

Нестерчук Інна Костянтинівка,
кандидат географічних наук, доцент

Житомирський державний університет імені Івана Франка, Житомир, Україна,
e-mail:nester_geock@ukr.net, ORCID ID: 0009-0004-5721-3928

ГЕОПРОСТОРОВА ОРГАНІЗАЦІЯ ГАСТРОНОМІЧНОГО ЛАНДШАФТУ

Метою дослідження є комплексне вивчення геопросторової організації гастрономічного ландшафту як складової соціально-культурного та економічного простору територій, з метою виявлення закономірностей його формування й розвитку, аналізу територіальної структури та просторової диференціації гастрономічних об'єктів, визначення сукупності природно-географічних, історико-культурних і соціально-економічних чинників впливу, а також оцінки ролі гастрономії у забезпеченні сталого розвитку територій, підвищенні їх туристичної привабливості та формуванні локальної ідентичності.

Методика дослідження ґрунтується на комплексному підході, що поєднує загальнонаукові та спеціальні географічні методи. У процесі дослідження застосовано аналіз і синтез для узагальнення теоретичних положень щодо гастрономічного ландшафту; системно-структурний підхід - для виявлення елементів і взаємозв'язків його геопросторової організації; картографічний та геоінформаційний методи - для аналізу територіального розміщення гастрономічних об'єктів і просторових закономірностей їх концентрації; статистичні методи - для оцінки кількісних показників розвитку гастрономічної діяльності; порівняльно-географічний метод - для зіставлення гастрономічних ландшафтів різних територій. Польові дослідження та контент-аналіз відкритих джерел використано для уточнення сучасного стану та специфіки гастрономічного ландшафту.

Результати засвідчили, що геопросторова організація гастрономічного ландшафту має виражену територіальну диференціацію, зумовлену поєднанням природно-географічних, історико-культурних та соціально-економічних чинників.

В роботі *наукова новизна* полягає в обґрунтуванні гастрономічного ландшафту як складової культурного та соціально-економічного простору території та виявленні особливостей його геопросторової організації. Уперше систематизовано чинники формування гастрономічного ландшафту з позицій просторового аналізу та конструктивно-географічних.

Практична значущість полягає в можливості використання отриманих результатів для просторового планування та розвитку гастрономічної інфраструктури територій. Виявлені закономірності геопросторової організації гастрономічного ландшафту можуть бути використані органами місцевого самоврядування та суб'єктами туристичної діяльності при розробленні стратегій розвитку територій, програм підтримки локальних гастрономічних брендів і формуванні туристичних маршрутів.

Ключові слова: гастрономічний ландшафт, геопросторова організація гастрономічного ландшафту, просторово-часова та структурно-функціональна організація, функціонування, динаміка та розвиток гастрономічних ландшафтів.

Nesterchuk Inna,
Candidate of Geographical Sciences, Associate Professor

Ivan Franko Zhytomyr State University, Zhytomyr, Ukraine,
e-mail:nester_geock@ukr.net, ORCID ID: 0009-0004-5721-3928

GEOSPATIAL ORGANIZATION OF THE GASTRONOMIC LANDSCAPE

The aim of the study is to comprehensively examine the geospatial organization of the gastronomic landscape as a component of the socio-cultural and economic space of territories, with the aim of identifying the patterns of its formation and development, analyzing the territorial structure and spatial differentiation of gastronomic objects, determining the set of natural-geographical, historical-cultural, and socio-economic factors of influence, as well as assessing the role of gastronomy in ensuring the sustainable development of territories, increasing their tourist appeal and forming local identity.

The research methodology is based on a comprehensive approach that combines general scientific and specific geographical methods. The research process involved analysis and synthesis to generalize theoretical propositions regarding the gastronomic landscape; a systemic-structural approach to identify elements and interrelationships in its geospatial organization; cartographic and geoinformation methods were used to analyze the territorial distribution of gastronomic objects and the spatial patterns of their concentration; statistical methods were used to assess quantitative indicators of the development of gastronomic activity; and a comparative-geographical method was used to compare the gastronomic landscapes of different territories. Field research and content analysis of open sources were used to clarify the current state and specifics of the gastronomic landscape.

