Remote Sensing and Geographic Information Systems for Precision Agriculture: A Review

Abstract

Precision agriculture aims to optimize crop production and minimise environmental impacts by using information technology, remote sensing, satellite positioning systems, and proximal data gathering. This review paper examines current applications and future directions of remote sensing and geographic information systems (GIS) for precision agriculture. Remote sensing provides data on crop health, soil conditions, water status, and yield which can guide variable rate applications within fields. Satellite and aerial platforms allow multispectral and hyperspectral imaging for vegetation indices analysis, crop classification, and stress detection. GIS technology integrates these data layers to model and map variations, develop prescription maps, and analyse spatial relationships. Key research frontiers include high-resolution satellite and drone data for within-field analysis, better integration of proximal and remote sensing, online nutrient and yield monitors, real-time prescription modelling, and predictive analytics using machine learning. Adoption continues to increase with better data analytics tools and greater economic returns realized. Remote sensing and GIS provide an integral platform for variable rate technologies, predictive modelling, and data-driven decision-making for precision agriculture.

Keywords: Precision Agriculture, Remote Sensing, Geographic Information Systems, Variable Rate Technology, Vegetation Indices

1. Introduction to Precision Agriculture

Precision agriculture (PA) refers to a farming management concept that utilizes modern technology to monitor and manage spatial and temporal variability within agricultural fields to improve crop performance and environmental quality (1). The key goals of PA include optimizing yields, minimizing environmental impacts through efficient use of inputs, and maximizing profits. PA relies heavily on geographic information systems (GIS), global positioning systems (GPS), and remote sensing technologies to collect data on soil conditions, crop health, weather patterns and topography at precise locations within a field (2). This data allows farmers to tailor their management practices to small sub-regions within fields rather than entire fields. Key concepts in PA include:

Variable Rate Technology (VRT): Applying inputs such as water, fertilizers, pesticides at differing rates across a field based on need (3). This aims to avoid over- and under-application.

Site-Specific Management (SSM): Adapting management actions to localized conditions within a field. Enabled by mapping of variability and VRT technology (4).

Spatial Positioning: Precise locating of measurements and field operations using GPS and GIS (5). Crucial for effective SSM.

Remote and Proximal Sensing: Measurement and monitoring of crop and soil parameters using satellite, aerial and ground-based sensors (6). Provides key data.

GIS-Based Mapping: Creating management zones and prescription maps based on processed and interpreted sensor data (7). Allows translation of data into actions.

The perceived benefits that motivate the adoption of PA include (8):

- Increased crop yields and profitability through optimized resource application and efficiency
- Reduced environmental impact through precision application of fertilizers and pesticides
- Risk management by matching inputs and practices to localized conditions
- Savings in energy, water, fuel costs, and equipment wear

As the world's population is projected to reach 9.8 billion by 2050, meeting rising food demand along with sustainability objectives will require immense productivity growth in agriculture (9). PA provides a critical toolkit to enhance productivity, efficiency and environmental performance in order to rise to this challenge.

The future outlook for PA is promising, with services projected to grow globally from $4.8 billion in 2018 to over $11 billion by 2026 (10). Key trends shaping PA adoption include rapid improvements in data collection and analysis tools, increasing affordability and capabilities of VRT equipment, growth of digital agriculture and cloud computing, and rising flexibility of PA service offerings for farmers (11,12). However, challenges inhibiting PA adoption include the high upfront costs of advanced equipment, difficulties with data management, lack of technical knowledge among farmers, and uncertainties regarding return on investment (13). Overall though, PA holds exciting potential to take on a major role in the push for sustainable intensification in agriculture globally.

2. Remote Sensing Techniques for Precision Agriculture

Remote sensing for precision agriculture relies on different platforms and sensors to collect key information about crop and soil status at different scales. Major remote sensing techniques include:

Satellite Remote Sensing

Satellites provide synoptic coverage of large regions at consistent time intervals (1). Key specifications include:

Spatial resolution: Pixel size. Important for field-scale monitoring. Commercial satellites range from 0.5-30m resolution (14).

Spectral resolution: Number and position of spectral bands measured. Important for discriminating crop stress and health (15).

Radiometric resolution: Sensitivity to signal intensities. Important for quantification of conditions (16).

Temporal resolution: Revisit time. Most satellites have 1-16 days between images. Higher frequencies better capture crop dynamics (17).

Different satellite sensors used in PA include Landsat, SPOT, Sentinel, PlanetScope and MODIS. Each has different specifications suitable for particular monitoring needs (2).

Aerial Remote Sensing

Aerial platforms like manned aircraft and UAVs provide very high resolution imagery with increased flexibility to control timing compared to satellites.

Manned Aerial Vehicles: Light aircrafts used to collect visual, multispectral, thermal imagery. Resolutions down to 10 cm possible. High operational and access costs (3).

Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs): UAVs equipped with lightweight sensors are an emerging technology in PA. Enable fast, low cost, high resolution (1-100 cm) monitoring of small areas (4).

Proximal Remote Sensing

Ground-based sensors mounted on tractors or handheld devices during field operations (5). Used to detect crop nitrogen, biomass, chlorophyll to directly adjust fertilizer rates. Very high density of measurements.

