

Enhancing Cotton Planting Efficiency: Optimization of Power Tiller Operated Pneumatic Planter under Laboratory Conditions

ABSTRACT

Aim: This study aimed to optimize the operational parameters of a power tiller operated pneumatic planter specifically for cotton crops in laboratory condition, focusing on improving planting accuracy.

Study Design: A Central Composite Rotatable Design (CCRD) was employed to optimize the operational parameters.

Place and Duration of Study: The study was conducted in a Soil test bin (sand bed test) in the Tillage and Traction Laboratory, Dept. of FMPE, CAET, OUAT, Bhubaneswar during the January 2023 to March 2023 to evaluate the effect of various operational parameters on seed uniformity.

Methodology: Based on the dimensions of different seeds, the size of the orifice on the seed drum was determined. The shape of the metering drum orifice was varied to assess its impact on planting accuracy. The effect of orifice diameter, suction pressure, and operational speed was examined by evaluating mean seed spacing, precision in spacing (coefficient of variation), miss index, multiple index, and quality of feed index.

Results: The study found that for achieving singulation of seeds, optimal parameters included a metering drum with an orifice size of 3 mm, a suction pressure of 2.78 kPa, and a forward speed of 1.36 km/h. Predicted values for the miss index, multiple index, quality feed index, and precision index were determined to be 4.40, 4.56, 90.1, and 3.90, respectively, resulting in seed placement at 600 mm spacing.

Conclusion: The findings suggest that optimizing operational parameters such as orifice size, suction pressure, and forward speed can significantly improve the performance of power tiller operated pneumatic planters for cotton seed planting. These results contribute to enhancing planting accuracy and efficiency in cotton sown areas.

Keywords: (Optimization, sand bed test, cotton sowing, precision planting, pneumatic planter)

1. INTRODUCTION

Precise seeding involves the meticulous selection and individual placement of single seeds from the seed reservoir into designated cells. Researchers worldwide have extensively explored the process of seed singulation, leading to the development of numerous precision seeding systems tailored to different crops[1]. Cotton, a globally significant crop revered for its diverse applications, serves as a linchpin in various industries. The optimization of cotton planting methods holds critical significance in ensuring robust yields and efficient farming practices. The contemporary agricultural landscape has transformed through the integration of technology and machinery, promising heightened precision, decreased labour requirements, and improved productivity in planting methods.

Placement of seeds in well prepared soil at equal spacing between rows promotes homogenous root growth, better crop management, lower production costs and increased crop yield when compared to broadcasting and drilling of seeds[2]; [3]. For placing the single seeds in soil, usually plant scientists use hand dibblers. Precision planting is the method of sowing single seed at equal distances in rows, and the precision planter is the machine used for precision planting[4]. Precision planters save up to 90% on seed costs as compared to drilling, and they also eliminate the need for thinning[4,5]. For precise seed planting, mechanical seed metering devices such as horizontal plates, vertical plates, and inclined plates with cells on the periphery have been developed. However, due to centripetal forces associated with higher speed, the employment of these mechanical devices causes severe seed damage and multiple seed pick-up[6]. In addition, these seed metering machines

have failed to manage irregularly shaped seeds properly. Furthermore, the usage of vertical and inclined seed metering plates has resulted in missed plantings due to seed dislodging from the plate's cells. In pneumatic seed metering devices apart from spherical seeds, there is an advantage to measure irregular shaped seeds[4].

The suction unit is the main component of pneumatic seed metering device which is mounted long with metering unit horizontally. Metering drum consists of seed holes of size less than the size of the seed in its periphery. Seeds are retained in the seed hole by a vacuum created by an aspirator blower on one side of the drum. Due to vacuum, the drum picks up seeds from the seed reservoir as it turns. When seed holes reach a point above the seed tube, airflow is blocked to release the seed from the seed drum. At the same point, vacuum force is absent and seed falls into seed delivery tube due to gravity. Accurate seed spacing is affected by the design of the metering drum, size of seed, vacuum pressure and operating parameters³. Due to high precision placement with minimum seed damage, good control and adjustment, high consistency or uniformity in intra row seed spacing, and applicability in a wide range of seed types[3]; [5]; [6]; [7].

