil quality, and the elimination of certain banned agrochemicals.	Skewed toward large-scale or well-capitalized farmers. High certificate cost for small-scale producers. Limited stakeholder involvement.

ProTerra	Cer-ID and Genetic ID	2004	Global	It is used to assess environmental and social performance (e.g., waste and pollution management, gender equity, child labor and labor conditions) in soy production.	Standard only designed for Brazilian context rather than a global context.
Soja Plus	ABIOVE	2011	Brazil	It provides environmental and social practices, a guideline of compliance of national regulations and economic opportunities to avoid unessential costs for Brazil's soybean sector.	Criteria regarding reductions of GHG emissions, land use conflict and resolutions for complaints of local communities and other traditional land users are not included.
Forest Friendly Soy Pilot Project	TNC	2004	Global	The initiative seeks to engage farmers to tackle deforestation in Amazon by ensuring soy producers to comply with Brazil's Forest Code to tackle potential threats and secure themselves against reputational risks.	Failure to address the environmental impacts of soy production in secondary forest areas.

Table 6 Research Gaps and Directions for Further Studies

Theme	Research Gaps	Future Research Directions
Drivers	Lack of research in the social aspect of sustainability.	More studies addressing social sustainability in the soybean supply chain, especially discussions over the mechanisms behind these phenomena, are required in future research.
	Understandings of challenges caused by soybean cultivation in a multi-national context are limited.	Future research can make more efforts to investigate such complex phenomena more holistically to discuss the issues caused by unsustainable soybean production in a global context.
	Lack of studies conducted outside of tropical regions (Brazil and Argentina).	More research can be conducted in other soy-producing countries, such as USA, China and Bolivia
	Negative effects of unsustainable soy cultivation were being discussed while another side remains blank.	Further studies should be addressing the positive consequences of sustainable soy cultivation.
Global value chain governance	Better practices on public-private partnership in soy sector were rarely mentioned in existing works.	More studies should be designed to answer the following questions: how such mechanism is making collaborative efforts on promoting sustainability
Certificate scheme	Most of our reviewed discussed WWF's RTRS certificate schemes followed by ProTerra and Soja Plus, while discussions on other relevant certificate schemes are lagged behind.	Discussions on other relevant certification schemes (e.g., TNC's Forest Friendly Soy Pilot Project, the Danube Soy Initiative, FEFAC Soy Sourcing Guideline) are desired.

	<p>Studies are addressing the relationships different initiatives, especially in the multi-national context and the relationship between public and private initiatives, are still lacking.</p>	<p>Future research can investigate these relationships if they exist.</p>
Potential barriers	<p>The current understandings of the relationship between barriers and effectiveness of sustainable initiatives in the soybean sector are limited.</p>	<p>Future research needs to address other potential barriers that influence the effectiveness of the initiatives and to what degree it can influence efficiency.</p>
Other emerging themes	<p>Understandings of applications of LCA in soy productions is still lacking</p> <p>A large number of reviewed articles used case study and modelling as methodology</p>	<p>More studies are needed to address how LCA can be used as a tool to facilitate soy productions at the process or product level.</p> <p>more studies adopt other methods rather than case study and modelling in the future.</p>