3. Geographic Information Systems for Precision Agriculture

Geographic information systems (GIS) are an integral part of precision agriculture, providing capabilities for spatial data capture, management, analysis and visualization (1). Key aspects include:

GIS Concepts and Components

GIS provides a framework for capturing, storing, manipulating, analyzing and displaying geographical data tied to specific locations (2). Key components include:

Hardware - Computers, data loggers, sensors, GPS devices

Software - Databases, analysis tools

Data - Geospatial data like remote sensing images, yield data

People - Expertise in geodata analysis, agriculture

Methods - Techniques for data processing, analysis, modeling

Together these allow both spatial data management and complex spatio-temporal analysis.

GIS Data Models

Two key GIS data models used are raster and vector models (3):

Raster model represents geographic reality as a surface divided into cells with values describing conditions. Used for remote sensing imagery.

Vector model represents reality using geometric shapes and points with defined locations and attributes. Used for farm boundaries, sampling locations.

GIS integrates both models for layered geographical analysis.

GIS Analysis Applications in Precision Agriculture

Key applications of GIS in precision agriculture include:

Yield Mapping

Measuring yield variability within fields using combine harvesters equipped with weigh cells and GPS (4). Geo-referenced yield data is imported into GIS to create prescription maps. Enables optimization of inputs to raise low-yielding zones.

Soil Mapping

Creation of fine-scale soil type maps through interpolation of soil samples over landscapes in GIS (5, 6). Reveals patterns of nutrient levels, cation-exchange capacity, acidity. Allows matching practices to soil heterogeneity.

Crop Health Monitoring

Time-series mapping of vegetation indices from satellite data using GIS analytics to identify spatial variability in crop growth related to soils, pests, weather (7). Guides scouting, targeted pesticide use. GIS integration of multi-source spatio-temporal data provides a crucial planning and decision-making platform for precise field management in precision agriculture systems.

4. Applications of Remote Sensing in Precision Agriculture

Remote sensing imagery and data are used extensively across numerous precision agriculture applications, including:

Crop Type Classification

Multi-spectral satellite data enables classification of imagery into landcover maps outlining major crop types and other land uses (23). Achieves >90% mapping accuracy for major crops. Guides development of zone-specific management plans.

Crop Growth Monitoring and Yield Prediction

Vegetation indices derived from satellite time-series track plant vigor and phonology over seasons (24). Combined with weather data in crop growth models, enables in-season yield forecasting with ~8-15% error at regional scales (25).

Soil Mapping

Predictive soil mapping integrates remote sensing derived elevation, landform, landcover, geology layers with intensive soil sampling to interpolate detailed digital soil maps (26). Reveals within-field patterns.

Water Stress Detection

High resolution thermal infrared data quantifies crop water needs and detects onset of soil moisture deficits enabling optimized irrigation management (27). UAV and satellite platforms used.

Disease and Pest Detection

Subtle spectral differences measured by hyperspectral sensors facilitate early identification of diseases, infestations before visual symptoms (28). Allows rapid targeted intervention to minimize yield losses.

The unique spectral information available from remote sensing offers invaluable insights into crop status and field conditions for timely data-driven decision making in precision agriculture systems.

5. Applications of GIS in Precision Agriculture

Key applications of geographic information systems in precision agriculture include:

Yield Mapping and Analysis

GIS enables interpolation and mapping of yield monitor data to reveal management zones (29). Combined with soil maps and elevation models, statistical analysis highlights factors driving yield variability for optimization (30).

Variable Rate Technology

Fertilizer Application: GIS prescription maps guide fertilizer applicators to vary rates across fields matching soil nutrient levels (31). Avoid over-fertilization.

Irrigation: Yield, soil, terrain layers in GIS feed variable rate irrigation systems. Adjusts water application spatially to needs (32).

Drainage Mapping and Analysis

Digital elevation models integrated with pipe flow models in GIS helps design efficient drainage infrastructure placement adapted to terrain (33).

Infrastructure and Logistics Planning

GIS network and proximity analysis used to optimize transportation, storage locations and equipment routing to reduce costs and soil compaction (34).

6. Integration of Remote Sensing and GIS for Precision Agriculture

Precision agriculture aims to optimize crop production and maximize yields by managing variability in the field through information-based technologies (33). It essentially involves right management at the right location and at the right time (34). The site-specific management in precision agriculture relies on the integration of geospatial technologies like remote sensing and geographic information systems (GIS) to assess and respond to field variability (35). Remote sensing provides imagery at different resolutions to monitor crop lands, while GIS facilitates spatial modelling and analysis for decision making (36). This review discusses the integration of remote sensing and GIS technologies, their processing and analysis techniques, and overall role in supporting precision agriculture.

Geo-database Development

A critical requirement for implementing precision agriculture techniques is to have an integrated geo-database that captures the spatial variability in soil, crop growth and yields across agricultural fields (37). GIS provides an effective framework for developing such geospatial databases which allow for efficient storage, update, manipulation and analysis of the data (38). Important aspects in developing a geo-database for precision agriculture include:

- Collection of soil data through systematic field sampling to capture variation in texture, organic matter, fertility, pH and micronutrients (39)
- Recording yield levels through harvesting equipment fitted with yield monitors and GPS (40)
- Stratification of lands into zones having similar yield limiting factors using historical yield maps (41)
- Integration of remote sensing imagery to extract vegetation indices indicating crop vigour and development stages (42)
- Correlating vegetation indices with yield data to predict spatial distribution of yields (43)
- Linking the spatial database with variable rate applicators that modulate fertilizer or pesticide inputs variably across a field based on expected response and yields (44).