Pneumatic planters are very much popular for their quality of seed metering. Existing pneumatic planters generally use positive as well as negative air pressure for their operation. Most of the planters use negative pressure for seed sucking and holding against the plate, also they use positive pressure for dropping seed pneumatically in the furrow (Singh et al., 2005). Some planters drop the seed just by cutting the flow of negative air pressure and allowing seed to expose atmospheric pressure which causes seeds to drop by gravitational force [6]. In some cases, mechanical dropping was also used. In general, pneumatic planters have individual suction chambers as well as positive pressure lines from blower for each row which is operated by PTO of tractor to the metering unit leading to high cost, while some recent experiments tried inside or outside filling single chamber for at least four to eight rows [8]; [9]. However till date common suction chamber for multiple rows has been utilized mostly for seed drill applications. In addition to that existing planters have other limitations. Seeds having one or more dimensions pointed more likely the multiple seeds per orifice [10].

To tackle all these limitations, the research work was conducted to develop a power tiller operated pneumatic planter (PTPP) for cotton seeds. Developed PTPP used single chamber with negative pressure for two rows. Suction unit is developed to operate with was used as suction chamber. Seed churning device was provided to agitate the seeds in seed box. Seed cut-off plate was provided to prevent metering of excess seeds. In addition to that one spill out chamber was provided just before seed scraping device to collect the excess seeds not cleaned by cut-off device. Mechanical seed scraping device was provided to release the seeds in the row through furrow opener.

The power tiller operated pneumatic planter marks a pivotal innovation in cotton planting, blending power tiller strength with precise pneumatic mechanisms for accurate seed placement and heightened efficiency. This study delves into optimizing these planters specifically for cotton cultivation, aiming beyond improved accuracy to address unique challenges in cotton farming scenarios. By illuminating these optimization efforts, this manuscript aims to significantly advance cotton cultivation practices, paving the way for more sustainable and effective planting methodologies. Identification of the best levels of operating parameters for the metering unit is required for the development of a compact metering unit.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Raw material

Some of the common high-yielding and hybrid varieties of cotton crops grown in Odisha and India are BS-279, RCH-659 and KCHH-2739. A Cotton seed of BS-279 variety was procured from AICRP on cotton, Bhawanipatna, Odisha and RCH-659 and KCHH-2739. The experiments were carried out at fixed moisture content (10%) db. The moisture content of the crops was determined with the help of the digital moisture analyzer (make: Indosaw; model: Universal 9800; accuracy: 0.1%) worked on the principle of electrical conductivity of the material, which always proportional to the percentage content of the moisture.

2.2 Dependent parameters

The performance indices of the planter, viz. miss index, multiple index, quality feed index, and precision index, are suitable for single seed metering [11]; [12]; [13]; [4]; [14].

Miss index

$$MI = \frac{n_1}{N} \times 100 \quad (1)$$

Where,

n_1 = Number of seed spacings more than 1.5 times of desired spacings;

N = Total number of spacings.

Multiple index

$$MUI = \frac{n_2}{N} \times 100 \quad (2)$$

Where,

n_2 = Number of hill spacings less than 0.5 times of desired spacings.

Quality feed index

$$QFI = 100 - (MI + MUI) \quad (3)$$

Precision index

$$PI = \frac{\text{Std. Dev. of hill spacings between 0.5 and 1.5 times of the desired spacing}}{\text{Desired spacing}} \quad (4)$$

2.3 Performance parameters for planter in laboratory

For the development of power tiller operated two row pneumatic planter (PTPP) for cotton seed, it was necessary to carry out the performance of developed laboratory prototype. We focused on examining the performance of a single row within the developed laboratory prototype. The cotton planter prototype consisted of a two-row unit with a shared suction chamber for both rows. As a result, assessing the entire metering drum's performance simultaneously became essential. Consequently, the evaluation of the PTPP was conducted in a laboratory setting using a sand bed with a working width of 1 meter. Fig.1 displays the laboratory setup of the sand bed test rig employed for this assessment.




