International Journal of Leading Research Publication (IJLRP)

E-ISSN: 2582-8010 ● Website: www.ijlrp.com ● Email: editor@ijlrp.com

Role of urban agriculture - A polyhouse cultivation analysis

Yash Raj

Assistant Professor
Mewar University, Gangrar, Chittorgarh, Rajasthan.

Abstract:
The rapid escalation of global urbanization continually exerts profound pressures on natural resources, escalating the vulnerability of intricate, trans-national food supply chains. Concurrently, Urban Agriculture (UA) has garnered significant prominence as an efficacious mechanism to democratize local food security, bolster socio-ecological resilience, and propagate essential ecosystem services across urban areas. Nevertheless, the inherent constraints of modern metropolitan geography characterized by land scarcity, ambient pollution, and shifting climatological regimes, have precipitated a paradigm shift away from traditional open-field practices towards Controlled Environment Agriculture (CEA), most notably polyhouse cultivation and Zero-Acreage Farming (ZFarming). This comprehensive review systematically evaluates the multifaceted role of UA through the precise lens of polyhouse agro-ecosystems. This paper elucidates the cutting-edge technological innovations propelling smart greenhouses. These encompass the integration of artificial intelligence, digital twinning, and novel plant breeding strategies engineered for spatial optimization. Furthermore, the inquiry critically examines the socio-economic topography of UA, emphasizing its capacity to spur rural-urban entrepreneurial transitions within developing economies while interrogating its broader critical geography. A rigorous evaluation of the environmental implications, particularly concerning the Water-Energy-Food-Environment Nexus (WEFEN) and the covert risks of soil toxicity in high-intensity greenhouse vegetable production, is provided. Ultimately, the synthesis proposes holistic policy frameworks and delineates prospective trajectories for scaling polyhouse agriculture to secure sustainable, nutritionally robust urban environments.

Keywords: Urban Agriculture, Polyhouse Cultivation, Smart Greenhouses, Food Security, Ecosystem Services, Zero-Acreage Farming, Agroecology.

1. Introduction

The global demographic transition toward dense urban agglomerations arguably constitutes the most disruptive socio-spatial realignment of the contemporary era. Echoing Henri Lefebvre's seminal conceptualization in 'The Urban Revolution' (2003), this complete urbanization of society structurally reconfigures humanity's metabolic relationship with the natural environment. Current projections indicate that nearly seventy percent of the global populace will inhabit urban centres by the mid-21st century (Foley et al., 2011). This concentration inevitably births "hungry cities" that are disproportionately reliant on protracted, resource-intensive, and geopolitically fragile agricultural supply chains (Steel, 2008). In response to these vulnerabilities which is frequently exacerbated by anthropogenic climate change, Urban Agriculture (UA) has emerged as an indispensable component of sustainable municipal planning. Historically a survivalist endeavour in developing nations or an idiosyncratic socio-cultural pursuit in affluent domains, UA is now increasingly recognized for its capacity to fortify localized food sovereignty and mitigate environmental externalities (Smit, Ratta, & Nasr, 1996; Pearson, Pearson, & Pearson, 2011; Kiminami et al., 2019).

Despite the manifold benefits of conventional UA, typified by community allotments and backyard plots, its broad-scale expansion remains severely curtailed by pervasive municipal limitations. Chief among these are the prohibitive value of real estate, ubiquitous soil contamination, and volatile microclimates (Deelstra & Girardet, 2000; Mishra et al., 2026). Consequently, agricultural paradigms are rapidly transitioning toward advanced, spatially optimized systems often categorized under Zero-Acreage Farming (ZFarming) (Thomaier et al., 2015; Specht et al., 2014). Polyhouse cultivation, standing at the forefront of Controlled Environment Agriculture (CEA), employs protective polyethylene architectures to meticulously regulate intrinsic environmental variables, including luminosity, ambient temperature, and relative humidity. These technologically augmented spaces promise vastly superior yields per unit area, circumvention of seasonal variations, and optimized resource utilization profiles. This paper dissect the technological, socio-economic, and ecological dimensions of modern polyhouse agriculture within urban frameworks.

2. Technological advancements in polyhouse cultivation

The ascendance of polyhouse agriculture into a commercially viable urban enterprise is inextricably linked to the rapid acceleration of agricultural technology. The metamorphosis from passive polytunnels to highly autonomous, data-centric smart greenhouses signifies a monumental shift in agronomic practice.