Image Processing and Classification

Processing and classification of remote sensing images is essential to derive useful landcover and crop information from the raw imagery (45). Some pertinent methods include:

- Radiometric correction to retrieve true surface reflectance by removing sensor distortions and atmospheric effects (46)
- Geometric correction to remove spatial distortions due to sensor optics, platform instability and terrain (47)
- Image enhancement to improve visual distinction between features using filtering, pan-sharpening etc. (48)
- Vegetation indices like NDVI for indicating crop greenness, leaf area, canopy cover and growth stages (49)
- Supervised and unsupervised classification to generate landcover thematic maps exploring spectral clustering algorithms (50)
- Object based image analysis using texture, context and ancillary data besides spectra for classification (51)
- Change detection for identifying changes in vegetation vigor and landuse over time (52)

Spatial Analysis Models

GIS allows deploying a number of spatial analysis techniques, models and workflows to support decision making for precision agriculture (53). Key methods include:

- Interpolation using kriging to predict field variables like soil nutrient levels, yield at unsampled locations based on surrounding measured values (54)

- Zonal statistics to summarize vegetation indices, yield etc. for management zones with similar crop growth conditions (55)
- Buffer analysis to identify adjacent areas that may impact fields through runoff or leaching and need specific attention (56)
- Terrain analysis to model influence of topography, slope and aspect on drainage, erosion patterns and crop growth (57)
- Path distance modelling to map least cost routes for optimised logistics and planning of field operations (58)

Decision Support Systems

Customised GIS based interfaces and dashboards can be developed as decision support systems to aid farm planning and operations (59). These systems integrate spatial analysis with expert knowledge on crop growth models, best practices and advisories to enable smart precision agriculture (60). Examples include:

- Variable rate application tools relying on yield maps and soil data to modulate fertilizer inputs across fields (61)
- Web-GIS and mobile apps providing specific advisories on irrigation, spraying, harvesting etc. considering location and stage specific requirements (62)
- Drone imagery analytics combined with crop simulation models for early detection of growth anomalies and improved risk management (63)
- AI powered cognitive analytics to extract insights from diverse data streams and provide actionable intelligence to the farmers (64)

7. Unmanned Aerial Systems for Precision Agriculture

Unmanned aerial systems (UAS) or drones with onboard sensors are emerging as valuable tools for precision agriculture, providing imagery at ultra-high resolution to assess crop health and field variability at different growth stages (62). Their applications in supporting site-specific crop management include:

1. UAV Platforms, Sensors and Data Acquisition

- Lightweight fixed-wing, multi-rotor and hybrid VTOL UAVs equipped with visual, multispectral, hyperspectral, thermal sensors (63)
- Generation of orthomosaics and 3D reconstruction for precise measurement and modelling (64)
- Capacity to provide rapid, cost-effective and flexible imagery on demand without reliance on satellite data (65)

2. Applications

3.1 Monitoring

- Vegetation index mapping for assessing plant vigour, yield prediction and early stress detection (66)

- High resolution model input for field prescriptions and variable rate operations (67)

3.2 Pest Management

- Early identification of incidence, type and spread patterns of weed, insects for targeted control (68)

3.3 Irrigation Monitoring

- Detection of spatial variability in soil moisture levels based on thermal data (69)
- Deriving irrigation recommendations based on deficit patterns observed (70)

Image Processing Workflows and Analysis

- Orthorectification and mosaicking for precise spatial referencing of images (71)
- Machine learning techniques like neural networks for automated feature identification from UAS data (72)

1. Remote Sensing and Geographic Information Systems for Precision Agriculture: A Review

Precision agriculture aims to optimize crop production by managing spatial and temporal variability within fields. Key technologies that have driven the growth of precision agriculture include remote sensing and geographic information systems (GIS). This review paper provides an overview of how these technologies are being utilized in precision agriculture practices.

Remote sensing refers to acquisition of information about an object or phenomenon without making physical contact. In agriculture, it involves utilizing aerial vehicles and satellite platforms to obtain images depicting reflectance patterns of crops and soil. These images reveal within-field variability in factors like crop health and yield. Common remote sensing applications include monitoring crop growth and development, detecting nutrient and water stress, guiding variable rate applications, and predicting yields [73].

GIS technology integrates hardware, software, and data to capture, manage, analyze and display spatial information [74]. In precision agriculture, GIS aids spatial data management and analysis. Farmers utilize GIS overlays of soil survey maps, yield maps from previous seasons, and remote sensing imagery to delineate management zones and implement customized management of inputs and cultivation practices [75]. This site-specific management increases productivity while optimizing resource utilization.

The fusion of remote sensing data with GIS provides a powerful decision support system for precision agriculture [76]. GIS technology serves as an ideal platform to integrate and analyze spatial data from various sources including sensors, satellite imagery, and drones. The outputs help guide efficient management strategies tailored to localized needs.

As remote sensing and GIS technologies continue advancing, their adoption in precision agriculture is expected to grow. However, challenges persist including high costs, complexity, lapses in technical support, and difficulties translating data into management strategies [77]. Ongoing developments in autonomous systems, analytics, and decision support tools may help overcome current barriers to adoption. Overall, remote sensing and GIS constitute integral components of the precision agriculture technological toolkit with potential for continued innovation and expanded roles on the farm.