Figure 4 Proposed Conceptual Framework

Appendix: Dof all the reviewed papers

No.	Author	Result	Method	Country	Theory
1	Arima et al. (2011)	Based on the investigation of land-use change in Brazilian Amazon, the results revealed that the land-use linkages in agricultural sector need to be realised by the government. Also, global efforts of reducing GHG gas emissions need to be made in response to the increasing demand for Brazilian agricultural products.	Modelling	Brazil	No
2	Arizpe et al. (2014)	This study assessed the agricultural changes in rural communities in North Argentina. By concluding, this article argued that both ecological (e.g., deforestation) and social (e.g., fair wage) need to be addressed.	Case Study	Argentina	MuSIASEM approach
3	Baletti (2014)	Through an analysis of the mechanisms and effects of two programs, implemented through partnerships between non-governmental organizations and corporations, to manage soy expansion into the Amazon, it is demonstrated that these programs have questionable environmental benefits at best and at worst work to reinforce the hegemony of international environmental organizations, to green the image of agri-business multinationals, and to destabilize strategies of resistance.	Case Study	Brazil	No
4	Bennett, 2017	This study the effectiveness of Socially-oriented Voluntary Sustainability Standards (VSSOs), suggesting that diversified global economic governance provides opportunities to bring new perspectives to the decision-making of VSSOs.	Case Study	No	No

5	Borzoni (2011)	This study carried out a multi-scale integrated assessment of soybean biodiesel in Brazil. The results show that soybean biodiesel increases energy consumption per hour of work without a corresponding increase in economic labor productivity. Consequently, the already low energy efficiency of Brazilian production could get worse. Although Brazil has large expanses of land, the substitution of 20% fossil diesel (i.e. just 3.3% of the country's primary energy consumption) with fully renewable biodiesel might destroy protected areas and forests and increase the GHGs emitted.	Modelling	Brazil	No
6	Brannstrom et al. (2012)	This study proposed a framework focusing on the interactions among state and non-state actors to address the effectiveness of “soft” governance. The conclusion is that the policies bridge the gap between environmental and agricultural interests. However, the effectiveness can be influenced by the effect of globalisation, market and state actors.	Case Study	Brazil	No
7	Bush et al. (2015)	This study reviewed the sustainability governance by concluding that the literature on global chain and networks has yet to be adequately conceptualised. In this regard, a typology was proposed to identify how firm and non-firm actors govern sustainability in global commodity networks.	Literature Review	No	No
8	Cohn and O'Rourke	This study discussed the agricultural certification tools in Latin America and found that certification faces greater challenges than other voluntary conservation schemes due to the little concerns from influential supply chain actors. To increase the effectiveness of certifications, potential risks (e.g., timeless and safety) need to be considered, so that they could be mitigated and supply chain actors can be involved.	Case Study	Brazil	No
9	da Silva, and Almeida D'Agostino (2013)	This article proposes a model to estimate the origin-destination (O–D) matrix for the export flow of Brazilian soybeans based upon a constrained gravity model. The performance of the model was improved by establishing an adjustment criterion for the data, which increased the coefficient of determination of the trend by 24–46%, combined with multi-objective optimization techniques to ensure a balance of the O–D matrix, which yielded R2 values of 0.94 regardless of the prediction year. The model is easy to apply and can help in	Modelling	Brazil	No

		the strategic planning of transportation for the export of soy products from Brazil, provided that the supply chain configuration is known and the absolute percentage errors are monitored over time.			
10	Elgert (2015)	It is a case study focusing on sustainable soy in Paraguay. The author suggested that stronger sustainability can be claimed by redressing the equity issues marginalised by neoliberal agriculture.	Case Study	No	Paraguay
11	Eranksi et al. 2019	This study analysed the carbon footprint of corn-soy-oats in the US and found that the N2O contributed the most significantly to the total carbon footprint in the on-farm areas, which is also depending on the yield of the crop.	Experiment	United States	No
12	Ercin et al. (2012)	This study investigated the water footprint (WF) of two soy products (i.e., soy milk and soy burger) and found that the transition from non-organic to organic farming reduces the grey WF by 98%. In addition, the total WF of soy milk and soy beef is much larger than other soy equivalents.	Experiment	Canada, China and France	No
13	Fearnsid e (2001)	This study carried out a case study regarding the unsustainable soy expansion and argued that the multiple impacts of soybean expansion on biodiversity and other development considerations have several implications for policy: (1) protected areas need to be created in advance of soybean frontiers, (2) elimination of the many subsidies that speed soybean expansion beyond what would occur otherwise from market forces is to be encouraged, (3) studies to assess the costs of social and environmental impacts associated with soybean expansion are urgently required, and (4) the environmental-impact regulatory system requires strengthening, including mechanisms for commitments not to implant specific infrastructure projects that are judged to have excessive impacts.	Case Study	Brazil	No
14	Fearnsid e et al. (2013)	This paper finds that the rapid rise in exports of soy and beef products to China are two of the major drivers of Amazonian deforestation in Brazil. The paper further argues that Chinese purchases of agricultural and forest land and Chinese imports of commodities such as timber and aluminum also cause environmental impacts in Amazonia. Chinese financing and investment in Amazonian infrastructure such as railways and	Modelling	Brazil	No