Fig.1 Sand bed test rig setup for laboratory testing of developed PTPP in the soil test bin

Length of setup was sufficient for recording spacing of 14 seed drops in one run. To avoid bouncing of seeds dropped from metering device, part of bed was filled with sand bed having total length of 10 m and depth of 0.5 m with soil into the soil test bin but to make it sand bed we modify it as sand bed having sand bed dimension of 1 m width, 10 m length and 15 cm depth spread uniformly to the whole test bin. To avoid damage to belt rubber due to grease application plastic strip was pasted on belt before putting grease. Sticky belt setup consisted of variable speed electric motor, power from which was provided at right angle to the belt pulley drum with the help of worm and pinion type gear box and chain drive. The setup was capable to provide linear speed of 0-3.5 km/h. Three-point linkages were provided for mounting implement on belt setup. The system for implement height adjustment of three-point linkage was hydraulically powered. The details of setup are shown in Fig 1.

2.4 Central composite rotatable experiment design (CCRD)

Three independent variables, viz., orifice size (A), suction pressure (B) and forward speed (C) were considered for optimisation. The experimental plan for optimisation consisted of four dependent variables, viz., miss index (MI), multiple index (MUI), quality feed index (QFI) and precision index (PI). For this purpose, RSM, using a CCRD [15]; [16]; [17]; [18] to fit a second-order polynomial equation, was employed. Values of parameter A varies from 2.5 to 3.5 mm, B from 2 to 4 kPa and C from 1 to 2 kmh⁻¹. The maximum and minimum values of metering drum speed were based on ready-made sprockets available in the market. The transmission system of the developed PTPP was equipped with a set of eight sprockets and four chains. Inbuilt gear combinations in the rotary unit of VST Shakti-130DI was used to achieve the required peripheral speed. Walking speed of a normal man, operating a PTPP, was found to be 0.36 ms⁻¹. For experimental purposes, a 3.72 kW electric motor (Already fitted in the test bin) was used to achieve the different speed of operation within the range of walking speed was selected. With the help of the limiting values of independent variables, 3 different levels of coded values, viz., +1.682, +1, 0, -1 and -1.682 were selected [18]. In the design (Tables 1), the coded values of independent variables, viz., X₁, X₂ and X₃ were converted into their real form as orifice size, suction pressure, and forward speed, respectively, using the following equations:

$$x_i = \frac{X_i - X_m}{X_D} \quad (5)$$

Here i= 1, 2 and 3

$$X_D = \frac{X_{\max} - X_m}{a_m} \quad (6)$$

$$X_m = \frac{X_{\max} - X_{\min}}{2} \quad (7)$$

$$a_m = 2^{0.25k} \quad (8)$$

The prototype PTPP was fabricated in the workshop of the dept of farm machinery and power engineering, CAET, OUAT, Bhubaneswar. Nonlinear second-order regression equations, Eqs. (9), was developed to optimise the miss index (MI), multiple index (MI), quality feed index (QFI) and precision index (PI) for response as functions of the coded value of the independent parameters.

Three replications of 20 observations each were recorded to evaluate the metering drum in terms of miss, multiple, quality feed and precision indices were done by taking 60 observations of the spacing between seeds on sand bed test setup. The experiment was conducted at three levels of orifice size (2.5, 3 and 3.5 mm), three levels of forward speed (1, 1.5 and 2 km h⁻¹), and three levels of suction pressure (2, 3 and 4 kPa). Optimization was done using response surface modelling (RSM) laid in central composite Rotatable Design (CCRD) using Design-Expert software. Regression equations (Second-order polynomial equation) as shown in equation 5 was generated to predict the values of dependent parameters.

$$R_v = \beta_0 + \beta_1 A + \beta_2 B + \beta_3 C + \beta_{11} A^2 + \beta_{22} B^2 + \beta_{33} C^2 + \beta_{12} AB + \beta_{13} AC + \beta_{23} BC \quad (9)$$

Where, R_v is the response variable whose equation is to be determined. $\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_{11}, \beta_{22}, \beta_{33}, \beta_{12}, \beta_{23},$ and β_{33} are regression coefficients. A, B, and C are the coded linear terms for orifice diameter, suction pressure, and drum rotational speed, respectively. $A^2, B^2, C^2, AB, AC,$ and BC are the quadratic terms. The objective was to achieve metering with minimum miss index, multiple index, and precision index with maximum quality feed index.