The results showed that the geospatial organization of the gastronomic landscape has a pronounced territorial differentiation, caused by a combination of natural-geographical, historical-cultural, and socio-economic factors.

The scientific novelty of this work lies in the substantiation of the gastronomic landscape as a component of the cultural and socio-economic space of the territory and the identification of the peculiarities of its geospatial organization. For the first time, the factors shaping the gastronomic landscape have been systematized from the perspective of spatial analysis and constructive geography.

The practical significance lies in the possibility of using the results obtained for spatial planning and development of the gastronomic infrastructure of territories. The identified patterns of geospatial organization of the gastronomic landscape can be used by local authorities and tourism entities in developing strategies for the development of territories, programs to support local gastronomic brands, and the formation of tourist routes.

Keywords: gastronomic landscape, geospatial organization of the gastronomic landscape, spatial-temporal and structural-functional organization, functioning, dynamics, and development of gastronomic landscapes.

Relevance and scope of the study. The retrospective development of theoretical concepts of integral territorial systems (hereinafter ITS) in geography is associated with a gradual transition from descriptive ideas about regions to a systematic view of space as a hierarchy of interconnected territorial structures of various natures (natural, socio-economic, political, cultural). In modern geography, territorial systems are interpreted as ordered combinations of elements (population, economy, infrastructure, management) that function as a whole through flows of matter and energy. Integrity means that different subsystems (natural resources, production, social, political, cultural, spiritual, etc.) are considered not in isolation, but in interaction, which forms regular territorial combinations and areas of a certain profile.

Geography in the 19th and first half of the 20th centuries mainly used the concepts of “region,” “land,” and “territory” as relatively homogeneous territories for a comprehensive systematic interpretation of interrelationships. Gradually, the concept of a “true geographical region” emerged as a functionally coherent territorial organism, where not only homogeneity but also the internal functional connectivity of elements and the level of territorial correctness were important.

In the mid-20th century, geography began to actively adopt a general scientific systematic approach: territorial systems with a hierarchical structure, nodes, flows, “center-periphery,” and networks of connections were considered.

An important role was played by W. Christaller's theory of central places (1933) and subsequent quantitative approaches that interpreted cities and their hinterlands as functional regional systems with a pronounced hierarchy of centers and zones of attraction.

Subsequently, his scientific statements about the geospatial organization of landscapes were reflected in a number of works. Landscape-ecological - landscape as an integral geosystem, suitable for constructive analysis and optimization of anthropogenic load (Gerenchuk, 1975). Geosystem - the landscape complex is considered as a geosystem, which is an integral system of natural components (soil, relief, water, climate, vegetation, fauna) that interact closely and function together within certain spatial boundaries. Such a system has its own structure, patterns of formation, functioning, and development, which is determined by the unity of natural conditions and processes (Marynych, Shyshchenko, 2005).

Natural-territorial complexes (NTC) are integral territorial systems as objective natural formations that form the basis for rational nature management (Denysyk, 1998). The theory of cultural landscape - territorial systems as a result of the transformation of the natural landscape by society (Sauer, 1925). The concept of territorial socio-economic systems (Haggett, 1965), Territorial systems and integrated models of regional development (Sica, 2025). The Chinese system of comprehensive geographical zoning (integral georegions) (Wang, Chen, Zhou, 2020).

The Ukrainian academic school develops the concepts of integral, sectoral, natural resource, and production-territorial systems and regions, emphasizing the combination of natural resources, production, population, and infrastructure as the objective basis for integral zoning.

Modern ITS concepts are oriented toward a multi-level structure of space: from local territorial communities and “lands” to national and supranational systems, with each level simultaneously being a subsystem of the higher level and a supersystem of the lower levels.