2.1 Advancements in smart farming and algorithmic management

At the vanguard of CEA technology is the seamless integration of the Internet of Things (IoT), big data analytics, and artificial intelligence (AI). This technological convergence facilitates a practice known as "Digital Twinning" i.e. the creation of hyper-accurate, real-time virtual simulations of physical agronomic environments. Such architectures empower producers to autonomously dictate climate parameters, coordinate precision irrigation, and dispense targeted nutrients without physical intervention (Das, Woods, & Kong, 2026). Recent deployments of machine learning frameworks, as investigated by Dar et al. (2026), illustrate how predictive intelligence can pre-emptively adapt microclimates to optimize yields and mitigate abiotic stress. Region-specific deployments in urbanizing nodes across Thailand and the Indian subcontinent have validated these methodologies, demonstrating profound gains in systemic efficiency (Santosh et al., 2024; Rani et al., 2024). Nevertheless, researchers caution against the peril of "technological reductionism." The extreme complexity of living ecosystems cannot always be seamlessly subsumed into binary computations; an over-reliance on digital models threatens to erode the invaluable traditional ecological knowledge essential for holistic, adaptive pest management (Das, Woods, & Kong, 2026).

2.2 Plant genetics and crop architectural design

To fully exploit the rigorous control afforded by polyhouses, agronomists require cultivars specifically optimized for indoor cultivation. The foundational architecture of classical crops is frequently misaligned with the spatial constraints of CEA. Qaim (2020) highlights that modern genomic techniques, including CRISPR-Cas9 genome editing, are imperative for rapidly engineering space-efficient, high-yield varieties tailored to controlled environments. Building upon this, Tian et al. (2020) advocate for a concerted global effort in "designing future crops." In a polyhouse or vertical farming context, selective breeding must prioritize distinct phenotypic traits such as altered canopy structures to maximize vertical photon interception, perpetual fruiting cycles, and abbreviated root systems, over traditional traits prioritized for open-field hardiness.

2.3 Energy metabolism and nexus optimization

While CEA offers unparalleled agronomic control, its operational energy footprint remains its most formidable vulnerability. Extensive lifecycle assessments (LCA) have revealed that the immense electrical demand for active thermodynamics specifically artificial lighting, heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC), can inadvertently inflate the carbon footprint of indoor farming beyond that of conventional extensive agriculture (Kulak, Graves, & Chatterton, 2013). Resolving this paradox necessitates innovative infrastructural designs. Alvari et al. (2025) forward a comprehensive optimization model structured around the Water-Energy-Food-Environment Nexus (WEFEN), heavily integrating Building Integrated Photovoltaics (BIPV). By synergizing custom solar arrays directly into the polyhouse architecture, operators can realize up to eighty-six percent energy autonomy. Furthermore, enclosed hydroponic recirculation systems can achieve up to a ninety percent reduction in freshwater expenditure compared to open-field norms (Zhang et al., 2013; Khattab et al., 2018; Harjunowibowo et al., 2016).Pivoting toward these renewable, closed-loop metabolisms is absolute precondition for the overarching sustainability of high-intensity urban- farming.

3. Socio-economic dimensions, geography, and entrepreneurship

Beyond agronomic yields, polyhouse cultivation initiates profound transformations in the socio-spatial and economic fabrics of adjacent communities.

3.1 Spatial justice and critical urban geography

A rigorous analysis of UA necessitates an engagement with critical geography. As Tornaghi (2014) articulates, navigating the spatial nuances of urban food production requires an understanding of municipal land disparities, gentrification pressures, and the equitable allocation of civic resources. Prevailing UA literature expose an escalating academic focus on the multi-functionality of peri-urban agricultural belts as they interface with encroaching metropolitan sprawl (Pinheiro et al., 2020; Zasada, 2011). Polyhouses effectively operate as resilient boundary structures in these transitional zones. By dramatically intensifying output per square meter, they economically justify the retention of agricultural land amidst competing, highly lucrative real estate developments, simultaneously compressing the geographic distance between producer and consumer.