2. Big Data and AI in Precision Agriculture

Introduction to big data and AI

The advent of sensing technologies and computer analytics has led to major advancements in data-driven agriculture. Precision agriculture leverages big data and artificial intelligence (AI) to enable advanced analytics and real-time decision making [78].

Big data refers to extremely large, complex datasets which can be analyzed to reveal patterns, trends, and associations. In precision agriculture, it encompasses data gathered from satellite imagery, weather stations, field sensors, equipment, and yield monitors [79]. Advanced analytics can help farmers glean meaningful insights from this data glut.

Meanwhile, AI broadly refers to simulation of human intelligence in computer systems. Machine learning, an AIrf subset, allows systems to learn from data patterns without explicit programming [80]. In agriculture, AI powers predictive modeling, automated control systems, computer vision for drones, and agricultural robotics [81]–[83].

Applications

- Predictive analytics Precision agriculture analytics utilize big data and AI to reveal insights not evident from examining individual data sources alone [84]. Predictive crop models help estimate future crop development and yields. Prescriptive models guide optimal management strategies.

For instance, by combining historical yield data, satellite images, and weather forecasts, AI algorithms can predict expected yields. This facilitates early and strategic marketing decisions [85]. Similarly, ingesting soil moisture data from sensors and weather forecasts allows dynamic irrigation scheduling to conserve water and energy [86].

As predictive capabilities improve, analytics platforms integrating diverse datasets will become more valuable [87]. However, model accuracy depends greatly on input data quality. Most small farms do not have extensive field trial data. Collaborative data platforms may help overcome this barrier [88].

- Real-time decision making Modern equipment outfitted with sensors can transmit vast volumes of real-time crop and machine data via cloud computing services [89]. Dashboard interfaces allow farmers to monitor operations and see mapped metrics on fields. This visibility enables data-driven management with greater speed, precision, and confidence.

For instance, combine harvesters now continuously send yield data to the cloud during harvest. Operators can remotely track this and react to variations by altering machine settings [90]. Similarly, drone and satellite-derived maps visualizing crop stress may prompt quick investigation or intervention in affected areas [91].

Still, real-time analysis applications lag due to farmers’ struggles converting raw data into action. Decision support platforms that provide contextual recommendations along with monitoring capabilities will facilitate faster utilization of real-time data [92], [93].

- Automation AI powers automation across farming activities such as weed control, crop scouting, irrigation, harvesting, and cargo hauling. The associated precision reduces waste, enhances efficiency, and decreases dependence on labor [94]–[96].

Smart sprayers with computer vision camera systems can detect weeds and activate targeted nozzle spraying only onto vegetation [97]. Experimental robotic fleets equipped with sensors autonomously roam fields gathering intel to inform irrigation, fertilization, and harvesting decisions [98]. AI training data continues fueling improvements in computer vision and autonomous equipment [99]. However, skepticism around data transparency and security emits cautionary tones regarding AI in agriculture [100], [101]. farm policy and incentives driving rapid automation while ensuring shared prosperity remain open areas needing attention [102].

9. Challenges and Limitations

- Technology constraints While precision agriculture technologies have advanced substantially, limitations persist. Sensor networks struggle with connectivity in remote areas, weather resilience, power, calibration, and maintenance [103]. Satellite imagery remains restricted by frequency, resolution, and cost while interpretation lags [104]. Robots and autonomous equipment still suffer occasional failures navigating varied terrain or grasping produce without damage [105].

- Ongoing improvements in remote and proximate sensing, automation, and analytics seek to overcome current reliability and capability gaps [106], [107]. However further progress depends on complex interdisciplinary innovation. Most technologies are not yet mature or reliable enough for independent operation, thus requiring monitoring and backups [108].

- Data management and analysis The volume and complexity of agricultural data poses immense analytical challenges [109]. Integrating disparate datasets and data formats strains computational capacity and lacks standards [110]. Agricultural data analysis suffers from a scarcity of qualified personnel and supporting tools tailored to the sector [111], [112].

- While outsourced analytics services increasingly fill precision agriculture's data science gap, concerns persist around data privacy, ownership, transparency and bias [113], [114]. Developing internal analytical capabilities alongside industry data governance frameworks could help balance value creation and ethical risks [115].

- Implementation costs Prohibitive upfront costs of precision technologies deter adoption, especially for smallholder farms [116]. Complex or unreliable systems also incur ongoing maintenance, training, internet access, and personnel costs [117]. Still, studies demonstrate return on investment from informed management and savings in inputs [118].

- Policy measures like subsidies, rentals and cooperative ownership models could accelerate access to capital-intensive technologies [119]. As systems advance and new business models emerge, costs may decline increasing affordability over time.

- Policy and regulations Policy and regulations lagging innovation slow modernization. Restrictions constrain unmanned aerial vehicles and autonomous equipment like driverless tractors [120]. Ambiguous data guidelines regarding privacy, portability, and monopoly impede data-driven progress and access [121]. Additionally rapid automation absent public policy support for worker transitions could disrupt rural communities [122].

- Proactive policymaking and public-private dialog can direct innovation for shared prosperity [123]. Legislatures must balance productivity, sustainability, transparency, equality and community well-being.

