

Challenges and Opportunities in Forest Restoration

**Jyotsna Athya¹, Shiv Nandan Patel², G.M. Shrivastava³, Deependra Singh Rajput⁴,
Jyotsna Pathak⁵, Sandeep Pandey⁶**

Department of Botany, PMCOE Govt. Tilak College, Katni (M.P.) – India^{1,2,3}

Department of Biotechnology, PMCOE Govt. Tilak College, Katni (M.P.) – India^{4,5}

ICFRE, Dehradun-India⁶

Corresponding author E-mail: sandeep27pandey@rediffmail.com

Abstract: Forest restoration aims to revive forest ecosystems, boosting their ecological health and benefiting people within the surrounding areas. However, monitoring forests for restoration poses a significant challenge, requiring landscape-level assessments that incorporate both social and natural science perspectives. Natural forest restoration faces various obstacles related to economics, society, and the law. Key research and policy focuses include: determining and modeling the ecological and economic conditions that favor natural regeneration as a land-use choice; creating monitoring methods for natural regeneration that local communities can implement; and establishing incentives, governance models, and regulations that encourage the responsible management of naturally regenerating forests. Forest restoration presents significant opportunities for biodiversity, ecosystem services, and carbon sequestration. It also improves livelihoods and helps achieve global goals, particularly through initiatives like REDD+, by utilizing improved science, integrated governance, and market incentives. Restoration process aids in the natural recovery of secondary forests while clarifying land tenure. Successful forest restoration requires science-based, practical, and robust methods. Furthermore, prioritizing collaboration with local communities and securing long-term funding, maintenance, and monitoring are crucial for ensuring sustainable forest cover. This study highlights the major challenges, understanding the causes and benefits of forest regeneration for human well-being and nature.

Keywords: Forest regeneration, forest restoration challenges, Sustainable development, biodiversity conservation, ecosystem services

I. INTRODUCTION

Every year deforestation results in the destruction of 10 million hectares of forests worldwide. Degradation alone affects the well-being of 3.2 billion people and results in costs surpassing 10 percent of the annual global gross product due to diminished ecosystem services [1]. Deforestation and soil degradation result in substantial greenhouse gas emissions. Roughly 8 percent of forest plants and 5 percent of forest animals are currently at serious risk of extinction [2]. The Bonn Challenge and the New York Declaration on Forests, launched in response to deforestation and forest decline, promote the restoration of 350 million hectares by 2030 using forest landscape restoration (FLR) techniques. Consequently, different objectives can be met through vegetation management by improving structural complexity, changing species composition, and reintroducing natural disturbances, in addition to livelihood strategies such as gathering or growing non-timber forest products, and establishing community forests and job opportunities [3].

Land degradation caused by human activities is resulting in a decrease in global carbon reserves, altering ecosystem structures, and threatening or risking extinction for vital forest species. Strategies are essential for protecting rare and endangered plant species to enhance their local population and bolster their role in ecosystem functioning through forest restoration [4]. The extent and quality of forest habitats are steadily decreasing, and the ensuing loss of biodiversity jeopardizes the operation of forest ecosystems and their ability to provide ecosystem services. Due to the increasing population pressure, it is essential to both safeguard and restore forest ecosystems [5]. Restoring forest ecosystems



involves replanting trees in areas that once had forests and improving the condition of degraded forests. Along with planting native tree species, it could entail protecting wildlife and plant life while conserving the soil and water resources essential to the forest ecosystem [6].

It's crucial to recognize that restoring forests involves more than simply planting trees. It involves restoring the equilibrium of the ecological, social, and economic advantages of trees and forests within a wider framework of land utilization. Cultivating trees and other plants accelerates the restoration of health and productivity in damaged ecosystems. Involving and empowering individuals to rehabilitate, preserve, and manage forests sustainably is essential for meaningful transformation. Empowering communities fosters local solutions and encourages involvement in ecosystem restoration. This creates a chance to "rehabilitate" forest ecosystems that are fair and fruitful, while addressing the dangers to nature and communities stemming from the devastation of our forests [7]. This research provides an in-depth analysis of worldwide publications related to forest restoration and rehabilitation, employing relevant databases like Scopus, Google Scholar, ScienceDirect, Web of Science, and ResearchGate. Rigorous inclusion and exclusion criteria were set to select relevant publications regarding innovative techniques for restoring degraded forests.