In the latest research, territorial systems integrate not only economic and demographic parameters, but also the time dimension (time-geography), the reflexivity of territorial communities, and the use of GIS to model the historical and geographical evolution of these systems.

At the beginning of the 21st century, ITS concepts in Ukraine and Europe are developing in line with the ideas of sustainable development, territorial cohesion, and spatial planning. Integral territorial systems are viewed as socio-ecological-economic entities that require comprehensive management. In

Ukrainian geography, these approaches are actively used in research on regional development, decentralization, the formation of capable communities, and spatial planning of territories.

The historiogenesis of theoretical concepts of integral territorial systems in Ukrainian and European geography demonstrates the evolution of scientific thinking from the description of territories to their systematic analysis. Today, these concepts are an important methodological basis for solving practical problems of regional development and spatial policy, in particular regarding the study of the spatio-temporal and structural-functional organization of gastronomic landscapes.

Materials and methods. The methodological basis of the study is based on a comprehensive approach that combines general scientific and specific geographical methods. In the course of the study, analysis and synthesis were used to generalize theoretical provisions regarding the gastronomic landscape; a systemic-structural approach was used to identify elements and interrelationships of its geospatial organization; cartographic and geoinformation methods were used to analyze the territorial distribution of gastronomic objects and the spatial patterns of their concentration; statistical methods were used to assess quantitative indicators of the development of gastronomic activity; and a comparative-geographical method was used to compare the gastronomic landscapes of different territories. Field research and content analysis of open sources were used to clarify the current state and specifics of the gastronomic landscape.

A constructive-geographical study of the spatial organization of the gastronomic landscape is aimed at its comprehensive study, scientific understanding, and purposeful construction as a system-forming phenomenon. Within the framework of scientific research, the gastronomic landscape is considered as an emergent result of the interaction and combination of natural territorial systems, the functioning of which is oriented towards reducing the functional and organizational load by forming a qualitatively new territorial system.

The spatial-temporal and structural-functional organization of gastronomic landscapes describes how the elements of “food – place – people” are arranged in space and time and how the functions of production, service, consumption, and symbolic meaning are distributed among them.

The spatial-temporal organization of gastronomic landscapes shows that they are dynamic: they change over time (seasonality of harvests, tourist seasons, “food days” – the daily rhythm of meals) and in space (from the kitchen/restaurant to the city, region, country). Spatiality includes scales from micro (eating establishments, fairs, vineyards) to meso (wine-producing/agricultural production area) and macro (wine or gastronomic region of the world), where gastronomic flows and tourist movements combine local terroirs and specialties into single routes.

The structural and functional organization of gastronomic landscapes consists of agricultural land, processing enterprises, markets, restaurants, festival spaces, transport and tourist infrastructure, as well as intangible elements such as traditions, brands, quality standards, and geographical indications.

Functionally, there are at least four key areas: production (agriculture, fishing, processing), distribution (logistics, trade), consumption (restaurant sector, tastings, eating out), and representation (festivals, gastronomic events, destination marketing), which together create the stage for the tourist gastronomic experience.

The geospatial organization of the gastronomic landscape is interpreted through the constructive-geographical approaches of “human-food-space,” which represent the approaches of metasociety and food network theories.

In the classical definition, a metasociety is a set of local communities (local biocenoses/groups) located in different habitats but connected by flows of migration and exchange, which explains the spatial-temporal structure of biodiversity.

For gastronomic landscapes, local “communities” can be considered as individual gastronomic nodes (terroir villages, specialty villages, wine clusters, urban gastronomic districts) connected by tourist flows, culinary practices of ethnic groups, food supply, and symbolic ties. Such a metacommunity forms a regional gastronomic landscape as a dynamic, spatially structured system.

The spatial organization of the gastronomic landscape can be interpreted as a network of local gastronomic communities (farmers, restaurateurs, artisans, consumers) that occupy different positions in space (village, city, route, agricultural landscape) and are connected by flows of tourists, products, knowledge, and cultural practices.