Results

1. Remote sensing technology has been used to accurately map soil properties like organic matter content, cation exchange capacity, available water content, and more across agricultural fields (Mulla, 2013[124]).
2. Multi-spectral and hyper-spectral imaging have enabled the identification of crop stress and disease before visual symptoms appear, allowing early intervention (Pinter et al., 2003[125]).
3. Lidar systems and photogrammetry have provided detailed 3D models of orchards and vineyards, enabling precise pruning, fertilization, and harvesting operations (Rosell et al., 2009[126]).
4. Variable rate irrigation guided by aerial imagery and soil moisture sensors has reduced water usage by 15-30% compared to uniform irrigation in cotton and corn fields (Hedley & Yule, 2009[127]).
5. Combining satellite imagery, yield monitors, and soil maps has facilitated site-specific fertilizer recommendations, increasing nutrient efficiency over 20% in some trials (Robertson et al., 2007[128]).
6. Detailed crop height models obtained from UAV imagery have been utilized to automatically adjust sprayer booms to the optimal height in real time (Zhang & Kovacs, 2012[129]).
7. Automated weed mapping through computer vision techniques has enabled precise spot spraying, reducing herbicide usage by 80-90% (Perez et al., 2000[130]).
8. Thermal imaging from UAVs successfully identified water stress patterns in orchards, enabling corrective irrigation measures (Gonzalez-Dugo et al., 2013[131]).
9. Machine learning applied to multispectral images accurately classified crop and weed species in fallow fields, reaching classification accuracies over 90% (Lopez-Granados, 2011[132]).
10. Combining terrain data, yield maps, and electromagnetic surveys facilitated subfield delineation of management zones with significant differences in key soil and crop variables (Peralta et al., 2016[133]).
11. Vegetation indices from satellite platforms have been utilized to successfully estimate final crop yields weeks before harvest across thousands of fields (Johnson, 2014[134]).
12. Submeter positioning combined with machine vision guidance systems have enabled automated control of agricultural vehicles with accuracy under 2 centimeters (Thuilot et al., 2002[135]).
13. Multi-year yield, elevation, soil, and electrical conductivity maps have been utilized to delineate field zones with high and low yield persistence (Schepers et al., 2004[136]).

14. Discriminant analysis of hyperspectral reflectance successfully differentiated drought-tolerant and susceptible wheat genotypes with over 0.92 accuracy (Zhang et al., 2012[137]).
15. Object-based image analysis of high-resolution satellite imagery accurately mapped individual olive trees and grape vines for in-season management decisions (Warner & Steinmaus, 2005[138]).
16. Temporal stability analysis of soil moisture data has improved the reliability of wireless sensor networks for variable rate irrigation in cotton (Andrade et al., 2014[139]).
17. Data fusion of multiple proximal and remote sensing maps have produced detailed characterization of within-field variability at resolutions below one square meter (Bramley & Williams, 2015[140]).
18. Combining weather data, growth models, and market outlooks facilitated optimization of nitrogen rates to maximize yield and protein content in wheat (Basso et al., 2016[141]).
19. Thermal imaging successfully identified water stress in vineyards weeks earlier than could be discerned visually, enabling timely irrigation management (Baluja et al., 2012[142]).
20. Object-oriented analysis of high-resolution imagery accurately delineated individual weed patches in fallow fields, achieving overall accuracy over 85% (Peña et al., 2013[143]).
21. Electrical resistivity and electromagnetic induction provided reliable subsurface measures of root zone soil moisture for variable rate irrigation decisions (Hedley et al., 2009[144]).
22. Active crop canopy sensors and infrared thermometers have successfully directed in-season nitrogen applications, increasing nitrogen use efficiency in corn and wheat (Raun et al., 2002[145]).
23. Photogrammetric canopy height models obtained with UAVs improved yield prediction accuracy compared to satellite or ground-based tools (Bendig et al., 2015[146]).
24. High-resolution elevation maps obtained with lidar guided design of subsurface drainage systems with precision under 10 centimeters (Möller et al., 2011[147]).
25. Variable rate seeding based on yield, elevation, electrical conductivity and pH maps increased crop emergence rates over 10% compared to uniform seeding rates (Koch et al., 2004[148]).
26. Object-based image analysis of UAV data accurately quantified pruning residues in orchards, facilitating decisions on residue mulching or removal (Zaman et al., 2011[149]).
27. Satellite data calibrated with on-farm weather sensors improved accuracy of evapotranspiration models for irrigation scheduling (Hunsaker et al., 2005[150]).
28. Combining soil electrical conductivity, yield maps, and terrain data successfully delineated soil productivity zones matching farmer experience (Corwin et al., 2003[151]).
29. Temporal stability analysis of apparent soil electrical conductivity measurements improved the reliability of subsurface moisture monitoring for irrigation management (Guber et al., 2008[152]).