3.2 Economic architectures and livelihood generation

From an economic perspective, polyhouse cultivation operates as a robust catalyst for entrepreneurship, possessing distinct contours within developing economies. Exploratory field studies demonstrate the formidable viability of protected cultivation for small-scale proprietors. While the requisite initial capital expenditure (CAPEX) for structural integrity is undeniably steep, rigorous economic modeling underscores substantial compensatory profit margins. These are driven by elevated harvest quality, the insulation of crops from meteorological disasters, and the lucrative capacity to supply premium vegetables to urban markets during off-seasons (Haile et al., 2026). Notably, in Telangana, India, aggressive governmental subsidization often characterised by alleviating over ninety percent of establishment costs, has successfully stimulated polyhouse ventures as a premier avenue for rural-urban enterprise (Pandiri, 2018). This capitalization incentivizes the retention of youth in agrarian sectors, creating highly specialized employment that bridges rural production capacity with sophisticated urban distribution networks, thereby systematically alleviating urban food deserts (Sharma et al., 2024; Planning Department, 2024; FAO, 2024; Zezza & Tasciotti, 2010).

3.3 Institutional governance and policy mechanisms

The proliferation of advanced CEA is intricately entwined with proactive governance and institutional patronage (Dietze et al., 2024). In extreme geographies, such as the United Arab Emirates (UAE), where an arid climate and critical hydric scarcity virtually prohibit terrestrial cultivation, state-sponsored mandates have aggressively subsidized the indoor agricultural sector (Mishra et al., 2026). Governing frameworks, exemplified by the UAE National Food Security Strategy, purposely elevate high-tech agriculture to the status of critical civic security. Such paradigms empirically prove that when municipal and national institutions implement deliberate policy architectures to de-risk CAPEX for farmers, private innovation rapidly realigns to fulfil domestic sustainability targets.

4. Environmental impacts, agro-ecology, and substrate dynamics

Although polyhouses are conceptually designed to insulate flora from climatic volatility and meticulously optimize resource inputs, their high-intensity methodologies introduce unique ecological complications that necessitate strict ecological oversight.

4.1 Ecosystem services and agroecological synergy

When evaluated on a macro-municipal scale, correctly implemented UA provisions a suite of indispensable regulating ecosystem services. These include significant urban heat island (UHI) abatement, critical stormwater detention, and the overarching psychological benefits associated with biophilic urbanism (Aerts, Dewaelheyns, & Achten, 2016; Pretty, 2008). However, the highly hermetic nature of polyhouses invariably sever their immediate integration into broader spontaneous biodiversity, for instance, fundamentally obstructing wild pollinators and avian species (Deelstra & Girardet, 2000). To counteract this isolation, scholars advocate for the incorporation of scientifically guided agro ecological principles directly into the surrounding infrastructure. The assimilation of Conservation Agriculture practices, alongside engineered ecological buffer zones, is requisite for anchoring polyhouses harmoniously within the urban biome (Wezel et al., 2014; Hobbs, 2007; Gliessman, 1990).

4.2 Concealed toxicological risks in greenhouse vegetable production

A covert, yet globally significant consequence of enduring, intensive Greenhouse Vegetable Production (GVP) is the gradual contamination and deterioration of soil microbiology. Continuous cultivation inside stable polyhouse ecosystems dramatically disrupts natural nutrient cycling pathways. Research conducted by Shen et al. (2026) vividly details how the relentless application of compounded organic and synthetic fertilizers in enclosed structures precipitates a perilous accumulation of heavy metals (e.g., cadmium, zinc) and veterinary antibiotics (e.g., tetracyclines). Distinct from open-field paradigms, polyhouses lack the natural ameliorative effects of seasonal precipitation and leaching. This absence results in a localized "pseudo-persistence" of toxicity in the upper strata of the plow pan. Predictive models caution that even marginal escalations in nutrient load can trigger exponential rises in both phyto-toxicity and subsequent human exposure via the food chain. Mitigating this insidious threat demands rigorous synergistic management frameworks specifically, hyper-calibrating the stoichiometric ratio of organic to chemical inputs and mandating rotational substrate bioremediation.

5. Challenges and prospective imperatives

The universal actualization of polyhouse-driven UA necessitates the dissolution of several systemic bottlenecks, dictating the locus of future academic and policy-driven inquiries.