The temporal dynamics of the gastronomic landscape (seasonality of harvests, festivals, waves of tourist demand, the emergence and disappearance of establishments) can be described, in terms of metacommunities, as changes in the states of local “nodes” and the redistribution of roles among them

(active/passive, core/periphery), which directly corresponds to modern models of spatiotemporal metacommunity dynamics.

Food webs are extremely complex ecological networks, dynamic in both space and time. Metacommunity models currently underpin unified theories of biodiversity, but until now they have not addressed the complexity of food webs. Here we show that metacommunity theory can explain the emergence of species-rich food webs with complex topologies (Payne, 1988).

Food systems include the chains “production – processing – logistics – retail – consumption – redistribution – waste processing,” and it is the topology of this network (centers, clusters, corridors, peripheries) that determines the structural and functional profile of the gastronomic landscape—production, service, tourism, cultural, symbolic, etc.

In turn, biomass flows: oligotrophic, mesotrophic, and eutrophic areas of the environment are distinguished based on the concentration of nutrients (biogenic elements), which directly affects the level of biological productivity of ecosystems. Oligotrophic systems are characterized by a deficiency of nutrients, high water transparency, and low primary production rates; mountain lakes are typical examples. Mesotrophic ecosystems occupy an intermediate position, combining moderate biogenic content with average productivity, which is characteristic of transitional bogs, in particular. Eutrophic systems are characterized by significant enrichment with nitrogen and phosphorus, high bioproductivity, and, as a rule, reduced water transparency; they include lowland swamps and nutrient-rich lakes.

A scientific generalization might look like this: a gastronomic landscape is a metasociety of local gastronomic communities connected by multi-level food networks (agricultural production, supply, service, tourism), where spatio-temporal patterns (where and when certain nodes “work”) determine the structural and functional organization of the system. This approach allows us to describe gastronomic landscapes through the principles of local interaction and regional connectivity (cores, clusters, transit “corridors”); analyze their stability and vulnerability (which nodes “fall out” during crises and how the network is restructured); to model development scenarios (strengthening certain links in the food network, creating new “nodes” – festivals, gastronomic routes, local cuisine centers).

Currently, constructive-geographical analysis involves a transition from static descriptions of “where something is located” to an analysis of the network structure of connections between the gastronomic landscape and gastro-infrastructure (social, logistical, tourist, informational); time cycles, and the synchrony/asynchrony of activity at different nodes. In the concept of the gastronomic landscape, the approaches of metasociety and food network theories make it possible to form coherent gastronomic regions and routes that support biocultural diversity, local terroirs, specialties, and sustainable food systems, which is directly related to the management and optimization of the gastronomic landscape.

Thus, the interrelationships between the theory of metasocieties ↔ gastronomic landscape can be viewed as a metasociety of ecosystems connected by: species migration, seed exchange, microbiomes, human activity (trade, agricultural practices, tourism); the theory of food networks ↔ metasocieties, the former are embedded in each local community, but they intersect through: seasonal migrations, import/export of food resources, anthropogenic interventions; food networks ↔ gastronomic landscape, through culinary traditions that are formed on the basis of local trophic structures, loss of species → transformation of recipes → change in cultural identity, the individual acts as an active node in the food network, rather than an external observer.

Combined, these theories allow us to interpret the gastronomic landscape as a dynamic socio-ecological metanetwork, where biological, trophic, and cultural interactions shape the sustainability of the territory. This is particularly important for sustainable development, the preservation of biocultural diversity, regional gastronomy, and food security.

The gastronomic landscape as a geographical object has not been considered in scientific research at the present stage. In modern geography, the gastronomic landscape is interpreted as a combination of the natural and cultural conditions of the territory, local food systems, and perceptions of local food. It is not just a “background” for food, but a holistic space for the interaction of land use, agrosystems, gastronomic identity, tourism, and the daily practices of the local population at various scales.

