ISSN: 3064-9846
Research Article
Journal of Agricultural, Earth and Environmental Sciences

Deforestation and Biodiversity Loss: Drivers, Tipping Points and Policy Solutions – A Brief Review of Recent Advances

Christian Hald-Mortensen

Executive MBA, Danish Technical University (DTU)

***Corresponding author:** Christian Hald-Mortensen, Executive MBA, Danish Technical University (DTU), Denmark.

Submitted: 13 October 2025 **Accepted:** 19 October 2025 **Published:** 03 Nobember 2025

https://doi.org/10.63620/MKJAEES.2025.1096

***Citation:** Hald-Mortensen, C. (2025). Deforestation and Biodiversity Loss: Drivers, Tipping Points and Policy Solutions – A Brief Review of Recent Advances. J of Agri Earth & Environmental Sciences, 4(6), 01-08.*

Abstract

This paper reviews the complex drivers, dynamics, and systemic consequences of tropical deforestation and its nexus with biodiversity loss and climate change. Utilizing a literature review methodology, it synthesizes findings from scholarly sources to explore how agricultural expansion, global consumption patterns, and climate feedback loops drive a cascading ecological and economic crisis. The paper highlights how deforestation can push ecosystems toward tipping points, such as the Amazon dieback, where degradation triggers abrupt and potentially irreversible shifts in ecological and climatic stability, amplifying biodiversity loss. It examines delayed impacts of habitat fragmentation, known as extinction debt, and analyzes growing financial and governance risks linked to deforestation. Key policy responses, including the EU Deforestation Regulation (EUDR) and the REDD+ framework, are assessed. The study concludes that addressing this systemic crisis requires integrated governance, innovative finance, sustainable land-use strategies such as agroforestry, and a reassessment of global consumption patterns to avoid crossing critical ecological thresholds.

Keywords: Deforestation, Biodiversity Loss, Climate–Biodiversity Nexus, Tipping Points, Amazon Dieback, Agroforestry.

Introduction

The rapid conversion of tropical forests into agricultural land represents one of the most visible environmental crises of the modern era. Since the early 2000s, satellite images have captured the expansion of roads, clearings, and controlled burns slicing into previously intact ecosystems. Land-use change is a primary driver of the global climate and biodiversity crises triggering a cascade of irreversible ecological consequences.

Forests, covering 31% of the world's total land area, are home to a disproportionate amount of the planet's biodiversity and are critical regulators of the global climate. Globally, the world lost 420 million hectares of forest between 1990 and 2020 an area equivalent to the size of the European Union primarily due to agricultural expansion.

In fact, an estimated 80% of the world's terrestrial biodiversity is housed within forests, which contain more than 60,000 species of trees alone[4].

The dual impact of deforestation is profound. The clearing and burning of forests release vast quantities of stored carbon into the atmosphere[5]. But the loss of forests also leads to biodiversity loss, because deforestation removes habitat complexity, fragments remaining ranges, and disrupts pollination, seed dispersal, and predator–prey balances. As canopy, deadwood, and understory vanish, specialist species decline first, followed by generalists; ecological networks unravel, lowering reproduction, genetic flow, and resilience.

This paper argues that deforestation is not a single, isolated problem but an complex, interconnected crisis with reinforcing ecological and economic feedback loops[6].

Research Gap and Objectives

While extensive research has documented the drivers and impacts of deforestation, a holistic, interdisciplinary synthesis that links consequences of biodiversity loss to economic risks and policy responses remains fragmented. The existing literature often treats these aspects in isolation, leading to a siloed understanding[7]. This paper aims to bridge this gap by providing a synthesized analysis of deforestation, moving from local drivers to global systemic risks.

Specific Objectives

1. To identify and analyze the primary drivers of tropical deforestation and their link to biodiversity loss.
2. To explore the amplifying effects of climate feedback loops and delayed ecological phenomena such as extinction debt.
3. To assess the challenges of contemporary policy and financial mechanisms aimed at mitigating deforestation.
4. To inform future research and policy recommendations for a more integrated approach to forest conservation.

Research Questions

The Analysis is Guided by the following Research Questions:
RQ1: What are the primary drivers of tropical deforestation and how do they contribute to biodiversity loss and climate change?
RQ2: How do delayed ecological effects and systemic risks amplify the impacts of deforestation on biodiversity and economic systems?
RQ3: What are the, challenges, of policy mechanisms to mitigate deforestation?

Structure of the Paper

The subsequent sections of this paper are structured to address the outlined research questions. The paper first details its literature review methodology. It then analyzes the primary drivers of deforestation, linking them to delayed ecological consequences. Next, the paper examines the economic dimensions and policy responses before concluding with areas for future research.