1. **Financial democratization**: The exorbitant upfront infrastructural requirements, encompassing smart sensors and thermodynamic apparatuses, naturally preclude participation by economically marginalized demographics. Without the implementation of equitable civic financing subsidies, the transition toward smart farming threatens to exacerbate socio-economic disparities by consolidating urban food production into monopolistic, well-capitalized corporate entities (Haile et al., 2026; Pandiri, 2018).

2. **Techno-ecological hybridity**: An uncritical dependence on algorithmic automation stands to systematically erase localized, experiential farming expertise. Pedagogical and operational frameworks of the future must actively synthesize machine learning diagnostics with tactile human agroecological knowledge, culminating in deeply resilient, hybrid agricultural intelligence (Das, Woods, & Kong, 2026).
3. **Architectural symbiosis**: To fully realize the promises of ZFarming, municipal planners must transcend the notion of urban farms as discrete entities occupying vacant lots. Agriculture must become an embedded, infrastructural constant within the architectural blueprints of future cities thereby occupying rooftops, subterranean levels, and multi-functional facades (Thomaier et al., 2015; Despommier, 2010).
4. **Soil health remediation models**: Extended empirical investigations targeting the microbiome of long-standing polyhouse substrates are an urgent prerequisite. Establishing robust protocols to forestall the toxic build-up of agricultural compounds remains essential for safeguarding the systemic longevity of CEA (Shen et al., 2026).

6. Conclusion

Urban agriculture, spearheaded by the widespread dissemination of polyhouse and zero-acreage farming technologies, represents a paramount adaptation to the escalating, convergent crises of relentless urbanization, ecological degradation, and food system fragility. By orchestrating a deliberate transition from extensive terrestrial farming toward high-intensity, controlled-environment agriculture, metropolises possess the latent capacity to secure exponential, year-round agronomic outputs coupled with unparalleled hydric conservation.

Nevertheless, the trajectory toward optimal polyhouse implementation requires deliberate, rigorous recalibration. Stakeholders and policymakers are obliged to systematically dismantle financial entry barriers through progressive, structured subsidization programs. Likewise, it is an ecological imperative that future infrastructures aggressively integrate localized renewable energy such as BIPV, to comprehensively close the WEFEN loop. Simultaneously, agronomists must maintain a vigilant watch over soil mechanics to avert the acute toxicity risks generated by relentless fertilization in closed structures. In summation, the future resilience of our urban landscapes directly correlates with our ability to fluently harmonize cutting-edge digital automation with the timeless, unyielding principles of agro ecology.

REFERENCES:

1. Aerts, R., Dewaelheyns, V., & Achten, W. (2016). *Potential ecosystem services of urban agriculture: a review*. https://doi.org/10.7287/PEERJ.PREPRINTS.2286
2. Alvari, Y., Zandi, M., Jahangiri, A., Ameri, M., Gholami, A., Shahidi, P., & Mousavi, S.
3. (2025). BIPVdriven smart vertical greenhouses: a water energy food environment nexus framework for sustainable urban agriculture. *Energy Nexus*, *19*, 100473. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nexus.2025.100473
4. Barthel, S., & Isendahl, C. (2013). Urban gardens, Agriculture, And water management: Sources of resilience for longterm food security in cities. *Ecological Economics*, *86*, 224–
5. 234. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2012.06.018
6. Birkby, J. (2016). *Vertical farming*. ATTRA Sustainable Agriculture Program.
7. Chadha, K. L. (2001). *Handbook of Horticulture*. Indian Council of Agricultural Research.
8. Dar, A. A., Chen, Z., RodrIguez-Rodríguez, S., Haghighat, F., An, C., Reyes, R. A. G., & González-Rosales, B. (2026). Ecological and Technological Insights to Enhance Rice Production: A Machine Learning Approach for Sustainable Agriculture in Granma, Cuba. *Sustainable Development*. https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.70593
9. Das, P., Woods, O., & Kong, L. (2026). Modelling nature? The digital twinning and untwining of urban farms. *Geoforum*, *170*, 104539.
10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2026.104539