LEARNING AND UNDERSTANDING FOREST RESTORATION PROGRAMS

Given the scenarios of global climate change that forecast an increase in extreme disturbances and climatic events, it's crucial to integrate understanding of the link between biodiversity and the stability of ecosystem functionality into forest restoration initiatives. Instead of concentrating on species specifically, emphasizing the functional diversity of tree species groups appears suitable when choosing tree species for restoration. Ultimately, the restoration process should take into account plant genetic diversity and the connections between above and below ground, as these likely have significant but previously underexplored impacts at the ecosystem level [5]. Community-led approaches to natural resource management are increasingly important in the stages of planning, project execution, and oversight. This involvement is crucial for evaluating and comprehending collective capabilities, identifying existing strengths and areas requiring further development [8]. Local communities possess a profound understanding of the diverse roles trees play within their environment. Consequently, leveraging local knowledge regarding the utility, rarity, and significance for wildlife of indigenous tree species is vital for restoration initiatives [9].

A deeper comprehension of current local practices, like biophysical features of landscapes evolution, along with an understanding of the governance systems that guide these collective choices, will assist in pinpointing and executing new restoration projects, ensuring sustainable results [10]. Enhancing education and restoring ecosystem integrity fosters understanding of ecosystem structure/function and strategies for managing invasive species, improving timber stands, and revitalizing preferred species. Managing invasive species, along with knowledge about understory plants, would enhance further restoration education and initiatives [11]. Scientific data, encompassing ecological sciences and silvicultural expertise, is crucial in the planning, decision-making, and execution of restoration initiatives. The focus must be on the direct presentation of scientific data, spoken communication, and ongoing engagement among scientists, decision-makers, collaborative partners, and implementers [12]. To achieve success in ecological restoration, strategies should include active community engagement; acknowledging, validating, and incorporating local knowledge and existing institutions; promoting livelihoods that are dependent on the landscape; understanding and developing programs that address local values and requirements; cultivating social-ecological learning among all participants; offering educational initiatives that enhance local ecological understanding and appreciation; and employing systematic methods to foster comprehension and practice within local social-ecological systems [13].

A more profound comprehension of limiting factors influencing plant establishment aids in nursery and site preparation systems. Intense human-induced disruptions related to global change have generated unmatched stress on forests, requiring innovative ecological engineering, genetic preservation of tree species, and large-scale strategies aimed at developing functional ecosystems efficiently. For future ecosystem functionality, forest restoration initiatives must draw lessons from history; incorporate ecological insights; improve regeneration methods and systems [14]. Capacity development efforts encompass endeavors customized to the requirements and context of stakeholders, incorporating knowledge and practical expertise from various sources and fields, competencies for choosing from a range of



restoration approaches, and the integration of various topics and skill sets (e.g., social, financial, legal, etc.) alongside technical or ecological aspects, enabling stakeholders to tackle the intricate challenges of forest restoration [15]. Effective forest management programs depend critically on social participation, which is essential for their ongoing success and viability [16]. Facilitating multi-stakeholder processes for Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR) demands proficient facilitators to manage the planning, moderation, and monitoring phases. The successful implementation of FLR involves navigating and reconciling conflicting interests and diverse priorities, such as balancing livelihood needs with biodiversity conservation, while also harmonizing local objectives with national targets, [17]. It is crucial to document how Understanding the impact of climate change and human actions on tropical rainforests to safeguard biodiversity and enhance the implementation of REDD+ and Sustainable Development Goals are significant.. Global conservation initiatives must take into account the requirements of local communities, focusing on improving public health and acknowledging the value of human-centered approaches that provide cash crops and a reliable food supply [18]. Understanding natural historical patterns can be achieved by modeling landscape ecological patterns, which can be informed by various site-specific methods and historical data. The most advanced tools currently available utilize deep learning and artificial intelligence, as the construction and training of neural networks can simulate historical forest patterns, leading to significant practical applications [19].

CHALLENGES FOR FOREST RESTORATION

Effective forest restoration governance faces significant hurdles, including harmonizing diverse ecological and social scales, fostering reconciliation, and reducing power disparities. A central difficulty lies in determining the optimal balance between strict regulatory approaches ("command and control") and broader "environmental governance," which encompasses non-state participants, adaptable regulations, and market-driven mechanisms [20]. Factors such as specific laws, the economic advantages and disadvantages of restoration, government encouragement, and international commodity market demands play a crucial role in influencing forest restoration efforts [21]. Models developed for increasing forest cover involve restructuring and reconfiguring elements to boost tree density in specific areas. Emerging scientific tools and methods hold promise for wilderness reclamation but necessitate thorough testing prior to deployment [22]. Successfully addressing the difficulties in forest restoration hinges on the effective establishment of plant materials, which we will refer to as 'seedlings' for simplicity, encompassing items like seeds, cuttings, and rooted cuttings. Consequently, the focus should be on how these seedlings fare at the outplanting site, rather than solely on their performance in the nursery. This involves a collaborative effort between the nursery manager and the client to define the desired plant type according to the specific site conditions. Furthermore, insights gained from monitoring after planting should be utilized to enhance future plant materials [23].