Table 1 Experimental design for conducting the study (design: CCRD, total no. of experiments: 20)

S. No.	Variable	Level 1 (-1.68)	Level 2 (-1)	Level 3 (0)	Level 4 (+1)	Level 5 (+1.68)
1	Orifice diameter (A), mm	2.15	2.5	3	3.5	3.84
2	Suction pressure (B), kPa	1.31	2	3	4	4.68
3	Forward speed (C), ms ⁻¹	0.65	1	1.5	2	2.3

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A laboratory experiment was conducted to study the effect of orifice size (A), suction pressure (B) and forward speed (C) of PTPP for cotton seeds on missing index (MI), multiple index (MUI), and quality of feed index (QFI) and precision index (PI). Results of laboratory experiment at different combinations of independent parameters are given in Table 2.

Table 2 ANOVA for response surface quadratic model of dependent parameters

Source	MI, %	MUI, %	QFI, %	PI, %
"F" value with significance				
Model	3.55*	5.67**	47.84***	6.67**
A- Orifice diameter	12.65**	0.0343	184.98***	6.29*
B- Suction pressure	4.29 ^{ns}	29.67***	57.96***	7.06*
C- Forward speed	0.09 ^{ns}	0.9571 ^{ns}	2.64 ^{ns}	30.77***
AB	0.33 ^{ns}	9.24*	40.63***	0.74 ^{ns}
AC	0.34 ^{ns}	2.31 ^{ns}	40.63***	0.10 ^{ns}
BC	0.34 ^{ns}	2.31 ^{ns}	40.63***	2.59 ^{ns}
A²	6.81*	0.3382 ^{ns}	53.55***	2.92 ^{ns}

B^2	ns	0.7414 ^{ns}	10.79**	7.26*
C^2	ns	5.31*	0.55 ^{ns}	4.65 ^{ns}
ABC	ns	ns	ns	ns
Lack of fit	ns	ns	ns	ns
Mean	5.5	6	88.5	4.77
R^2	0.67	0.83	0.97	0.85

***= highly significant ($p < 0.01$), **= significant at 1% level of significance ($0.01 \leq p < 0.05$), *= significant at 5% level of significance ($0.05 \leq p < 0.10$), ns= Not significant ($p \geq 0.10$), SOV= Source of variation, R^2 = coefficient of determination, CV= Coefficient of variation, Adj. R^2 = Adjusted R^2 , Pred. R^2 = Predicted R^2 , Adeq. Precision = Adequate precision.

Table 3 Regression model coefficients (coded values) and ANOVA of second order polynomial regression models of the responses

Source	MI, %	MUI, %	QFI, %	PI, %
Coded values of regression coefficients				
Intercept	+5.11	+4.92	+89.97	+4.07
A	-2.95*	-0.12 ^{ns}	3.06***	-0.40*
B	-1.71*	+3.43***	-1.71***	-0.43*
C	+0.25 ^{ns}	-0.62 ^{ns}	0.37 ^{ns}	0.89***
A×B	-0.63 ^{ns}	+2.50*	-1.87***	0.18 ^{ns}
A×C	+0.63 ^{ns}	+1.25 ^{ns}	-1.88***	0.068 ^{ns}
B×C	+0.63 ^{ns}	+1.25 ^{ns}	-1.88***	0.34 ^{ns}
A^2	+1.96*	-0.36 ^{ns}	-1.60***	0.27 ^{ns}
B^2	+0.19 ^{ns}	+0.53 ^{ns}	-0.72**	0.42*
C^2	-1.58 ^{ns}	+1.41*	0.16 ^{ns}	0.34 ^{ns}
ANOVA				
Model	3.55*	5.67**	47.84***	6.67**
LoF	ns	ns	ns	ns
R^2	0.78	0.83	0.97	0.85
Adj. R^2	0.58	0.68	0.95	0.72
Pred. R^2	-0.65	-0.24	0.81	0.08
Adeq. Pre.	8.63	8.72	24.72	8.19

MI = Miss index; MUI = Multiple index; QFI = Quality feed index; PI = Precision index; D = Orifice diameter, mm; P = Suction pressure, kPa; S = Forward speed, km/h; LoF = Lack of fit; R^2 = Coefficient of determination; Adj. R^2 = Adjusted R^2 ; Pred. R^2 = Predicted R^2 ; Adeq. Pre. = Adequate precision; *** = Highly significant at <0.01% level of significance; ** = Significant at 1% level of significance, * = Significant at 5% level of significance; ns= non-significant.