		mineral processing facilities have additional impacts.			
15	García-López and Arizpe (2010)	It is a case study regarding the participatory process in soy conflicts in Paraguay and Argentina. The author suggested that the bottom-up approach can be used to promote true agricultural sustainability and the research on the grassroots participatory process and their limitations need to be addressed in future research.	Case Study	Argentina and Paraguay	No
16	Garrett and Rausch (2016)	It is a case study regarding the social and ecological tradeoffs of the sustainable soybean sector in Brazil. In conclusion, it is suggested that the Brazilian soy production performs as well as or better than other crops in terms of local economic development, land use efficiency and macroeconomic contribution. However, the tradeoffs between economic contributions, ecological and social influences are still involved.	Case Study	Brazil	No
17	Garrett et al. (2013)	By exploring the economic geography land-use change in Brazilian Amazon, this study concluded that the occurrence of agglomeration economies is influenced by various environmental and land tenure in different regions. In this, supply chains become more competitive and divers in Sorriso where few environmental regulations existed, while the diversity of supply chains is reduced by environmental regulations Santarém. In addition, the supply chain model in different regions also led to different degrees of productivity, innovation and soy expansion.	Case Study	Brazil	Thunian Theory
18	Garrett et al. (2013) Ab?	This study discussed the impacts on soybean production in South America by linking the preferences for non-genetically modified crops, eco-certification, and land use. It is suggested that the availability of financial incentives for protecting forests, reducing greenhouse gas emissions and other green practices should be encouraged. Nevertheless, it is also found that mismanagement may exist during the implementation of sustainable certifications (e.g., producers who historically deforested may be rewarded).	Modelling	Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Paraguay, Uruguay and United	No

				States	
19	Gollnow and Lakes (2014)	It is a case study regarding policy and land-use (i.e., land use displacement) of the Brazilian soybean sector, arguing that decoupling has taken place after the policy implementation.	Case Study	Brazil	No
20	Gryson et al. (2009)	By discussing the strategies for GM and non-GM soy from import to processing, this study shows that many tools are in place to ensure and maintain the current coexistence. However, a profound harmonization of procedures and methods at a European level should be encouraged.	Case Study	No	No
21	He et al. (2019)	This study explored how trade barriers increase global environmental costs of agricultural production, arguing that a sustainable cropping system in the global market would improve the environmental performance of the global agricultural system.	Modelling	China and United States	No
22	Heron et al. (2018)	This study takes soybean value chain governance as a case to argue that sustainability is difficult to foster by considering the peculiar structural and institutional characteristics of the soybean.	Case Study	No	Governance Theory
23	Hospes (2014)	This study investigated the effectiveness of RTRS and RSPO, concluding that the global stakeholder governance initiatives can be used to fill governance deficit. However, to better implement, national standards need to be launched.	Case Study	Brazil and Indonesia	No
24	Ingram et al. (2018)	This article is a case study regarding the effectiveness of landscape governance in soy, tropical timber and palm and oil value chains. Finally, it concluded that chains sourced in tropical landscapes may be governed more effectively for sustainability if voluntary, market policy tools and governance arrangements have more integrated goals that take account of sourcing landscapes and impacts along the entire value chain.	Case Study	No	No