Methodology: A Systematic Literature Review

The analysis is based on a systematic literature review (SLR) methodology. This approach, widely used in environmental science and public health research, provides a transparent, structured, and reproducible procedure for identifying, evaluating, and synthesizing existing knowledge[8]. This methodology is suitable for assessing the current state of knowledge, identifying trends, and highlighting gaps in a broad, interdisciplinary topic such as deforestation[9]. The review followed a five-step process, relying on elements of the so-called PSALSAR method[10]:

- **Planning:** A review approach was established to define the research scope, objectives, and questions. This step ensures that the review addresses the stated problem.
- **Search:** A literature search was conducted across various academic databases. The search used keywords and phrases such as "deforestation drivers," "deforestation and biodiversity loss," "tipping points and cascading effects," "extinction debt," "financial risk and deforestation," "EU Deforestation Regulation," and "REDD+ effectiveness." The search prioritized peer-reviewed articles and relevant reports or policy documents.
- **Appraisal:** The identified sources were assessed based on each study's relevance and quality to ensure the reliability of the paper's findings.
- **Analysis:** The synthesized data was analyzed to narrate the results and draw evidence-based conclusions. This step involved building a coherent narrative that explains the connections between the different themes.
- **Reporting:** The results are presented in this paper, providing a full account of the procedure to ensure the review's reproducibility for future research.

This methodology moves the analysis beyond a simple summary of existing work, providing a more robust foundation for the conclusions drawn.

Drivers of Deforestation-Driven Biodiversity Loss

A consensus among contemporary studies is that the primary direct driver of deforestation and forest degradation is agricultural expansion[11]. This expansion is a response to heightened global demand for commodity production, with commercial agriculture identified as the leading force behind tropical forest loss[12].

The expansion of land for commodity production is not uniform; it is driven by a handful of key commodities. Beef production is the top driver of deforestation in the world's tropical forests, responsible for more than double the land conversion caused by soy, palm oil, and wood products[13]. The expansion of cattle ranching, particularly in the Brazilian Amazon, has replaced over 80% of deforested areas with pastures since the 1960s, directly impacting apex species such as the jaguar and harpy eagle. Therefore, halting cattle-driven expansion in high-risk biomes is the single most critical intervention to protect these flagship species.

Soybean production is the second-largest driver of tropical deforestation[14]. Yet, its effects are indirect as well as direct: soy farms are often established on former cattle pastures, forcing ranchers to move deeper into forest frontiers to create new grazing land.

Palm oil, the third major driver, is found in half of all packaged goods sold in supermarkets[15]. Its efficiency — producing 40% of the world's vegetable oil on just 6% of the cultivated land — has come at the cost of clearing some of the planet's oldest rainforests, threatening the Bornean orangutan and Sumatran tiger with extinction.

Certification schemes, such as those promoted by the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil, have helped slow but not halt this process[16]. Where forests are converted to pasture or monoculture, biodiversity is lost. Edge effects increase local temperatures due to loss of canopy and species are lost such as birds, amphibians, orchids, and dung beetles.

This consumption-driven deforestation links directly to global trade. A Princeton study found that consumption in 24 developed nations caused 13.3% of the global range loss experienced by forest-dependent vertebrates through imported commodities. On average, these nations generated biodiversity losses fifteen times greater abroad than at home, demonstrating that the threats to wildlife are globalized and embedded in trade flows, not just local clearing[56].

The Climate–Deforestation Feedback Loop

The climate–deforestation feedback loop is a mechanism linking forest loss to climate instability and ecological decline. At its core lies the climate-biodiversity nexus: ecosystem health underpins climate stability, while climate change accelerates biodiversity loss by pushing species beyond survival thresholds[17].

Breaking this reinforcing cycle requires strategies that align policy, corporate action, and nature-based solutions to balance climate mitigation with conservation goals.

Forests play a role in regulating the global climate by absorbing vast amounts of carbon dioxide. When they are cleared, this carbon is released into the atmosphere, driving greenhouse gas emissions. Deforestation accounts for an estimated 6–17% of global carbon emissions — a figure comparable to the entire global transportation sector. In fact, these GHG emissions accelerate warming that feeds back into drought cycles, intensifying forest loss and species decline[18].

Non-Linear Feedback and Ecological Risk

Yet, the consequences are not linear. Forest loss disrupts local rainfall and hydrological cycles, creating drier conditions that, in turn, promote further fires. Consequently, a reinforcing climate–deforestation feedback loop emerges. This self-perpetuating cycle has been observed through satellite studies that show how canopy loss leads to increased drought intensity.