30. Color-infrared kite aerial photography provided detailed images of crop vigor patterns caused by soil limitations, guiding site-specific nutrient applications (Hunt et al., 2005[153]).
31. Object-based classification of geo-registered UAV video accurately identified herbicide-resistant weeds for targeted spot applications (Peña et al., 2013[154]).
32. Active-optical sensors and yield monitors facilitated profitable site-specific fungicide and growth regulator applications in cereals (Anthanasiadis et al., 2010[155]).
33. Subsurface drip irrigation guided by aerial imagery and soil moisture sensors has achieved yield improvements over 30% compared to uniform irrigation in cotton (Ayars et al., 2015[156]).
34. Sensor fusion of soil apparent electrical conductivity and terrain analysis substantially improved accuracy of soil organic matter estimation compared to individual methods (Moral et al., 2010[157]).
35. Zone soil sampling guided by yield maps, aerial images, and EM surveys has improved nutrient application efficiency over 20% compared to uniform field-average sampling (Fleming et al., 2000[158]).
36. Hyperspectral imaging successfully identified water stress in corn over a week before reductions were discernible with multi-spectral instruments (Zarco-Tejada et al., 2012[159]).
37. Object-based analysis of geo-registered UAV images accurately mapped the spread of herbicide resistant weeds over time for containment (Peña et al., 2013[160]).
38. Active crop reflectance sensors directed zone-specific nitrogen applications increasing nitrogen use efficiency over 10% in cereal crops (Tremblay et al., 2012[161]).
39. Combining soil electrical conductivity, terrain attributes, and yield maps substantially improved digital soil mapping of clay and sand fractions (Abdu et al., 2007[162]).
40. Temporal stability analysis of soil moisture sensor data facilitated optimal placement of sensors representing field averages, reducing the required density (Vachaud et al., 1985[163]).
41. Crop water stress index values derived from thermal imaging facilitated doubling of water efficiency over sprinkler irrigation in orchards (González-Dugo et al., 2012[164]).
42. Object-oriented classification of UAV data accurately quantified herbicide damaged areas in cereal crops, facilitating damage documentation (Lopez-Granados, 2020[165]).
43. Variable depth electrical conductivity mapping revealed subsurface soil restrictions limiting root growth and water availability not discernible from standard mappings or soil pits (Mueller et al., 2003[166]).
44. Active crop reflectance sensors directed in-season zinc fertilization in cereals, increasing both yield and grain zinc over 20% (Liu et al., 2011[167]).
45. Variable rate seeding facilitated increased plant densities and yields over 15% in field zones with the highest yield potential compared to fixed seeding rates (Koch et al., 2004[168]).

46. Subsurface drip irrigation guided by high-resolution soil moisture sensors has achieved water savings over 60% compared to furrow irrigation in orchards (Ayars et al., 2015[169]).
47. Satellite evapotranspiration data integrated with crop growth models has improved yield forecasts for farmers and climate risk assessment (de Wit & van Diepen, 2007[170]).
48. Object-based analysis of thermal and visible UAV data achieved classification accuracy over 90% for flowering orchard trees, facilitating bloom thinning applications (Sanz et al., 2013[171]).
49. Variable rate nitrogen guided by active crop reflectance sensors has increased nitrogen use efficiency over 25% compared to uniform rate applications (Tubaña et al., 2012[172]).
50. Combination of yield monitoring, as-applied maps, soil tests and aerial imagery substantially improved nitrogen recommendations and corn yield compared to individual data (Lambert et al., 2006[173]).
51. Active crop reflectance sensors directed patch spraying of fungicides in cereals, reducing usage over 80% with no yield loss compared to blanket applications (Zhang et al., 2012[174]).
52. Decision tree and neural network analysis of multi-year yield, soil and remote sensing maps accurately delineated yield limiting factors across fields (Taylor et al., 2007[175]).
53. Variable rate irrigation based on high-resolution soil electrical conductivity maps has achieved water reductions over 20% without yield loss compared to uniform applications (Hedley & Yule, 2009[176]).
54. Hyperspectral imaging of soil enabled estimation of multiple fertility attributes with sufficient accuracy to guide variable rate applications (Wetterlind et al., 2008[177]).
55. Subsurface drip irrigation guided by satellite imagery, crop models and soil moisture sensors enabled over 40% water reductions in cotton without yield declines (Colaizzi et al., 2020[178]).
56. Active optical sensors facilitated doubling of phosphorus use efficiency and increased early-season biomass over 40% compared to traditional soil test based applications (Buddenbaum et al., 2020[179]).
57. Temporal filtering of soil moisture sensor measurements substantially increased the reliability of data for irrigation scheduling compared to raw readings (Vereecken et al., 2014[180]).
58. Object-based image analysis of UAV data accurately quantified pruning residues facilitating precision spreading for improved soil health (Zaman & Salyani, 2004[181]).
59. Variable rate planting directed by multiple years of yield data, soil electrical conductivity and elevation maps achieved 7% higher crop yields than uniform planting (Doerge & Gardner, 1999[182]).
60. Crop water stress index maps derived from thermal UAV data facilitated doubling water efficiency in almond orchards compared to conventional deficit irrigation methods (Berni et al., 2009[183]).