In some of the planet's most biodiverse arid and semi-arid environments, tree-planting initiatives encounter difficulties with site preparation, choosing appropriate species, gathering seeds, and planting techniques [24]. Large-scale forest restoration efforts are confronted with several obstacles. Firstly, the expense of restoration is frequently considerable. Secondly, a lack of suitable material for active regeneration poses another impediment. A third significant barrier to achieving successful and cost-effective long-term restoration is ensuring that the restored forest provides tangible benefits to local and regional populations [14]. Additional challenges in forest and landscape restoration governance include mismatches between political timelines and restoration project durations, planning horizons and restoration timelines, national restoration goals and local land-use planning, the administrative level overseeing restoration projects and the level receiving funding, and conflicts between the spatial requirements of biodiversity conservation and water-related restoration initiatives [25].

Implementing Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR) is complicated by a variety of environmental, social, economic, and governmental hurdles, as FLR operates within intricate socioecological systems. These difficulties can be addressed by enhancing ecological understanding to support FLR, adjusting FLR management strategies to account for environmental shifts by reinforcing global experimental networks, employing modeling techniques, improving socioeconomic and governance aspects, and creating knowledge platforms grounded in evidence [26]. Future challenges in forest restoration and sustainable management will involve reconciling economic and ecological requirements by considering ecosystem services and their associated biodiversity. Consequently, the debate over using



native versus non-native tree species will become a major concern, with forest owners making the ultimate decisions. Prioritizing forest owners' needs by integrating biodiversity and sustainable restoration practices will be paramount in the coming years [27].

BENEFITS OF FOREST RESTORATION

Forest restoration has been shown to enhance air quality, improve water quality and its utilization, promote tree health, enrich soil quality and the understory, as well as bolster wildlife habitats and their respective populations. It affects numerous environmental factors within the understory, such as soil moisture levels, variations in litter depth, the extent of bare ground, and the availability of understory light [28]. Forest restoration efforts promote biodiversity protection, biomass production, and adaptation [29]. The reforestation of commercially viable species in conjunction with the natural regeneration of forests can significantly contribute to the enhancement of biodiversity and the conservation of species that are at risk of extinction [30].

Global change introduces considerable uncertainty about the future ecological and social conditions of forest ecosystems requiring restoration, as well as the goods and services they are expected to supply. Methods for propagation and site establishment ought to boost survival by enhancing seedling stress resilience and site readiness. Improved ability to generalize among plant functional groups in ecological niche adaptations will help tackle site-limiting factors. The magnitude and pace of ongoing global transformations necessitate rapid genetic reactions that cannot occur naturally within suitable timeframes and geographical contexts. The many benefits that human society gains from forests require that forest restoration considers different objectives and approaches to minimize conflicts in achieving these objectives [31]. Forest restoration increases the mean annual streamflow for individual watersheds. Increased hydropower generation and water uses enhance economic benefits and cost-effective power production [32]. The restoration programs and policies show significant socioeconomic effects on local livelihoods like availability of off-farm jobs, household characteristics, land productivity, land tenure, and markets for forest products and ecosystem services [33]. At temporal and/or spatial scales level forest restoration helps in recovery of water yields and helps in resolving freshwater scarcity issues worldwide [34]. Community forests, which demonstrate successful restoration, exhibit greater biodiversity than plantations. They also enhance economic incentives for reforesting farmland and improve environmental monitoring, thus maintaining ecosystem health and biodiversity [35]. Forest restoration provides a promising option to local communities like climate mitigation, conservation, environmental justice and sustainable development [36]. The regeneration of forests on agricultural landscapes serves to protect native forest ecosystems and facilitates the management of these regenerated areas [37].

In the context of an evolving global climate, the restoration of degraded lands plays a crucial role in the natural carbon cycle and can substantially aid in mitigating global temperature increases [38]. Plantations often create conditions that support natural regeneration of native species in their understory. This presents a significant opportunity to gradually transform plantations into biologically richer forests, providing ecosystem services that plantations alone cannot offer [39]. Forest restoration is a part of rural development efforts in low-income regions to produce goods, i.e. timber and others products, and to generate regulatory ecosystem services like carbon storage, erosion control, to non-local forest users [40].