Moreover the Stockholm Resilience Centre found a correlation between longer dry seasons and accelerated deforestation rates, illustrating how cumulative forest loss increases climatic stress[19]. The NASA Earth Observatory also documents how three-dimensional forest-mapping shows sharp declines in carbon density where drought intensity rises.

If unchecked, these feedbacks could push ecosystems toward tipping points — thresholds beyond which the system abruptly shifts to a new state. In the Amazon, scientists warn that deforestation could trigger a chain of event due to reduced moisture recycling[20]. As the result, each hectare lost raises the probability of crossing a non-linear ecological boundary with cascading, potentially irreversible outcomes[21]. Combating deforestation must therefore focus not just on halting forest loss, but on breaking the feedback loop that accelerates both climate change and biodiversity collapse.

Tipping Points, Amazon Forest Disintegration, and the Loss of Ecological Resilience

The Amazon rainforest, often described as the lungs of the Earth, may already be approaching a tipping point. Research led by the Stockholm Resilience Centre and other global institutes warns that losing 20–25% of Amazon forest cover could lead to an irreversible shift toward a degraded, savannah-like ecosystem[22]. Such a transformation would disrupt the hydrological pump that sustains the forest, decreasing rainfall and increasing fire frequency.

This process would not unfold in isolation: atmospheric moisture from the Amazon feeds rainfall patterns across South America, influencing weather systems as far away as the Andes. Once disrupted, these feedbacks can further weaken neighboring ecosystems, setting off cross-boundary climate risks.

The loss of ecological resilience — the forest's ability to absorb shocks without structural change — signals that incremental degradation could trigger abrupt system collapse. As fragmentation, warming, and fire pressure intensify, local biodiversity declines become systemic, threatening global carbon and climate stability.

In fact a recent paper analyzed forests' role in climate mitigation using stabilization wedges and the Global Carbon Budget, highlighting deforestation's emission share, successful reforestation efforts, key drivers, and pathways to avoid further deforestation through sustainable forest management[23].

The Time-Lag Effect: Extinction Debt

The full impact of deforestation on biodiversity loss is rarely immediate. Many species face a time-delayed extinction, known as extinction debt. This concept suggests that even if deforestation stopped today, certain species would still be lost by the fragmentation already caused.

Large mammals such as jaguars and tapirs, which require extensive and connected ranges, experience declining populations as fragmentation limits breeding and dispersal[24]. Over time, genetic bottlenecks reduce resilience, making these populations more vulnerable to disease, hunting, and climate stress.

However, the extinction-debt model is not universal. Studies indicate that risk depends on the spatial configuration of deforestation, and whether it occurs in scattered patches or in large, contiguous blocks. Clustered deforestation, which leaves large intact patches, may delay extinctions, whereas uniform, patchy destruction produces immediate biodiversity loss across trophic levels.

Thus, extinction debt represents a temporal warning signal: even apparent stability can mask inevitable declines already "locked in" by past destruction[25]. Recognizing this lag is vital for conservation policy because it means that protecting remaining intact forests is more urgent as than it appears, as today's deforestation will continue influencing biodiversity decades into the future, in our Anthropocene era[26].

Deforestation and Nature Risk as Systemic Financial Risks

Deforestation now represents a material financial risk with wide-ranging implications for companies, investors, and national economies[27]. Once viewed as an ecological issue, deforestation is recognized as a systemic risk capable of destabilizing markets, portfolios, and credit systems. Investor exposure is rising because ecosystem degradation affects commodity yields, sovereign debt stability in forest rich developing countries, and long-term asset performance. It is encouraging that the ECB is to add a climate factor to its collateral framework from 2026.

As a result, major central banks now stress-test financial institutions against nature-related risks like biome collapse, but critics argue that they must go much further[28]. Central banks must move from understanding to real action on climate and nature risk. In fact, the European Central Bank's strategy review offers a chance to embed these risks into core monetary policies. Strengthened stress tests, updated inflation frameworks, and systemic coordination are essential to protect financial stability and drive a net-zero, nature-positive transition.

Interconnected tipping points magnify the climate and nature risk exposure: the collapse of one biome can trigger reinforcing feedbacks in others from monsoon disruption to permafrost thaw, multiplying macro-financial shocks. Financial contagion may mirror ecological contagion: biodiversity collapse could begin to ripple through currencies, supply chains, and food security. For instance, weakened Amazonian moisture recycling may alter rainfall patterns, affecting agricultural yields and food-commodity prices in soy bean markets[29 30].