25	Kamali et al. (2017)	The study discussed the evaluation of the economic, environmental and social performance of the soybean farming system in southern Brazil, showing that accounting for variability in key system partners provides insights into the robustness of system performance as well as the prediction of outcomes.	Modelling	Brazil	No
26	Lambin et al. (2018)	By discussing the role of supply chain initiatives in reducing deforestation, this study found that the zero-deforestation initiatives by individual companies face difficulties to target the forms of deforestation (e.g., those associated with legal activities).	Case Study	No	No
27	Leguizamón (2016)	I argue that the push for technological innovation by large-scale agribusinesses, in articulation with financial sector involvement, is both an example of and are instrumental in the process of distancing and abstraction identified in the agro-food literature. This paper also highlights how, despite agribusiness efforts to ‘displace’ and ‘disappear’ nature, these processes are never fully accomplished. I thus reflect on the socio-ecological contradictions that arise from the processes of distancing and abstraction which accompany the financialization of the corporate food system under neoliberal globalization.	Case Study	Argentina	No
28	Liu et al. (2019)	This study explored the utilisation of fertiliser in China Shaanxi Province, arguing that the use of chemical fertiliser has threatened the environment and decreased agricultural efficiency. It requires financial and technical supports to improve farmers’ willingness to adopt conservation tillage. In addition, the change in the Chinese diet structure is another way for sustainable production.	Case Study	China	No
29	Mattsson et al. 2000	It is a case study focusing on land use in life cycle assessment of vegetable oil crops, which suggested that the indicators (i.e., soil erosion, soil organic matter, soil structure, soil pH, phosphorus and potassium status of the soil, and the impact on biodiversity) combining qualitative and quantitative information can be used for assessing soil fertility and biodiversity.	Case Study	No	No
30	McKay	This paper focused on the “land-grabbing” in Bolivia and suggested that the development model threatened	Case Study	Bolivia	No

	(2018)	the livelihood of small-scale farmers and increased the nation's dependence on food import.			
31	Medina et al. (2017)	By analysing the curbing enthusiasm for Brazilian agribusiness, the study suggested that the current enthusiasm of the potential for sustainable agricultural development needs to be based on the assessment of specific dynamics, which can avoid false expectations, and promote standardised concepts and perceived intervention strategies.	Secondary Data Analysis	Brazil	No
32	Meijer (2015)	This study presented a case study to discuss the effectiveness of four supply chain initiatives. Of all influential factors, particularly the powerful position of a limited group of actors with high leverage over producers was found to lead to more ambitious standards with regard to deforestation and higher adoption of these standards. Other factors played a less pronounced role in explaining differences between the effectiveness of supply chain initiatives to reduce deforestation. For all initiatives, the (perceived) demand for low-deforestation products played an important role in the establishment of the initiative and the adoption of the standards, and for all initiatives, leakage can compromise the impacts on actual deforestation.	Case study	Brazil and Indonesia	No
33	Meyer and Miller (2015)	This study developed a case study focusing on Zero Deforestation Zones (ZDZ) and suggested that REDD+ could provide a framework for private sector actors to implement their zero-deforestation commitments with reduced transaction costs, increased environmental integrity, and aligned incentives with the public sector. Many of these actors are now using certification, roundtables, and moratoria successfully to reduce deforestation in their specific supply chains. These initiatives would occupy an important role in facilitating the implementation and efficient functioning of ZDZs. Private sector initiatives would also invaluable for improving sustainability and social issues at the farm-level, such as optimizing fertilizer use and eliminating slave labor. "Zero deforestation" would need to be defined for different regions, incorporating criteria from REDD+ and private stakeholder initiatives, through multiple stakeholder processes that include indigenous peoples, producers, companies, governments, and civil societies.	Case Study	Brazil and Indonesia	No