3.1 Evaluation of metering system of pneumatic planter under laboratory condition

Miss Index (MI)

The ANOVA analysis highlighted significant impacts of orifice size, suction pressure, and forward speed on the missing index (MI), as shown in Table 2. The model for the missing index achieved statistical significance at the 0.05 level. Figure 2(a) visually represents the significant two-way interactions affecting the missing index. Notably, increasing orifice diameter under constant suction pressure and vice versa led to decreases in the missing index. Further investigation showed that at an optimized suction pressure of 2.7 kPa, initial decreases in the missing index with increasing orifice diameter transitioned to gradual decreases at higher levels of orifice diameter. Conversely, variations in forward speeds at a specific orifice size had minimal impact on the missing index. At an optimized orifice diameter of 3 mm, an initial steep decline in the missing index was observed with increasing suction pressure at a constant forward speed, as depicted in Fig. 2(a). The regression equation for miss index for optimum operational parameters are given as

$$\text{Miss Index (MI)} = 106.83 - 55.93 A + 8.34 A^2 \quad (10)$$

Multiple Index (MUI)

The Multiple Index (MUI) represents the percentage of spacings equal to or less than half the set plant distance S in mm. Table 2 indicates the significant model for the multiple index at less than

1% level of significance. Fig. 2(b) illustrates the contours and three-dimensional graphs depicting the significant two-way interactions influencing the multiple index. Notably, increasing orifice diameter under constant suction pressure and vice versa resulted in increased multiple index. Similarly, at an optimized suction pressure of 2.7 kPa, initially decreasing the orifice diameter at a constant forward speed led to a gradual decrease in the multiple index at higher levels of orifice diameter. The change in the multiple index for various forward speeds at a specific orifice size initially displayed a sharp decrease, which gradually became more gradual at the highest level of forward speed. At an optimized orifice diameter of 3 mm, increasing suction pressure at a constant forward speed sharply increased the multiple index, as depicted in Figure 2(b). Panning et al. (2000), and Zulin et al. (1991) also reported similar findings. The regression equation for multiple index for optimum operational parameters are given as

$$\text{Multiple Index (MUI)} = 80.55 - 18.48 B + 5 AB + 5.64 C^2 \quad (11)$$

Quality Feed Index (QFI)

Quality of feed index (QFI) is an important parameter for the assessment of the performance of the metering device. The occurrence of single seed drops in the furrow during the sowing operation. Both Table 2 and Table 3 demonstrate the highly significant model for QFI at less than 0.01% level of significance. All individual terms show a high significant effect on QFI, except for forward speed, possibly due to its limited range. Contours and three-dimensional graphs further investigate interactions with highly significant effects (Table 2). Figure 2(c) illustrates the 3D graphs of the interaction effect of orifice diameter and suction pressure at an optimized forward speed (1.3 km/h) on the QFI parameter, showing a significant increase in QFI with increasing orifice diameter and suction pressure. Similarly, in the interaction between orifice diameter and forward speed at an optimized suction pressure (2.7 kPa), QFI increased with increasing orifice diameter at a constant forward speed, while a gradual decrease in QFI was observed with increasing forward speed at a specific orifice size. At an optimized orifice diameter of 3 mm, the quality feed index improved with higher suction pressure at a constant forward speed, as depicted in Figure 2(c). The regression equation for quality index for optimum operational parameters are given as

$$\text{Quality Feed Index (QFI)} = -71.47 + 67.11 A + 19.48 B - 3.77 AB - 7.50 AC - 3.75 BC - 6.41 A^2 - 0.71 B^2 \quad (12)$$

Precision Index (PI)

Precision index is a function of the seed spacing and deviation of seed from its targeted point. Observations from the ANOVA presented in Tables 2 and 3 indicate that the model for the quality feed index is statistically significant, at a level of significance below 0.1%. Notably, both the linear and quadratic terms of suction pressure individually exhibit significant effects on the precision index, whereas the linear term of forward speed does not demonstrate a significant impact. Additionally, the combined influence of any two independent parameters does not affect the precision index. Consequently, graphical interactions are not addressed for the precision index in Fig. 2(d). The model reveals that the linear term of forward speed carries a negative sign, while the quadratic term exhibits a positive sign. This behaviour suggests that the precision index decreases up to a central value and increases thereafter. The regression equation for precision index for optimum operational parameters are given as

$$\text{Precision Index (PI)} = 29.07 - 8.71 A - 5.05 B - 5.10 C + 1.34 C^2 \quad (13)$$

Where, A is the coded orifice size, B is the coded suction pressure and C is the coded forward speed.