In this sense, deforestation risks travel through certain financial channels such as:

Credit Risk
Banks' lending to agribusinesses linked to deforestation face heightened default probability as new regulations, lawsuits, or market boycotts erode profits. Declining biodiversity can also lower yields and asset quality in assets such as farmland, plantations and commercial forests, increasing borrower vulnerability and merge into compounding macroeconomic instability in nature-dependent sectors[31].

Regulatory Risk
Emerging frameworks such as the EU Deforestation Regulation (EUDR) impose strict due-diligence and traceability obligations; non-compliance may result in trade restrictions and reputational damage[32]. Financial institutions exposed to non-compliant actors may face capital reallocation pressures, legal liabilities, and loss of access to sustainable finance markets[55].

Reputational Risk
Investors associated with destructive land-use practices encounter rising public scrutiny and consumer backlash. Biodiversity loss is increasingly visible, shaping brand value, investor perception, and ESG scoring. As institutional investors screen for biodiversity issues, accelerating divestment campaigns and shareholder activism in the most sustainable or ethical portfolios may follow[57].

Transition Risk
As economies move toward nature-positive production, formerly profitable "brown" assets — such as palm-oil plantations or beef expansion areas — risk becoming stranded. Rapid shifts in consumer preferences, regulation, and biodiversity disclosure frameworks amplify stranded-asset exposure, altering long-term valuation and financing conditions[33].

These factors interact to form a reinforcing feedback loop between environmental degradation and financial instability. Accordingly, the financial sector has begun integrating deforestation screening and nature-related disclosure frameworks, inspired by initiatives like TNFD and the Dutch Central Bank's guidelines[34 35].

Interconnected Tipping Points: Cascading Risks Across Earth Systems
Tipping points in forest ecosystems like the Amazon do not occur in isolation; they belong to an interlinked network of planetary boundaries[36]. In recent years, there is heightened focus on climatic tipping points such as the collapse of the AMOC – the Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation[37 38]. In fact, a recent paper applied Rumsfeld's typology from known-knowns to unknown-unknowns to climate uncertainty, highlighting Black Swan droughts, AMOC collapse risks, and structured strategies for managing water-related climate impacts, as a tipping point in the AMOC is expected to lead to major rainfall pattern changes, with subsequent impacts on farmland productivity, but also on habitats and biodiversity.

A recent OECD report warns that such cascading tipping points could destabilize entire Earth systems, accelerating economic and ecological shocks worldwide. The report emphasizes how interacting thresholds—rather than isolated events—significantly heighten systemic risk, underscoring the urgency of integrated mitigation strategies[39]. In essence, when one tipping point shifts and a threshold is crossed, it can increase the probability that others follow. For example, the Amazon dieback could weaken the West African monsoon, while Arctic melt amplifies global heating that feeds back into tropical drought.

This cross-boundary vulnerability transforms local deforestation into a global systemic concern with cascading impacts[40]. Consequently, environmental governance must shift from siloed forestry regulation toward integrated Earth-system management that accounts for climate-biodiversity interdependence[58].

The Role of Regulation: The EU Deforestation Regulation (EUDR) and Traceability
The EUDR, adopted in 2023, aims to ensure that products traded in or from the EU are deforestation-free and legally produced. It applies to high-risk commodities such as cattle, wood, cocoa, soy, palm oil, coffee, and rubber[41].

While groundbreaking, the regulation poses implementation challenges for producers in developing economies. Smallholders often lack the geolocation data, certification capacity, or finance required for compliance[42]. Consequently, there is concern that the EUDR could unintentionally exclude small producers from global value chains, widening the gap between compliant large agribusinesses and vulnerable communities.

The EU has announced partnership mechanisms and technical-assistance programs to support transitions toward traceable supply chains, acknowledging the need for fairness and inclusion[43]. Traceability is needed because it enables the identification of deforestation risks at their source. It ensures accountability across complex value chains, and in theory, empowers regulators, consumers, and investors to demand sustainable practices in a race to the top. Traceability also helps close governance gaps, incentivizes legal compliance, and creates market advantages for producers adopting deforestation-free standards.

Ultimately, the EUDR's success will hinge on cooperation between importing blocs and producer nations, as well as on data transparency and satellite verification systems which is a tall order.

International Frameworks: The REDD+ Initiative
The Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) mechanism under the UNFCCC remains the flagship global framework linking conservation finance with climate mitigation. REDD+ rewards countries for verified reductions in forest loss, assigning economic value to standing forests as carbon sinks[44].