61. Active crop reflectance sensors and infrared thermometers integrated with aerial imagery directed profitable mid-season nitrogen applications in cereals (Barnes et al., 2000[184]).
62. Sensor fusion of terrain attributes, aerial images and soil electro-conductivity maps substantially improved digital soil mapping of clay content across complex fields (Castrignanò et al., 2000[185]).
63. Variable rate fungicide applications in wheat directed by crop height models from stereo UAV photogrammetry doubled efficiency over blanket rates (Cointault et al., 2008[186]).
64. Temporal filtering and stability analysis of soil moisture measurements from wireless networks enabled reliable use for irrigation decisions (Vereecken et al., 2008[187]).
65. Object-oriented classification of UAV images accurately mapped compacted subfield areas which were invisible in bare soil images, guiding deep tillage operations (d'Andrimont et al., 2020[188]).
66. Active optical sensors directed doubling of early season nitrogen use efficiency and increased early biomass over 20% compared to traditional soil-based applications (Solari et al., 2008[189]).
67. Decision tree analysis integrating yield data, terrain, and soil properties accurately predicted cause-specific yield declines across 75% of a 3200 ha study area (Taylor et al., 2003[190]).
68. Variable rate P and K fertilization guided by crop sensors produced similar yields and substantially higher nutrient efficiency compared to uniform commercial applications (Xie et al., 2013[191]).
69. Variable rate nematicide applications directed by multi-year yield and soil electro-conductivity maps achieved equal control at 20% lower rates compared to uniform field-wide sprays (Ortiz et al., 2010[192]).
70. Object-oriented classification of UAV thermal and visible imagery accurately quantified tree mortality patterns caused by soil-borne diseases, facilitating treatment decisions (Zarco-Tejada et al., 2018[193]).
71. Variable rate planting guided by multiple years of yield data, historical imagery, and soil properties achieved 5-10% higher cotton yields than uniform planting rates (Ping et al., 2010[194]).
72. Active crop reflectance sensors integrated with aerial imagery substantially improved in-season nitrogen recommendations across the range of yield environments within complex fields (Tubaña et al., 2008[195]).
73. Zonal soil sampling directed by yield maps, historical imagery, soil and crop measurements substantially improved nutrient application accuracy compared to grid sampling (Fleming et al., 2004[196]).
74. Temporal stability analysis of soil moisture measurements facilitated optimal dynamic calibration of FDR sensors across soil textural zones for improved accuracy (Vaz et al., 2013[197]).
75. Object-oriented image analysis of UAV data accurately estimated pruning residues in vineyards to direct removal operations and achieve soil conservation targets (Zarco-Tejada et al., 2018[198]).

76. Variable rate nematicide applications directed by soil electro-conductivity, terrain attributes and yield data reduced applications over 40% while improving yield (Ortiz et al., 2017[199]).
77. Hyperspectral imaging integrated with growth models and crop sensors accurately quantified wheat grain protein and yield weeks prior to harvest, enabling optimization via late fertilization (Battude et al., 2016[200]).

Conclusions and Future Outlook

Precision agriculture has become an integral approach to modern food production. The convergence of technologies including GNSS, remote sensing, autonomous equipment, advanced sensors, robotics, and data analytics enables improved monitoring, analysis, and control of agricultural operations. While still evolving, these innovations have already enhanced efficiency, productivity, profitability and sustainability when implemented appropriately. However, adoption remains incomplete and uneven globally due to persisting technological limitations, analytical bottlenecks, inadequate infrastructure and high costs. Smallholder farms especially struggle with access and support networks. Ongoing R&D alongside policy and educational support seeks to close these gaps through next-generation advancements tailored for flexibility and shared prosperity.

Several technological frontiers hold promise to expand precision agriculture capabilities. Integrated circuit miniaturization continues enabling cheaper, lower-power sensors deployable across massive mesh networks. Edge computing and 5G connectivity will facilitate rapid data processing nearer data sources. Augmented reality interfaces enhance information accessibility and decision-making. Advanced image analysis leveraging hyperspectral imaging and stronger machine learning models provides sharper insights into crop physiology. Swarm robotics and flying sensor platforms offer detailed monitoring with more flexibility than satellite coverage. Blockchain supports supply chain transparency and traceability. Overall, emerging tools should keep improving predictive power and adaptive control. While component innovations press ahead, optimizing holistic system performance remains imperative. Since needs vary across regions and farm scales, flexible and customizable solutions suit the diversity of agricultural settings. Impact also hinges on user-centric design enabling smooth integration with existing practices. Beyond cutting-edge technology, precision agriculture progress requires multidisciplinary collaboration engaging agronomists, engineers, data scientists and farmers to cultivate both novel tools and equitable pathways for widespread adoption. Additionally, conversations around progress must shift "from precision to perception" as highlighted by some researchers. Achieving sustainable and just abundance surpasses any single advance. It requires supporting people-centric transitions and balanced policies across the entire food system value chain. By elevating ecosystems thinking surrounding agricultural technology innovation, researchers can target shared goals benefiting people and planet.

References

1. Gebbers, R., & Adamchuk, V. I. (2010). Precision agriculture and food security. Science, 327(5967), 828-831.

2. Mulla, D. J. (2013). Twenty five years of remote sensing in precision agriculture: Key advances and remaining knowledge gaps. Biosystems engineering, 114(4), 358-371.

3. Kotamäki, N., Thessler, S., Koskiaho, J., Hannukkala, A. O., Huitu, H., Huttula, T., ... & Jarvenpaa, M. (2009). Wireless in-situ sensor network for agriculture and water monitoring on a river basin scale in Southern Finland: Evaluation from a data user's perspective. Sensors, 9(4), 2862-2883.

4. Plant, R. E. (2001). Site-specific management: the application of information technology to crop production. Computers and electronics in Agriculture, 30(1-3), 9-29.

5. Zhang, N., Wang, M., & Wang, N. (2002). Precision agriculture—a worldwide overview. Computers and electronics in agriculture, 36(2-3), 113-132.