The models are valid for the following conditions:

$$2.5 \text{ mm} \geq A \geq 3.5 \text{ mm},$$




$$2 \text{ kPa} \geq B \geq 4 \text{ kPa},$$

$$1 \text{ m/s} \geq C \geq 2 \text{ m/s},$$




(a) Miss Index






(b) Multiple Index



(c) Quality Feed Index



(d) Precision Index



(d) Orifice size x Suction pressure (AB) Orifice size x Forward speed (AC) Suction pressure x Forward speed (BC)

Fig.2 Comparison of different performance indices (level of significance, 5%): (a) miss index; (b) multiple index; (c) quality of feed index (d) Precision index for Orifice size x Suction pressure (AB), Orifice size x Forward speed (AC), Suction pressure x Forward speed.

Factor Coding: Actual

Overlay Plot

- Miss Index
- Multiple Index
- Quality Feed Index
- Precision Index

X1 = A
X2 = B

Actual Factor

C = 1.36199




Fig.3 Overlay plot between orifice size and suction pressure

The optimization of metering operation is facilitated through a graphical approach utilizing the overlay plot tool of Design Expert software. Fig. 3 illustrates the graph generated based on the solution proposed by the numerical approach. In this graph, the curves representing all responses are overlaid in a single figure to depict the interaction between orifice diameter and suction pressure at the optimized forward speed of 1.3 km/h. The desirable area is highlighted in yellow on the graph, bounded by the curves of various responses from all sides. This plot provides a comprehensive understanding of the behavior of all responses simultaneously.

3.2 Optimization of operating parameters

An instrumented test rig of sand bed was prepared to study the effect of orifice size, suction pressure and forward speed on performance of pneumatic metering mechanism for cotton seeds. The optimum values of independent parameters that maximize the performance of planter were obtained from the numerical optimization technique of Design Expert software (10.0.1.0). The models for different dependent parameters were developed with the help of the quadratic equation of independent parameters. The ANOVA showed that the models of missing index, multiple index, quality of feed index and precision index are significant.

Table 4 Predicted and optimized values of parameters

Constraints	Goal	Optimized/predicted values
Orifice size, mm	In range	3.00
Suction pressure, kPa	In range	2.78
Forward speed, m/s	In range	1.36
Miss Index, %	Minimize	4.40
Multiple Index, %	Minimize	4.56
Quality Feed Index, %	Maximize	90.1

Precision Index, %	Minimize	3.90
--------------------	----------	------

3.3 Validation

Validation involves comparing the outcomes forecasted by established regression models with the actual experimental values of the responses under the same independent parameter settings. This step is crucial to assess the appropriateness of the developed models for performance prediction. In this study, five replicates were carried out in the laboratory using optimized settings for orifice diameter (3 mm), suction pressure (2.7 kPa), and forward speed (1.3 km/h). The validation process was conducted using the confirmation tool in Design Expert software. The validation outcomes obtained from the confirmation tool are summarized in Table 4. The confirmation experiment was conducted at a significance level of 5%. It is observed that the mean values of all responses fall within the prediction interval of the confirmation tool. Consequently, the developed regression models accurately predict the behavior of the responses with reasonable precision.

Table 5 Validation of regression model through confirmation tool

Response	Mean	Median	SD	n	SE prediction	95% PI low	Data mean	95% PI high
Miss index	5.10	5.10	2.73	5	1.66	1.42	5.68	8.79
Multiple index	4.91	4.92	2.32	5	1.41	1.78	4.83	8.06
Quality feed index	89.97	89.98	0.83	5	0.50	88.85	89.49	91.10
Precision index	4.06	4.07	0.59	5	0.36	3.27	4.82	4.87

SD = Standard deviation; n= number of observations; SE= Standard error; PI = Prediction interval.