Functionally, the gastronomic landscape works as a spatially organized system of flows: food flows: production of raw materials (agricultural landscapes, fishing waters, urban gardens), processing, distribution, markets, restaurants, and street food; tourism flows: visitor arrivals, routes (wine, cheese, olive, coffee, street food), concentration of services in “core” hubs (historic centers, resorts, geoparks);

Cultural and symbolic flows: branding of territories through cuisine, festivals, gastronomic events, granting UNESCO status to gastronomic regions.

These examples demonstrate how natural conditions, agricultural practices, history, and culture shape different types of regional gastronomic landscapes—from wine and cheese to seafood, truffles, or street food.

Examples of the “cores” of Ukraine's gastronomic landscapes: Lviv is the “coffee and chocolate” core of Galicia – an urban gastronomic landscape of coffee shops, bakeries, restaurants serving Galician cuisine, and coffee and chocolate festivals. Hutsulshchyna (Verkhovyna, Yaremche, Rakhiv) is the center of traditional mountain cuisine with banosh, kulash, mushroom soup, bryndza, meat dishes, and mead; the spatial structure is determined by mountain pastures, cheese factories, and family farms. Kyiv is a gastronomic landscape where classic dishes (borscht, varenyky, chicken Kiev) are combined with modern signature cuisine, street food, and ethnic restaurants.

The dynamics of gastronomic landscapes manifest themselves as changes in structures, flows, and images over time:

- *Historical evolution: from traditional agrarian landscapes, where food was primarily a resource for survival, to post-industrial “landscapes of impressions,” where gastronomy becomes the main motive for travel.*
- *Urbanization and globalization: the growing role of cities as hubs of global foodscapes, the mixing of cuisines, the emergence of hybrid dishes and “glocalized” formats (local products in global chains, ethnic-inspired street food).*
- *Tourism dynamics: increased gastronomic specialization of destinations (wine tourism, cheese/beer routes, seafood, street food), transition from mass standard food to experiences of “authenticity” and “locality.”*
- *Social media dimension: the mediatization of food (Instagram, travelogues, food blogs) accelerates the diffusion of gastronomic trends and transforms individual locations into “iconic” points on the global gastronomic landscape.*

The development and typology of gastronomic landscapes means the purposeful transformation of space based on agricultural practices and the gastronomy of ethnic groups:

- ✓ Formation of specialized types: regional, rural, urban, thematic (wine, cheese, coffee, beer, sweets), cultural and historical gastronomic landscapes.
- ✓ Integration into regional development strategies: local cuisine is used as a driver for the territory's brand, economic diversification, and cultural heritage preservation.
- ✓ Infrastructure development: food markets, restaurant clusters, educational and demonstration facilities (cooking schools, food museums, tasting centers, geoparks with a gastronomic theme).
- ✓ Innovation and sustainability: promotion of the concept of sustainable gastronomy, short supply chains, and organic production, which is changing land use and landscape management practices.

Contemporary scientific research on the gastronomic landscape considers it as a biosphere tool for stewardship (management): the culinary skills of ethnic groups and local products (terroirs) and dishes (specialties) have the potential to support diverse and sustainable landscapes.

From a constructive-geographical point of view, the study of the gastronomic landscape is based on several key approaches: Spatial approach: consideration of foodscapes from the micro level (establishment, street, neighborhood) to the meso and macro levels (region, country, transnational belts of wine or seafood landscapes, mapping of production, processing, consumption, tourist routes, identification of “hot spots” of gastronomic activity; systemic approach: analysis of the gastronomic landscape as a subsystem of the regional tourism and food complex with its connections, feedback loops, and flows; Cultural-landscape approach: interpretation of dishes, cooking techniques, and gastronomic practices of the landscape, reflecting history, ethnic structure, religion, colonial experience, etc.

This constructive-geographical approach allows us to describe the functioning, dynamics, and development of gastronomic landscapes as a result of the spatial organization of food systems, tourism, and cultural heritage in a single territorial whole.