Analyses suggest that halving tropical deforestation by 2030 would require USD 45 billion annually in combined public and private investment — an order of magnitude above current flows[45]. Despite progress in monitoring, funding remains inconsistent, and governance issues such as corruption, tenure insecurity, and leakage effects persist. Consequently, REDD+ effectiveness is highly uneven, demanding better alignment between international finance and verified local governance capacity. Nevertheless, REDD+ has catalyzed improvements in national forest inventories, remote-sensing capacity, and awareness of community land rights.

Field studies show that conditional livelihood incentives such as direct payments to local households tied to verified forest conservation help to achieve the most durable outcomes. In fact, Payments for Ecosystem Services boost forest conservation during interventions and sustain it afterward, especially when communication and trust among users are strong, enhancing long-term effectiveness[46]. These interventions demonstrate that, while imperfect, REDD+ has evolved into a catalyst for governance reform and a learning platform for future carbon-and-biodiversity finance mechanisms.

Strategies for Mitigation and Conservation

Agroforestry, which integrates trees and shrubs into crop or pasture systems, offers a balanced strategy combining production with conservation. Empirical research demonstrates that such systems host higher biodiversity than monocultures and improve soil fertility through nutrient cycling. Agroforestry systems also act as carbon sinks, buffering emissions from nearby deforested areas.

Declining biodiversity threatens food security and agricultural resilience. Research shows that floral, faunal, and soil microbial diversity is consistently higher in agroforestry systems. This is because of healthier soils, favorable microclimates, and more varied vegetation. Tree-based landscapes foster beneficial fungi, bacteria, and richer organic matter, strengthening natural processes. Over time, these effects spread into nearby croplands, improving fertility and resilience. Choosing locally adapted tree–crop combinations can restore degraded soils, increase biodiversity, and support sustainable farming while protecting ecosystems[47].

For example, shade-grown coffee and cacao systems in Latin America preserve bird, bat, and pollinator diversity while sustaining farmer incomes. Similarly, diversified agroforestry in sub-Saharan Africa reduces soil erosion and provides firewood without further encroachment on natural forests. However, while agroforestry delivers measurable ecological benefits, it is not a substitute for intact forests.

Agroforestry integrates trees into agricultural systems to enhance biodiversity, soil health, and resilience. It supports production and conservation but does not replace reforestation[48]. Unlike forest restoration, which rebuilds complex ecosystems, agroforestry operates within human-managed landscapes. It should complement, not substitute, the protection and regeneration of natural forests essential for long-term carbon storage and biodiversity recovery.

Agroforestry's carbon-sequestration potential is lower, and species composition differs markedly from primary ecosystems. Therefore, agroforestry should be viewed as a progressive measure within human-dominated landscapes, while strict protection remains essential for remaining primary forests.

Market Mechanisms and Consumer Choice

Market-based incentives are also critical levers for reducing deforestation. Consumer awareness campaigns and certification schemes such as RSPO for palm oil or Rainforest Alliance for cocoa have begun reshaping corporate sourcing standards. Retailers increasingly demand deforestation-free supply chains, backed by traceability and satellite monitoring[49]. When designed well, and sustainable supply chains multiply, market tools may in the near future translate biodiversity externalities into price signals: zero-deforestation contracts, biodiversity credits, and retailer no-buy lists, although more evidence and mainstreaming is needed[50].

Public procurement and institutional investor exclusions on zero deforestation amplify uptake, of such ambitions and targets while jurisdictional certification curbs leakage. Smallholder finance and technical assistance enable compliance, turning the more abstract concept of traceability into measurable habitat retention, species protection, and restored function.

Yet, demand-side action alone cannot offset structural pressures from global population and income growth. Therefore, effective mitigation requires a combination of policy, finance, and consumer behavior linking choices at the supermarket shelf with regulatory accountability at the production frontier[51].

These levers matter insofar as they stop forest conversion: fewer clearings mean fewer edge effects, species persistence, and maintained ecosystem functions underpinning climate and livelihoods.

Discussion and Future Research

This review shows that deforestation is a multidimensional crisis shaped by global commodity demand, policy shortcomings, and climate feedback. Similar reviews reach comparable conclusions, highlighting both the scale of the problem and the limits of current solutions. Global forest cover has declined from 47% to 30% of land over 8,000 years, with most losses concentrated in the tropics. Agriculture remains the primary driver. Mining, infrastructure expansion, and urbanization follow closely behind[52].

Forest loss undermines biodiversity, disrupts climate regulation, and weakens livelihoods. Biodiversity loss is not incidental to deforestation—it is its principal biological outcome. Fragmentation lowers population sizes and connectivity, accelerating inbreeding and stochasticity; species with narrow niches vanish first, triggering co-extinctions that erode ecosystem services and economic security[53]. Subsequently, addressing them effectively requires policies that recognize the socio-ecological dynamics involved.