4. CONCLUSION

Following meticulous experimentation, the optimization of parameters for developing a power tiller operated pneumatic planter for cotton seeds has yielded significant insights. Predictive analysis has revealed forward speed as the foremost determinant, profoundly influencing the missing index, multiple index, quality of feed index and precision index. Meanwhile, orifice size emerges as a critical factor significantly shaping the precision index. By optimizing to minimize the miss index, multiple index, and precision index, while maximizing the quality of feed index, optimal values for independent variables were discerned. Specifically, these optimized parameters entail an orifice size of 3 mm, suction pressure of 2.78 kPa, and forward speed of 1.36 km/h. Corresponding predicted values for the miss index, multiple index, quality feed index, and precision index stand at 4.40, 4.56, 90.1, and 3.90, respectively. These findings offer practical guidance for optimizing planting operations and hold promise for enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of pneumatic planting technologies tailored for cotton seed cultivation.

CONSENT: Not applicable

ETHICAL APPROVAL: Not applicable

REFERENCES

1. Gaikwad BB, Sirohi NP. (2008) No Title. *Biosyst Eng* 99:322–329
2. Lan Y, Kocher MF, Smith JA (1999) Opto-electronic sensor system for laboratory measurement of planter seed spacing with small seeds. *J Agric Eng Res* 72:119–127
3. Panning JW, Kocher MF, Smith JA, Kachman SD (2000) Laboratory and field testing of seed spacing uniformity for sugarbeet planters. *Appl Eng Agric* 16:7–133
4. Singh RC, Singh G, Saraswat DC (2005) Optimisation of Design and Operational Parameters of a Pneumatic Seed Metering Device for Planting Cottonseeds. *Biosyst Eng* 92:429–438. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2005.07.002>
5. Parish R, Bergeron P, Bracy R (1991) Comparison of vacuum and belt seeders for vegetable planting. *Trans ASAE* 7:537–540

6. Karayel D, Barut ZB (2004) Mathematical Modelling of Vacuum Pressure on a Precision Seeder. *Biosyst Eng* 87:437–444. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2004.01.011>
7. Zhan Z, Yaoming L, Jin C, Lizhang X (2010) Numerical analysis and laboratory testing of seed spacing uniformity performance for vacuum-cylinder precision seeder. *Biosyst Eng* 106:344–351
8. Yitao L, Lei W, Qingxi L (2017) Design and test of an inside-filling pneumatic precision centralized seed-metering device for rapeseed. *Int J Agric Biol Eng* 10:56–62. <https://doi.org/10.3965/j.ijabe.20171002.2061>
9. Wang B, Luo X, Wang Z, et al (2018) Design and field evaluation of hill-drop pneumatic central cylinder direct-seeding machine for hybrid rice. *Int J Agric Biol Eng* 11:33–40. <https://doi.org/10.25165/j.ijabe.20181106.4175>
10. Ismail ZE (2008) Developing the metering unit of the Pneumatic Planter 1-The Factors Affecting Seed-Metering Unite Performance. *J Agric Sci Mansoura Univ* 33:6511–6525
11. Beerge RM, Veerangouda M, Reddy BS, et al (2017) Simulation of Design and Operational Parameters of Pneumatic Seed Planter for Cotton Using ANSYS Software. *Agric Eng Today* 41:
12. Rajaiah P, Mani I, Kumar A, et al (2016) Development and evaluation of electronically controlled precision seed-metering device for direct-seeded paddy planter. *Indian J Agric Sci* 86:598–604. <https://doi.org/10.56093/ijas.v86i5.58255>
13. Satti YH, Liao Q, Yu J, He D (2013) Dynamic analysis for kernel picking up and transporting on a pneumatic precision metering device for wheat. *Agric Eng Int CIGR J* 15:95–100
14. Mandal S, Kumar GVP, Tanna H, Kumar A (2018) Design and evaluation of a pneumatic metering mechanism for power tiller operated precision planter. *Curr Sci* 115:
15. Hunang BK, Suggs CW (1967) Vibration studies of tractor drivers. *Trans ASAE* 10:476–482
16. Rastogi NK, Rajesh G, Shamala TR (1998) Optimization of enzymatic degradation of coconut residue. *J Sci Food Agric* 76:129–134
17. Das H (2005) *Food Processing Operation Analysis*, 1st ed. Asian Book Private Limited, New Delhi
18. Myres RH (1971) *Response Surface Methodology*. Allyn and Bacon