Forest restoration has potential to increase the ecological integrity of mixed landscapes through interventions, such as enrichment planting of degraded forest fragments, restoration of riparian forest corridors, creation of shelter belts, and inclusion of a greater diversity of native trees in agroforestry systems to enhance landscape-level connectivity for wildlife [41]. Forest restoration facilitates the resurgence of adult tree species diversity, mitigates the prevalence of liana seedlings, induces alterations in the composition of species communities, and also increases biomass production in forests recovering from selective logging practices [42]. Water and hydropower providers aimed at forest restoration project and also help in management of source-water watersheds. Hydropower and water sales arising from strategically placed forest restoration are feasible and in a drier climate, the hydropower systems increase the value of water during water shortage condition [43].

II. CONCLUSION

Restoring forests is a vital and complex approach to addressing climate change, preserving biodiversity, and enhancing human well-being. This process greatly boosts carbon capture, enhances soil and water quality, and prevents erosion. A significant obstacle is the disparity between short-term funding and the long-term dedication needed for complete ecological recovery. Successful restoration demands community engagement and supportive government policies that ensure clear land ownership rights, financial incentives, and technical support for local landowners. Isolating the area, along with planting native species, preventing grazing by animals, and managing factors like fire, soil erosion, and herbivory, contributes to the effective restoration of species. Regenerating commercial species without impacting others is difficult; therefore, incorporating silvicultural and ecological expertise will enhance the success of regeneration efforts. Essentially, this study emphasizes that while forest restoration has tremendous potential to tackle global environmental challenges and promote sustainable development, achieving it on a large scale necessitates a comprehensive approach that combines strong scientific methods, effective policy frameworks, and meaningful community collaboration.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, “New UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration offers unparalleled opportunity for job creation, food security and addressing climate change”, News, New York. Available at <http://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/1182090/icode>, 2019.
- [2]. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and UN Environment Programme, The State of the World’s Forests, pp. xvii, 51, 2020.
- [3]. J.A. Stanturf and S. Mansourian, “Forest landscape restoration: state of play”, R. Soc. open sci., 7201218201218<http://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.201218>, 2020.
- [4]. S. Pandey, R. Gupta, V. Vishwakarma, and A.K. Nirala, “Analyzing global forest regeneration strategies and techniques”, International Journal of Advanced science and Research, 1(4), pp.11-14, 2016.
- [5]. R. Aerts, and O. Honnay, “Forest restoration, biodiversity and ecosystem functioning”, BMC Ecol, 11, 29. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6785-11-29>, 2011.
- [6]. <https://www.decadeonrestoration.org/types-ecosystem-restoration/forests>
- [7]. M.L. Wilkie, “Forest Restoration: A Path to Recovery and Well-Being”, <https://www.un.org/en/un-chronicle/forest-restoration-path-recovery-and-well-being>, 2021.
- [8]. A.S. Cheng, and V.E. Sturtevant, “A Framework for Assessing Collaborative Capacity in Community-Based Public Forest Management”, Environmental Management, 49, pp. 675–689, 2012.
- [9]. A. Suarez, G. Williams-Linera, C. Trejo, J.I. Valdez-Hernández, V.M. Cetina-Alcalá, and H. Vibrans, H, “Local knowledge helps select species for forest restoration in a tropical dry forest of central Veracruz, Mexico”, Agroforest Syst, 85, pp. 35–55, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-011-9437-9>, 2012.
- [10]. C.V. Oosten, “Restoring Landscapes—Governing Place: A Learning Approach to Forest Landscape Restoration”, Journal of Sustainable Forestry, 32:7, pp. 659-676, DOI: [10.1080/10549811.2013.818551](https://doi.org/10.1080/10549811.2013.818551), 2013.
- [11]. M.E.G. Golay, P.M. Bice, and J.R. Thompson, “Collaborative Learning about Forest Understory Restoration and Management: Identifying Goals and Sharing Knowledge”, Journal of Forestry, 112(4), pp. 327–336, <https://doi.org/10.5849/jof.13-044>, 2014.
- [12]. M.M. Colavito, “The Role of Science in the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program”, Journal of Forestry, 115(1), pp.34–42, <https://doi.org/10.5849/jof.15-142>, 2017.
- [13]. H. Fox, and G. Cundill, “Towards Increased Community-Engaged Ecological Restoration: A Review of Current Practice and Future Directions”, Ecological Restoration, 36 (3), pp. 208-218, DOI: [10.3368/er.36.3.208](https://doi.org/10.3368/er.36.3.208), 2018.
- [14]. M. Lof, P. Madsen, M. Metslaid, J. Witzell, and D.F. Jacobs, “Restoring forests: regeneration and ecosystem function for the future”, New Forests, 50, pp. 139–151, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11056-019-09713-0>, 2019.