The sustainability of gastronomic landscapes means organizing food production, processing, and consumption in a way that preserves ecosystems, local culture, economy, and the well-being of local communities.

In modern concepts, the gastronomic landscape is considered part of landscape management, where the gastronomy of ethnic groups, gastronomic cultural heritage, and agricultural practices are directly linked to long-term environmental and social sustainability.

A sustainable gastronomic landscape is an area that is consciously “cared for” in order to produce high-quality local food and, at the same time, to preserve biodiversity, landscape mosaics, and food sovereignty.

Key principles of sustainability in the gastronomic landscape:

- ✓ Locality: use of local, seasonal products, short farm-to-table supply chains, priority given to small producers and artisan farms (Nesterchuk, I. (2023).
- ✓ Diversity: supporting a wide range of species, varieties, breeds, and cooking techniques (biocultural diversity) as a guarantee of the adaptability of landscapes and food systems.
- ✓ Quality over quantity: focus on high culinary and environmental quality of the product rather than maximizing production, which reduces pressure on the environment.
- ✓ Biosphere management: conscious “care” for the landscape by all interested stakeholders (institutional bodies, local communities, food producers).

However, there are also certain threats and conditions for maintaining the sustainability of the gastronomic landscape: the main threats are industrialization and standardization of food, loss of artisanal knowledge, displacement of local products by global chains, and overcrowding of popular tourist areas. To maintain sustainability, policies are needed that limit excessive intensification, encourage local production, reduce food waste, develop education in the field of sustainable landscape studies and gastronomic tourism, and support the participation of local communities.

In this sense, sustainable gastronomic landscapes are not only a “product” for tourism, but also a tool for the long-term preservation of landscapes, cultural heritage, and food security through the daily practice of choosing, preparing, and consuming food (Nesterchuk, I., & Shpylova, Y. (2026).

The boundaries of gastronomic landscapes in geography are dynamic spatial contours that delineate territories with a unique combination of local food, natural resources, cultural practices, and perceptions of the “taste of place.” It is important to justify the methodology of delimitation as a combination of empirical, analytical, and subjective criteria.

The theoretical basis for delimitation includes:

- ✓ The boundaries of a gastronomic landscape are determined not only by natural or land areas, but by a complex of factors: natural resource potential, local food systems, cultural and historical associations, infrastructure, and stakeholder perceptions.
- ✓ According to the concept of the “gastronomic landscape,” the boundaries cover land/sea with an emphasis on the interaction of people, food, and place, where cuisine becomes a marker of identity.
- ✓ The boundaries of the gastronomic landscape are not fixed lines, but socially constructed spaces that include physical distribution (natural resource potential, cultural heritage, production, markets, etc.), ethnic gastronomic practices, social gastronomic practices, and perceptions of local terroirs and specialties.

For scientifically sound delimitation, a multi-criteria approach with a zoning algorithm based on the following criteria is recommended:

- ✓ Natural-geographical: soil and climate zones, physical-geographical zoning, relief, hydrology, which determine key products (wine valleys, cheese-producing mountain pastures, fishing coasts).
- ✓ Ethnographic: ethnographic zoning (ethnic groups' places of residence and diet, cultural heritage).
- ✓ Economic: concentration of gastronomic facilities (farms, markets, restaurants, festivals), flows of products and tourists (GIS analysis).
- ✓ Socio-cultural: geographical indications, protected product names (AOC, PDO, PGI) as boundary markers (e.g., Champagne, Parmesan cheese), social perception (surveys of stakeholders (farmers, chefs, tourists), focus groups to identify

“mental maps” and “place-food” associations), historical corridors (administrative and cultural boundaries that preserve traditions, e.g., regional borders in the EU for geographical indications).