34	Newton et al. (2013)	This study discussed the effectiveness of sustainable commodity chains in tropical forest and agricultural landscape. It is suggested that the roles of actors in making impacts on agricultural production are depending on their positions and influences in supply chains.	Secondary Data Analysis	Brazil	No
35	Oliveira (2016)	From the perspective of geopolitics in the Brazilian soybean sector, the author suggested that the current understandings of politics in the Brazilian soybean sector are not sufficient. Moreover, studies regarding “soy-dollars” and “grain-dollars” can be undertaken to reinforce the existing understandings of soy politics.	Case Study	Brazil	No
36	Oliveira and Schneider (2016)	This study demonstrates that the agribusiness actors who are gaining more control over the soy complex are doing so in part through flexing and that the ability to flex may ultimately determine the trajectory of global agro-industrial restructuring.	Case Study	Brazil and China	No
37	Phélinas et al. (2017)	This study analysed the social, economic, and environmental sustainability in Argentina’s soybean sector. On one hand, the use of the GM soybean production technique increased the yield of soybean production. On the other, it also led to land-use conflict and other environmental issues, which provides implications for the local agricultural industry.	Survey	Argentina	No
38	Prudêncio da Silva et al. (2010)	The authors proposed models testing the environmental varieties of Brazilian soybean transportation, arguing that the region of origin needs to be considered to reduce pollution as they have different environmental impacts.	Modelling	Brazil	No
39	Reis and Leal	By proposing a deterministic mathematical model to support temporal and spatial decisions of the soybean chain, the author suggested that a stochastic model is needed in further studies.	Modelling	Brazil	No

	(2015)				
40	Safarza eh and Rasti-Bar zoki (2019)	The findings reveal the equilibrium pricing decisions for the supply-chain players to maximize their profits, besides the best energy policy and supply-chain structure for the efficient management of household energy consumption. More precisely, the first scenario with the Nash structure between the manufacturer and energy supplier has the most advantages and the least disadvantages than the other scenarios. Also, the manufacturer subsidy has the most performance in the discussed energy- efficiency program. Finally, the present study shows the significant effects of considering the energy rebound, innovation abilities of the manufacturer, and consumer behavior assumptions in the household energy problems.	Modelling	No	Game Theory
41	Safarza eh and Rasti-Bar zoki (2019)	The results indicate that considering energy rebound can close profit calculations to reality. Additionally, the tax deduction is a more effective policy than subsidy schemes to support the energy-efficient manufacturer in competition with similar manufacturers. However, subsidy policy provides better conditions for the government to control the energy consumption of the household sector using energy price reform.	Modelling	No	Game Theory
42	Safarza eh and Rasti-Bar zoki, 2018	By investigating the modified lexicographic semi-order model the author suggested that the application of the model improves the quantitative and qualitative decision-making process.	Modelling	No	No
43	Safarza eh et al. (2018)	This study proposed a heuristic scheduling method for the pipe-spool fabrication process and argued that comparing the results obtained from the proposed heuristic algorithm and IBM ILOG CPLEX software showed that it is better to use the software in small and medium test problems, but for large size problems, which are similar to the real-world problems, the proposed algorithm is suitable. In addition, the	Modelling	No	No