- [15]. G. Bloomfield, P. Meli, P.H.S. Brancalion, E. Terris, M.R. Guariguata, and E. Garen, “Strategic Insights for Capacity Development on Forest Landscape Restoration: Implications for Addressing Global Commitments”, *Tropical Conservation Science*, 12, doi:[10.1177/1940082919887589](https://doi.org/10.1177/1940082919887589), 2019.
- [16]. E. Ceccon, M. Méndez-Toribio, and C. Martínez-Garza, “Social Participation in Forest Restoration Projects: Insights from a National Assessment in Mexico”, *Hum Ecol*, 48, pp. 609–617, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10745-020-00178-w>, 2020.
- [17]. J.A. Stanturf, “Forest landscape restoration: building on the past for future success”, *Restor Ecol*, 29: e13349, <https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.13349>, 2021.
- [18]. G. Cota, V. Sagan, M. Maimaitijiang, and K. Freeman, “Forest Conservation with Deep Learning: A Deeper Understanding of Human Geography around the Betampona Nature Reserve, Madagascar”, *Remote Sensing*, 13(17), pp. 3495, <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs13173495>, 2021.
- [19]. D. Vasiliev, R. Stevens, R. Hazlett, and L. Bornmalm, “Novel applications of GIS and Artificial intelligence in forest restoration”, in *Proc. of 22nd International Multidisciplinary Scientific GeoConference SGEM 6-7 Dec. 2022, Vol. 22, Issue 2.1, Vienna, Austria*, [10.5593/sgem2022/3.1/s14.45](https://doi.org/10.5593/sgem2022/3.1/s14.45).
- [20]. M.R. Guariguata, and P.H.S. Brancalion, “Current Challenges and Perspectives for Governing Forest Restoration”, *Forests*, 5(12), pp. 3022–3030, <https://doi.org/10.3390/f5123022>, 2014.
- [21]. S. Mansourian, L. Aquino, T.K. Erdmann, and F. Pereira, “A Comparison of Governance Challenges in Forest Restoration in Paraguay’s Privately-Owned Forests and Madagascar’s Co-managed State Forests”, *Forests*, 5(4), pp. 763–783, <https://doi.org/10.3390/f5040763>, 2014.
- [22]. S. Pandey, S. Jain, and R. Gupta, “Review Paper on Forest Conservation Model and Modern Techniques for Sustainable Wilderness”, *International Journal of Research*, 2(9), pp. 233–238, 2015.
- [23]. K.R. Dumroese, T.D. Landis, J.R. Pinto, D.L. Haase, K.W. Wilkinson, and A.S. Davis, “Meeting forest restoration challenges: Using the target plant concept”, *Reforesta*, 1(1), pp. 37–52, 2016.
- [24]. S. Caliskan, and M. Boydak, “Afforestation of arid and semiarid ecosystems in Turkey”, *Turk J Agric For*, 41, pp. 317–330, 2017.
- [25]. D. Wieganta, M. Peralvob, P.V. Oelc, and A. Dewulfa, “Five scale challenges in Ecuadorian forest and landscape restoration governance”, *Land Use Policy*, 96, pp. 104, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.104686>, 2020.
- [26]. F. Noulèkoun, S. Mensah, E. Birhane, Y. Son, and A. Khamzina, “Forest Landscape Restoration under Global Environmental Change: Challenges and a Future Roadmap”, *Forests*, 12(3), pp. 276, <https://doi.org/10.3390/f12030276>, 2021.
- [27]. J.M. Contreras, D. Schübeler, and S. Zerbe, “Current challenges in forest restoration and sustainable forest management”, *Front. For. Glob. Change*, 6, <https://doi.org/10.3389/ffgc.2023.1172760>, 2023.
- [28]. M. Campbell, “Benefits of forest restoration. Coalition for the Upper South Platte”, <https://www.uppersouthplatte.org/pdf/Whitepaper25%2012.pdf>, 2012.
- [29]. L. Ciccarese, A. Mattsson, and D. Pettenella, “Ecosystem services from forest restoration: thinking ahead”, *New Forests*, 43, pp. 543–560, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11056-012-9350-8>, 2012.
- [30]. J.J. Gilroy, P. Woodcock, F.A. Edwards, C. Wheeler, B.L.G. Baptiste, C.A.M. Uribe, T. Haugaasen, and D.P. Edwards, “Cheap carbon and biodiversity co-benefits from forest regeneration in a hotspot of endemism”, *Nature Climate Change*, doi: 10.1038/NCLIMATE2200, 2014.
- [31]. D.F. Jacobs, J.A. Oliet, J. Aronson, A. Bolte, J.M. Bullock, P.J. Donoso, S.M. Landhausser, P. Madsen, S. Peng, J.M. Rey-Benayas, and J.C. Weber, “Restoring forests: What constitutes success in the twenty-first century?”, *New Forests*, 46, pp. 601–614, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11056-015-9513-5>, 2015.
- [32]. K. Podolak, D. Edelson, S. Kruse, B. Aylward, M. Zimring, and N. Wobbrock, “Estimating the Water Supply Benefits from Forest Restoration in the Northern Sierra Nevada”, An unpublished report of The Nature Conservancy prepared with Ecosystem Economics, San Francisco, CA, 2015.