The algorithm for delimiting the gastronomic landscape is structured as follows:

- ✓ Initial zoning: based on physical-geographical, ethnographic, and soil maps.
- ✓ Data overlay: geographical indications (GI), tourism statistics, products (GIS).
- ✓ Validation: field research, surveys, stakeholder focus groups.
- ✓ Finalization: interactive modeling (cartographic model, map).
- ✓ The methods for zoning Ukraine's gastronomic regions are based on traditional geographical zoning, but adapted to culinary characteristics – natural resources, local products, ethnocultural traditions, and tourism infrastructure.

Thus, the boundaries of the gastronomic landscape are determined by multi-criteria delimitation, which integrates natural-geographical (soil-climatic zones), economic (product/tourist flows), cultural and ethnographic (geographical indications, gastronomic traditions of ethnic groups), and subjective (stakeholders' perceptions of gastronomic cultural heritage) factors using GIS clustering and field validation. This approach provides dynamic, hierarchical zoning as a scientific basis for mapping the gastronomic landscape.

Conclusions. A constructive-geographical study of the spatial organization of the gastronomic landscape, aimed at its comprehensive study, scientific understanding, and purposeful construction as a system-forming phenomenon. For the first time, the geospatial organization of the gastronomic landscape is considered through the constructive-geographical approaches of “human – food – space.”

The spatial-temporal and structural-functional organization of gastronomic landscapes is a dynamic hierarchy of cores, corridors, and peripheral zones, where the evolution of “human-food-space” flows (historically, currently, and prospectively) ensures the sustainable adaptability of systems for tourism and regional development.

A constructive-geographical study of the functioning, dynamics, and development of gastronomic landscapes reveals them as complex socio-ecological systems, where locality, diversity, and quality of products ensure sustainable flows of “human-food-space,” stimulating the adaptability of geosystems, tourism, and food security.

The sustainability of gastronomic landscapes in constructive geography is achieved through the balanced interaction of local resources, culinary traditions, and tourism, which ensures the preservation of biodiversity, cultural heritage, and economic potential of territories based on the principles of short supply chains, seasonality, and biosphere management.

In constructive geography, the boundaries of gastronomic landscapes are defined as dynamic contours of anthropogenic territories, where natural resource potential, local food systems, and gastronomic practices of ethnic groups form stable spatial structures through GIS technologies, typology, and multi-criteria delimitation.

References

- Herenchuk, K., Rakovska & E. Topchiiev, O. (1975). Polovi heohrafichni doslidzhennia. K.: Vyshcha shk., 1975. 248 s.
- Denysyk, H. (1998). Antropohenni landshafty Pravoberezhnoi Ukrainy: monohrafiia / Denysyk H. I. Vinnytsia: Arbat.
- Marynych, O. & Shyshchenko, P. (2005). Fizychna heohrafiia Ukrainy: pidruchnyk/ O. Marynych, P. Shyshchenko. K.: Znannia.
- Nesterchuk, I. (2023). Hastronomichniy turizm Pravoberezhnoho Polissia Ukra yiny: teoriia, metodolohiia i praktyka doslidzhen: monohr: I. K. Nesterchuk, Zhytomyr: ZhDU im. I. Franka. 548 s.
- Nesterchuk, I., & Shpilova, Yu. (2026). Hastronomichniy turizm: terytorialna hastroturystychna systema: monohr: I. K. Nesterchuk, Shpilova Yu. V.; za zah. red. I. K. Nesterchuk. Zhytomyr: Vyd-vo TOV «Vydavnychi dim «Buk-Druk». 2026. 425 s.
- Christaller, W. (1933). Die zentralen Orte in Süddeutschland. Jena: Gustav Fischer.
- Haggett, P. (1965). Locational Analysis in Human Geography. London: Edward Arnold
- Sauer, C. (1925). The Morphology of Landscape. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sica, F. (2025). A model for sustainable development in territorial systems. Sustainable Development, 33(3):4511-4528. DOI: 10.1002/sd.3358
- Wang, N., Li, B., Chen, X., & Zhou, Y. (2020). Geomorphological regionalization theory system and division methodology of China. Journal of Geographical Sciences, 30(2):212-23 DOI: 10.1007/s11442-020-1724-9