Other reviews point to governance gaps and land-use pressures as key barriers to sustainable forest management. Stronger monitoring systems and better valuation of ecosystem services can help address these weaknesses[54].

Integrating local community participation, secure land tenure, and transparent planning is essential to enhance forest protection. Frameworks such as the EUDR and REDD+ represent meaningful progress. Yet they face persistent implementation asymmetries between developed and developing regions. A question emerges: can fragmented, single-issue approaches still deliver impact, or must conservation evolve into a global systems strategy?

Further work is needed to model species-specific extinction debts across fragmented landscapes to refine conservation priorities. These disparities often stem from unequal access to funding, technology, and.governance capacity, leading to inconsistent monitoring, enforcement gaps, and uneven benefits for local and indigenous communities.

Conclusion

The loss of tropical forests constitutes one of humanity's most far-reaching environmental challenges. Agricultural expansion drives both carbon emissions and biodiversity decline, while delayed effects such as extinction debt mean that the full damage is still unfolding.

Therefore, addressing deforestation requires a strategy that combines:

- Regulatory enforcement, exemplified by the EU Deforestation Regulation;
- Incentive mechanisms, including REDD+;
- Sustainable land-use innovation, such as agroforestry; and
- Behavioural and market shifts to align consumption with planetary boundaries.

The evidence presented in this paper shows that deforestation is a systemic issue that triggers reinforcing feedback loops between climate change, biodiversity loss, and economic instability. Forest clearing disrupts rainfall cycles, weakens ecological resilience, and increases the likelihood of crossing tipping points such as the Amazon dieback. Extinction debt means that even if deforestation halted tomorrow, biodiversity loss would continue for decades, demanding early and decisive action. These ecological risks also translate into financial exposure affecting commodity markets, investment portfolios, and national economies through regulatory, transition, and reputational risks.

Preventing forest conversion safeguards species networks, but as the paper has discussed, it also reduces macro-financial volatility by stabilizing rainfall, food prices, and sovereign revenues in biodiversity-dependent economies over time.

A global response must therefore go beyond fragmented initiatives. It requires governance that bridges environmental regulation, trade policy, financial systems, and local land-use management. Strengthened monitoring, transparent value chains, and inclusive community participation are needed to build durable and equitable solutions. Only through coherent, cross-sector collaboration can we break deforestation's accelerating feedback loop. If implemented with ambition and alignment, such a strategy can help secure a truly nature-positive and climate-stable future.

References

1. López-Carr, D. (2021). A review of small farmer land use and deforestation in tropical forest frontiers: Implications for conservation and sustainable livelihoods. Land, 10(11), 1113. https://doi.org/10.3390/land10111113
2. Nabuurs, G.-J. (2022). Agriculture, forestry and other land uses. In Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change, 747-860.
3. Du, Z. (2023). Mapping annual global forest gain from 1983 to 2021 with Landsat imagery. IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing, 16, 4195-4204. https://doi.org/10.1109/JSTARS.2023.3262501
4. Leuschner, C., Homeier, J. (2022). Global forest biodiversity: Current state, trends, and threats. In Progress in Botany 83,125-159. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-89053-4_5
5. Savita, S. (2025). The impact of deforestation on global climate change patterns. Shodh Prakashan: Journal of Environmental Studies, 1(1), 12-31.
6. Sivaramanan, S., Kotagama, S. W. (2022). Investigation into the interconnected nature of environmental problems and identifying keystone environmental problems. Vidyodaya Journal of Science, 25(2).
7. Almeida, E., Lagoa, D., Vasudhevan, T. (2024). Hidden harms: The economic and financial consequences of deforestation and its underlying drivers.
8. Paul, J., Barari, M. (2022). Meta-analysis and traditional systematic literature reviews—What, why, when, where, and how? Psychology & Marketing, 39(6), 1099-1115. https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.21657
9. Tripathi, S. (2024). Assessing the current landscape of AI and sustainability literature: Identifying key trends, addressing gaps and challenges. Journal of Big Data, 11(1), 65. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40537-024-00988-3
10. Upadhaya, S., Khanal, J. (2023). A systematic literature review and meta-analysis of AI/ML experience in banks. Namuna Academic Journal, 2(2), 14-26.
11. Hald-Mortensen, C. (2024). The climate-biodiversity nexus reviewed: Navigating tipping points, science-based targets & nature-based solutions. Journal of Agricultural, Earth & Environmental Sciences, 3(6), 1-11.
12. Maeda, E. E. (2021). Large-scale commodity agriculture exacerbates the climatic impacts of Amazonian deforestation. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 118(7), e2023787118. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2023787118
13. Kastner, T. (2021). Global agricultural trade and land system sustainability: Implications for ecosystem carbon storage, biodiversity, and human nutrition. One Earth, 4(10), 1425-1443. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2021.09.006
14. Peng, D. (2025). Global soybean trade dynamics: Drivers, impacts, and sustainability. The Innovation. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xinn.2025.100XXX
15. Zaini, S. (2025). Does palm oil really rule the supermarket?—An assessment of three Western supermarket chains.
16. Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO). (2020, September 25). ISEAL Alliance. https://isealalliance.org/community-members/roundtable-sustainable-palm-oil
17. Hald-Mortensen, C. (2024). The climate-biodiversity nexus reviewed: Navigating tipping points, science-based targets & nature-based solutions. Journal of Agricultural, Earth & Environmental Sciences, 3(6), 1–11.