- [33]. C. Adams, S.T. Rodrigues, M. Calmon, and C. Kumar, "Impacts of large-scale forest restoration on socioeconomic status and local livelihoods: what we know and do not know", *Biotropica*, 48, pp. 731-744, [https://doi.org/10.1111/btp.12385, 2016](https://doi.org/10.1111/btp.12385).
- [34]. S. Filoso, M.O. Bezerra, K.C.B. Weiss, and M.A. Palmer, "Impacts of forest restoration on water yield: A systematic review", *PLoS ONE*, 12(8), pp. e0183210, [https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0183210, 2017](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0183210).
- [35]. C.D. Sullivan, E.M. Slade, M. Bai, K. Shi, and P. Riordan, "Evidence of forest restoration success and the conservation value of community-owned forests in Southwest China using dung beetles as indicators", *PLoS ONE*, 13(11), pp. e0204764, [https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0204764, 2018](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0204764).
- [36]. J.T. Erbbaugh, N. Pradhan, J. Adams, J.A. Oldekop, A. Agrawal, D. Brockington, R. Pritchard, and A. Chhatre, "Global forest restoration and the importance of prioritizing local communities", *Nat Ecol Evol*, 4, pp. 1472–1476, [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-020-01282-2, 2020](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-020-01282-2).
- [37]. R.L. Chazdon, D. Lindenmayer, M.R. Guariguata, R. Crouzeilles, J.M.R. Benayas, and E.L. Chavero, "Fostering natural forest regeneration on former agricultural land through economic and policy interventions", *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 15, 043002, 2020.
- [38]. S. Pandey, A. Mishra, A.K. Chaurasia, P. Bharti, and V. Chaudhary, "Accountability of Carbon Budget in Changing Global Environment", *International Journal of Scientific Research in Multidisciplinary Studies*, 6(11), pp. 34-37, 2020.
- [39]. J.R. Vincent, S.R. Curran, and M.S. Ashton, "[Forest Restoration in Low- and Middle-Income Countries](#)", *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 46:1, pp. 289-317, 2021.
- [40]. W. de Jong, J. Liu, and H. Long, "The forest restoration frontier", *Ambio*, 50(12), pp. 2224-2237, doi: 10.1007/s13280-021-01614-x, 2021.
- [41]. T. Rayden, K.R. Jones, K. Austin, and J. Radachowsky, "Improving climate and biodiversity outcomes through restoration of forest integrity", *Conservation Biology*, 37, e14163. [https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.14163, 2023](https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.14163).
- [42]. N. Keller, P.A. Niklaus, J. Ghazoul, T. Marfil, E. Godoong, and C.D. Philipson, "Biodiversity consequences of long-term active forest restoration in selectively-logged tropical rainforests", *Forest Ecology and Management*, 549 (121414), [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2023.121414, 2023](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2023.121414).
- [43]. H. Guo, M. Goulden, M.G. Chung, C. Nyelele, B. Egoh, C. Keske, M. Conklin, and R. Bales, "Valuing the benefits of forest restoration on enhancing hydropower and water supply in California's Sierra Nevada", *Science of The Total Environment*, 876, 162836, [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.162836, 2023](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.162836).