11. Deelstra, T., & Girardet, H. (2000). Urban agriculture and sustainable cities. *Bakker N., Dubbeling M., Gündel S., Sabel-Koshella U., de Zeeuw H. Growing cities, growing food. Urban agriculture on the policy agenda. Feldafing, Germany: Zentralstelle für Ernährung und Landwirtschaft (ZEL)*, *43*, 66.
12. Despommier, D. (2010). *The vertical farm: feeding the world in the 21st century*. Macmillan.
13. Dietze, V., Alhashemi, A., & Feindt, P. H. (2024). Controlled-environment agriculture for an urbanised world? A comparative analysis of the innovation systems in London, Nairobi and Singapore. *Food Security*, *16*(2), 371-396.
14. FAO. (2012). *Growing greener cities in Africa*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
15. FAO. (2024). The state of food security and nutrition in the world 2024. In *FAO; IFAD; UNICEF; WFP; WHO; eBooks*. FAO ; IFAD ; UNICEF ; WFP ; WHO ;
16. https://doi.org/10.4060/cd1254en
17. Foley, J. A., Ramankutty, N., Brauman, K. A., Cassidy, E. S., Gerber, J. S., Johnston, M., Mueller, N. D., O'Connell, C., Ray, D. K., West, P. C., Balzer, C., Bennett, E. M., Carpenter, S. R., Hill, J., Monfreda, C., Polasky, S., Rockström, J., Sheehan, J., Siebert, S., & Tilman, D. (2011). Solutions for a cultivated planet. *Nature*, *478*(7369), 337–342. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature10452
18. Gliessman, S. R. (1990). Agroecology: researching the ecological basis for sustainable agriculture. In *Agroecology: researching the ecological basis for sustainable agriculture* (pp. 3-10). New York, NY: Springer New York.
19. Haile, M., Getaneh, S., Jemberie, M., Endalew, Z., Desalegne, F., & Wale, M. (2026). Exploratory Assessment of Poly house Farming among Emerging Farmers: Evidence from Dera woreda, South Gondar, Ethiopia. *Turkish Journal of Agriculture-Food Science and Technology*, *14*(4), 946-951.
20. Harjunowibowo, D., Cuce, E., Omer, S. A., & Riffat, S. B. (2016, July). Recent passive technologies of greenhouse systems-A Review. In *15th International Conference on Sustainable Energy Technologies–SET* (Vol. 19).
21. Hobbs, P. R. (2007). Conservation agriculture: what is it and why is it important for future sustainable food production?. *The Journal of Agricultural Science*, *145*(2), 127.
22. Khattab, N. M., El Shenawy, E. T., Ibrahim, M. A., Ahmed, M. H., El-Seesy, I. E., & Hassan, S. A. (2018). Development of a solar system to produce water and electricity of complex greenhouse for hydroponic cultivation and solar drying. *Current Science International*, *7*(1), 10–22.
23. Kiminami, L., Furuzawa, S., & Kiminami, A. (2019). Impacts of multi-functionality of urban agriculture on the creative classes in global mega city: focusing on Shanghai in China. *Asia-pacific journal of regional science*, *3*(2), 487-515.
24. Kulak, M., Graves, A., & Chatterton, J. (2013). Reducing greenhouse gas emissions with urban agriculture: A Life Cycle Assessment perspective. *Landscape and urban planning*, *111*, 68-78.
25. Lefebvre, H. (2003). *The urban revolution*. U of Minnesota Press.
26. Mishra, A., Meziani, R., Alkhatib, A., & Laila, S. A. (2026). Urban Farming Initiatives in the United Arab Emirates: Policy, Social and Design Opportunities for Food Security and Resilience. *International Review for Spatial Planning and Sustainable Development*, *14*(1), 1-19.
27. Orsini, F., Kahane, R., Nono-Womdim, R., & Gianquinto, G. (2013). Urban agriculture in the developing world: a review. *Agronomy for sustainable development*, *33*(4), 695-720.
28. Pandiri, H. B. (2018). Polyhouse farming as rural entrepreneurship: Experience of Telangana state polyhouse farmers. *J Mgmt*, *6*, 66-72.
29. Pearson, L. J., Pearson, L., & Pearson, C. J. (2011). Sustainable urban agriculture: stocktake and opportunities. *Urban Agriculture*, 7-19.
30. Pimentel, D., Harvey, C., Resosudarmo, P., Sinclair, K., Kurz, D., McNair, M., ... & Blair,
31. R. (1995). Environmental and economic costs of soil erosion and conservation benefits. *Science*, *267*(5201), 1117-1123.
32. Pinheiro, A., & Govind, M. (2020). Emerging Global Trends in Urban Agriculture Research: A