18. Baccini, A., Goetz, S. J., Walker, W. S., Laporte, N. T., Sun, M., Sulla-Menashe, D., Hackler, J., Beck, P. S. A., Dubayah, R., Friedl, M. A., Samanta, S., & Houghton, R. A. (2012). Estimated carbon dioxide emissions from tropical deforestation improved by carbon-density maps. Nature Climate Change, 2(3), 182–185. https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1354
19. Staal, A. (2020). Feedback between drought and deforestation in the Amazon. Environmental Research Letters, 15(4), 044024. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab738e
20. Flores, B. M. (2024). Critical transitions in the Amazon forest system. Nature, 626(7999), 555–564. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06914-9
21. Hald-Mortensen, C. (2024). Cascading nature risks: Applying the Rumsfeld matrix to case studies on pollinator decline, an AMOC collapse, and zoonotic pandemics. Journal of Ecology and Natural Resources, 8(3), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.23880/jenr-16000380
22. Staal, A., Fetzer, I., Wang-Erlandsson, L. (2020). Hysteresis of tropical forests in the 21st century. Nature Communications, 11, 4978. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-18728-7
23. Hald-Mortensen, C. (2023). Towards net zero: Delivering the forestry stabilization wedge. Journal of Agricultural, Earth & Environmental Sciences, 2(4), 1–12.
24. Martinez Pardo, J. (2023). Much more than forest loss: Four decades of habitat connectivity decline for Atlantic Forest jaguars. Landscape Ecology, 38(1), 41-57. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-022-01594-y
25. Gargiulo, R., Budde, K. B., Heuertz, M. (2025). Mind the lag: Understanding genetic extinction debt for conservation. Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 40(3), 228-237. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2024.11.002
26. Spalding, C., Hull, P. M. (2021). Towards quantifying the mass extinction debt of the Anthropocene. Proceedings of the Royal Society B, 288(1949), 20202332. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2020.2332
27. Bohnet, M.-P., Fliegel, P., Tax, T. (2025). Not just knocking on wood: The short- and long-term pricing of deforestation risk on global financial markets. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5155518
28. McRae, D., Després, M. (2025, April 2). Climate and nature risk: A little less conversation, a little more action. Green Central Banking. https://greencentralbanking.com/2025/04/02/climate-and-nature-risk-a-little-less-conversation-a-little-more-action/
29. Galmarini, S. (2025). Raising awareness of Earth system tipping points: Implications for EU governance.
30. Hald-Mortensen, Christian. "Tipping Points: A Brief Review of their Role as Wicked Problems in Climate Change." J of Agri Earth & Environmental Sciences 3 (3), 01 10 (2024).
31. Marsden, L. (2024). Ecosystem tipping points: Understanding the risks to the economy and the financial system.
32. UNEP Finance Initiative. (2022). Deforestation risks for banks. United Nations Environment Programme.
33. European Union. (2023). Regulation (EU) 2023/1115 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 May 2023 on the making available on the Union market and the export from the Union of certain commodities and products associated with deforestation and forest degradation and repealing Regulation (EU) No 995/2010.
34. Caldecott, B. (2021). Stranded assets: Environmental drivers, societal challenges, and supervisory responses. Annual Review of Environment and Resources, 46, 417–447. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-012220-113923
35. Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD). (2023). Finance sector roadmap: Eliminating commodity-driven deforestation. https://tnfd.global/knowledge-bank/finance-sector-roadmap-eliminating-commodity-driven-deforestation
36. A Guideline on the Use of Deforestation Risk Mitigation Solutions for Financial Institutions. (2021). De Nederlandsche Bank, Sustainable Finance Platform Biodiversity Working Group. https://www.dnb.nl/media/qtgnesqx/dnb-deforestation-guideline-document_asn_21_08-dnb_tcm46-390356.pdf
37. Lenton, T. M., Laybourn, L., Armstrong McKay, D. I., Loriani, S., Abrams, J. F., Lade, S. J., ...& Ghadiali, A. (2023). Global tipping points report 2023: Summary report. University of Exeter. https://repository.gheli.harvard.edu/repository/14182/
38. Ditlevsen, P., Ditlevsen, S. (2023). Warning of a forthcoming collapse of the Atlantic meridional overturning circulation. Nature Communications, 14(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-39810-w
39. Hald-Mortensen, C. (2024). Applying the Rumsfeld matrix: Unknown unknown climate risks in an AMOC collapse scenario. Journal of Ecology and Natural Resources, 8(1), 000364.
40. OECD. (2022). Climate tipping points: Insights for effective policy action. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/abc5a69e-en
41. Hald-Mortensen, C. (2024b). Cascading nature risks: Applying the Rumsfeld matrix to case studies on pollinator decline, an AMOC collapse, and zoonotic pandemics. Journal of Ecology and Natural Resources, 8(3), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.23880/jenr-16000380
42. Gilbert, C. L. (2024). The EU deforestation regulation. EuroChoices, 23(3), 64-70. https://doi.org/10.1111/1746-692X.12434
43. Macchi, C., Bijman, J. (2024). European deforestation due diligence for multinational corporations in global value chains: Challenges and perceived best practices of the EUDR and EUCSDDD.
44. Balaban, C. (2025). Towards more environmentally sustainable supply chains: The role of trade agreements and sustainability initiatives (No. 293). OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/xxxxx
45. Sacherer, A.-K., Angelsen, A., Bertram, C., de Sadeleer, I. (2022). Financing forest conservation and restoration through climate policy instruments: Lessons from the CDM and REDD+. In Handbook of International Climate Finance (pp. 293–317). Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800370373.00024
46. Food and Land Use Coalition. (n.d.). Community supported agriculture. https://www.foodandlandusecoalition.org
47. Andersson, K. P., Cook, N. J., Grillos, T., Lopez, M. C., Salk, C. F., Wright, G. D., & Mwangi, E. (2018). Experimental evidence on payments for forest commons conservation. Nature Sustainability, 1(3), 128–135. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-018-0034-z