		computational results show that the presented lower bound has an acceptable distance to the exact optimal solution.			
44	Sauer (2018)	This article examines relations between the arrival and expansion of soybean plantations, particularly in post-2001, as part of regional agro-strategies that have perpetuated and deepened long-standing conflicts over land in the state of Pará. It also highlights the emergence of new territorial disputes, which have created additional obstacles, increasing the demand for land and rising land prices while impacting processes by which land and territorial rights are secured in the state of Pará.	Case Study	Brazil	No
45	Sauer (2018)	This article examined the relationship between the arrival and expansion of soybean plantations in the post-2001 era, which highlighted the environmental and social challenges caused by the land-use conflict in the State of Pará.	Case Study	Brazil	No
46	Schleifer (2017)	This study suggested that Brazil's soy producers first backed but then opposed private sustainability regulation, whereas in the sugarcane sector the dynamic was exactly the opposite. Through in-depth analysis and cross-case comparison, this article reveals how changing transnational conditions were decisive in shaping these outcomes. Specifically, shifting end markets exposed the two sectors to different economic and regulatory pressures.	Case Study	Brazil	No
47	Schouten and Bitzer (2015)	This paper analysed the Southern and Northern standards of sustainable governance standards and concluded that the Southern standards have different audiences to gain legitimacy and rely on different sets of legitimacy sources comparing with Northern standards.	Case Study	No	Legitimacy Theory
48	Sinayi and Rasti-Bar	By discussing the game theoretic approach for pricing, greening and social welfare policies in supply chains, the study found that collaboration between the manufacturer and retailer leads to a cleaner and efficient production. Moreover, the retail price in the corporate model is not lower than the noncorporate model, and	Modelling	No	Game Theory

	zoki (2018)	the price and the environment can be significantly influenced by the policies.			
49	Taherzadeh and Caro (2019)	Focusing on the drivers of water and land use conflict in international soybean trade, this paper suggested that drivers of excessive land and water consumption need to be explored by taking region, economic conditions and environmental criteria into account.	Modelling	No	No
50	Tomei and Upham (2009)	This paper has barely begun to establish the nature of what critical UK observers might define as a 'sustainable' biofuel supply from Argentina. It suggested that there is a vocal body of NGO opinion, perhaps epitomised by Biofuelwatch, expressing the view that production of biofuel for export is undesirable and tantamount to expropriation of the rural poor by powerful western corporates.	Case Study	Argentina	No
51	Tomei et al. (2010)	This study presents a case study regarding the production and certification of Argentinean soy-based biodiesel. It concludes that at present certification schemes are unlikely to be able to address either the institutional challenges associated with their implementation or the detrimental impacts of the additional demand generated by biofuels.	Case Study	Argentina	No
52	Torres et al. (2017)	In this paper, the authors indicate how China and Brazil, telecoupled by trade in soybeans, are depending on each other as they try to balance environmental and economic objectives. Brazil, as a sending system, has created pressures on its natural ecosystems, which have led to losses particularly in the Cerrado biome and its ecotones in the Amazon's tropical moist forest biome. China, as a receiving system, has created a land asset important to regenerating its lost natural systems (e.g., forest cover areas). Both countries have different property rights regimes, which have created distinct circumstances in which they are to protect or regenerate their natural ecosystems.	Case Study	Brazil and China	No

53	van der Ven et al. (2018)	This work provides a case study of non-state market-driven (NSMD) governance in soy, palm oil and cocoa sectors. The result suggested that a lack of broad market uptake limits the effectiveness of NSMD.	Case Study	Brazil, Côte d'Ivoire, Indonesia and	No
54	Virah-Sawmy et al. (2019)	In this study, the results show that companies along the soy–meat value chain have made different sustainability commitments probably because they are facing very different risk factors: those upstream such as soy traders are concerned mainly with international pressures associated with deforestation, whilst those further downstream in the supply chain have from very loose to very ambitious sustainability objectives on various topics associated with the sector including animal welfare, climate change and human health. We found that these supply chain initiatives are not addressing sufficiently the cause and effect of key drivers of sectoral impacts such as land appreciation and the global demand for cheap meat. Further, because the soy–meat sector is vertically integrated both upstream and downstream, this may result in comparable bargaining power among business actors such that none of these actors may be able to impose sustainability norms without inferring cost onto themselves or causing perverse outcomes.	Case Study	Brazil	No
55	Waldman and Kerr (2014)	This study explored the ways in which supply chain initiatives and standards used to change practices in soybean and corn production. The conclusion is that certification schemes and standards face challenges to reduce and limit environmental pollution.	Case Study	No	No