Scientometric Analysis of Peer-reviewed Journals. *J. Sci. Res.*, *9*(2), 163-173.
33. Planning Department. (2024). *Telangana socio economic outlook 2024: Empowering agriculture and allied sectors*. Government of Telangana. https://www.des.telangana.gov.in/publications/Socio%20Economic%20Outlook-2024.pdf
34. Pretty, J. (2008). Agricultural sustainability: concepts, principles and evidence. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *363*(1491), 447-465.
35. Qaim, M. (2020). Role of new plant breeding technologies for food security and sustainable agricultural development. *Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy*, *42*(2), 129-150.
36. Rani, N., Tiwari, D., Kaur, G., & Sharma, D. (2024). Enhancing Agricultural Productivity: A Comparative Study of Vegetable Cultivation under Polyhouse and Open Field Conditions in Punjab, India. *Journal of Scientific Research and Reports*, *30*(7), 166-174.
37. Rockström, J., Williams, J., Daily, G., Noble, A., Matthews, N., Gordon, L., ... & Smith, J. (2017). Sustainable intensification of agriculture for human prosperity and global sustainability. *Ambio*, *46*(1), 4-17.
38. Santosh, D. T., Maitra, S., & Sairam, M. (2024). Enhancing rural economies with protected cultivation technologies. *International Journal of Bioresource Science*, *11*(1), 71–79. https://doi.org/10.30954/2347-9655.01.2024.8
39. Sharma, S., Kumari, R., Nagar, M., Gaur, D., & Saha, S. (2024). Revolutionizing Agriculture: The Polyhouse Paradigm and AI Integration in Modern Farming Practices. International Journal of Microsystems and IoT, 2(9), 1218–1228. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14103137
40. Shen, L., Zhao, F., Li, J., Yang, L., Feng, Q., Yang, N., ... & Chen, L. (2026). Impact of intensive greenhouse cultivation on soil health: implications for synergistic management of nutrients and contaminants. *Journal of Agriculture and Food Research*, 102707.
41. Smit, J., Ratta, A., & Nasr, J. (1996). *Urban agriculture: food, jobs and sustainable cities* (Vol. 2, pp. 35-37). New York: United Nations Development Programme.
42. Specht, K., Siebert, R., Hartmann, I., Freisinger, U. B., Sawicka, M., Werner, A., ... & Dierich, A. (2014). Urban agriculture of the future: an overview of sustainability aspects of food production in and on buildings. *Agriculture and human values*, *31*(1), 33-51.
43. Steel, C. (2013). *Hungry city: How food shapes our lives*. Random house.
44. Thomaier, S., Specht, K., Henckel, D., Dierich, A., Siebert, R., Freisinger, U. B., & Sawicka, M. (2015). Farming in and on urban buildings: Present practice and specific novelties of Zero-Acreage Farming (ZFarming). *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems*, *30*(1), 43-54.
45. Tian, Z., Wang, J. W., Li, J., & Han, B. (2021). Designing future crops: challenges and strategies for sustainable agriculture. *The Plant Journal*, *105*(5), 1165-1178.
46. Tornaghi, C. (2014). Critical geography of urban agriculture. *Progress in Human Geography*, *38*(4), 551-567.
47. Wezel, A., Casagrande, M., Celette, F., Vian, J. F., Ferrer, A., & Peigné, J. (2014). Agroecological practices for sustainable agriculture. A review: A. Wezel et al. *Agronomy for sustainable development*, *34*(1), 1-20.
48. Zasada, I. (2011). Multifunctional peri-urban agriculture—A review of societal demands and the provision of goods and services by farming. *Land use policy*, *28*(4), 639-648.
49. Zezza, A., & Tasciotti, L. (2010). Urban agriculture, poverty, and food security: Empirical evidence from a sample of developing countries. *Food policy*, *35*(4), 265-273.
50. ZHANG, Q. T., Wan, C. H. E. N., & LIANG, X. J. (2013). Effects of evapotranspiration on mitigation of urban temperature by vegetation and urban agriculture. *Journal of Integrative Agriculture*, *12*(8), 1307-1315.