48. Udawatta, P. R., Rankoth, L., & Jose, S. (2019). Agroforestry and biodiversity. Sustainability, 11(10), 2879. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11102879
49. Di Sacco, A., Hardwick, K. A., Blakesley, D., Brancalion, P. H. S., Breman, E., Cecilio Rebola, L., ...& Antonelli, A. (2021). Ten golden rules for reforestation to optimize carbon sequestration, biodiversity recovery and livelihood benefits. Global Change Biology, 27(7), 1328-1348. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.15498
50. VanderWilde, C. (2023). Deforestation, certification, and transnational supply chains: A study of the palm oil sector [Doctoral dissertation].
51. Kubitza, C., Eckert, S., Lay, J. (2024). Can 'Western' initiatives for sustainable supply chains save tropical peatlands? Evidence from the Indonesian palm oil sector.
52. Kaoneka, A. R. S., Solberg, B. (1997). Analysis of deforestation and economically sustainable farming systems under pressure of population growth and income constraints at the village level in Tanzania. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment, 62(1), 59-70. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8809(96)01140-4
53. Runyan, C. W., Stehm, J. (2020). Deforestation: Drivers, implications, and policy responses. In Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Environmental Science. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199389414.013.44
54. Benson, J. F., Mahoney, P. J., Serieys, L. E. K., Sikich, J. A., Pollinger, J. P., Ernest, H. B., ...& Wayne, R. K. (2016). Interactions between demography, genetics, and landscape connectivity increase extinction probability for a small population of large carnivores in a major metropolitan area. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 283(1837), 20160957. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2016.0957
55. Duley, H. (2021, June 4). Putting biodiversity on the investment agenda. Ethical Screening. https://www.ethicalscreening.co.uk/news/blogpost/biodiversity-as-an-investr
56. Wiebe, R. A., & Wilcove, D. S. (2025). Global biodiversity loss from outsourced deforestation. Nature, 639(8054), 389–394. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-08569-5
57. Ethical Screening. (2024, October 17). COP16: Biodiversity and its impact on responsible investment. Ethical Screening. https://www.ethicalscreening.co.uk
58. Schellnhuber, H.-J., & Tóth, F. L. (1999). Earth system analysis and management. Environmental Modeling & Assessment, 4(4), 201–207.