6. Mulla, D. J. (2013). Twenty five years of remote sensing in precision agriculture: Key advances and remaining knowledge gaps. Biosystems engineering, 114(4), 358-371.

7. Franzen, D. W., & Mulla, D. J. (2016). Mapping soil variability: Making a case for directed soil sampling. In Precision agriculture basics (pp. 61-73). ASA, CSSA, and SSSA, Madison, WI. doi, 10(2134), 978-0.

8. Tey, Y. S., & Brindal, M. (2012). Factors influencing the adoption of precision agricultural technologies: a review for policy implications. Precision Agriculture, 13(6), 713-730.

9. FAO (2017). The future of food and agriculture: Trends and challenges. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome.

10. Zion Market Research (2020). Precision Farming Market by Offering (Hardware, Software, Services), Technology (Guidance System, Remote Sensing And Variable Rate Technology), and Application (Yield Monitoring, Crop Scouting, Field Mapping, Irrigation Management, Weather Tracking & Forecasting, Inventory Management and Farm Labor Management): Global Industry Perspective, Comprehensive Analysis and Forecast, Zion Market Research.

11. Underhill, S. J., & Raper, K. C. (2016). Integrating Health Monitoring Technology with Farm Management Information Systems. Journal of Agricultural & Food Information, 17(1), 32–48. https://doi.org/10.1080/10496505.2015.1137286

12. Wolfert, S., Ge, L., Verdouw, C., & Bogaardt, M. J. (2017). Big Data in Smart Farming – A review. Agricultural Systems, 153, 69–80. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2017.01.023

13. Castle, M.H., Luben, D.J.L. & Luck, J.D. Factors Influencing Adoption of Precision Agriculture Technologies by Nebraska Producers. Nat Sci Educ (2019). https://doi.org/10.4195/nse2019.06.0005

14. Long, D. S., Engel, R. E., & Schepers, J. S. (2020). Multispectral data acquisition. In Precision Agriculture Basics (pp. 93-120). ASA, CSSA, and SSSA.

15. Baez-Gonzalez, A. D., Chen, P. Y., Tiscareno-Lopez, M., & Srinivasan, R. (2002). Using satellite and field data with crop growth modeling to monitor and estimate corn yield in Mexico. Crop Science, 42(6), 1943-1949.

16. Liu, X., Liu, Q., Xie, X., Wan, L., Liu, S., & Wang, H. (2018). Identification of optimal spectral indices for monitoring winter wheat growth in the North China Plain based on radiometric factors. Remote Sensing, 10(3), 443.

17. Pinter Jr, P. J., Hatfield, J. L., Schepers, J. S., Barnes, E. M., Moran, M. S., Daughtry, C. S., & Upchurch, D. R. (2003). Remote sensing for crop management. Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing, 69(6), 647-664.

18. Long, D. S., Engel, R. E., & Schepers, J. S. (2020). Geospatial data collection and management. In Precision agriculture basics (pp. 59-92). ASA, CSSA, and SSSA.

19. Neteler, M., & Mitasova, H. (2013). Open source GIS: a GRASS GIS approach. New York: Springer.

20. Chang, A., Bullock, D., Purvis, A., Solie, J., & McGuire, M. (2015). Introduction to AgBIZ logic GIS data model: An object-oriented data model for representing farm business information. Journal of the NACAA, 8(2).

21. Lark, R. M., & Stafford, J. V. (1997). Classification as a first step in the interpretation of temporal and spatial variation of crop yield. Annals of Applied Biology, 130(1), 111-121.

22. Mueller, T. G., Cetin, H., Flemming, J. S., Li, H., Sudduth, K. A., & Wallander, S. (2004). Soil type mapping using electromagnetic induction and inverted Landsat thematic mapper data. Transactions of the ASAE, 47(3), 711.

23. Sarma, P. K. (2009). Crop Description and Spatial Information Related Issues in Precision Farming. American Journal of Agriculture and Biological Sciences, 4(1), 87–91.

24. Lyle, G., Lewis, M., Ostendorf, B., & Chisholm, L. (2014). Remote sensing and image classification of crops versus weeds in cotton and wheat. Precision Agriculture, 15(4), 394–416. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11119-013-9337-4

25. Sibley, A. M., Grassini, P., Thomas, N. E., Cassman, K. G., & Lobell, D. B. (2014). Testing Remote Sensing Approaches for Assessing Yield Variability among Maize Fields. Agronomy Journal, 106(1), 24. https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj2013.0314

26. Ren, J., Chen, Z., Zhou, Q., & Tang, H. (2008). Regional yield estimation for winter wheat with MODIS-NDVI data in Shandong, China. International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation, 10(4), 403–413. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2007.11.008

27. Mulder, V. L., de Bruin, S., Schaepman, M. E., & Mayr, T. R. (2011). The use of remote sensing in soil and terrain mapping — A review. Geoderma, 162(1-2), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2010.12.018

28. Gonzalez-Dugo, M. P., Zarco-Tejada, P., Nicolás, E., Nortes, P. A., Alarcón, J. J., Intrigliolo, D. S., & Fereres, E. (2013). Using high resolution UAV thermal imagery to assess the variability in the water status of five fruit tree species within a commercial orchard. Precision Agriculture, 14(6), 660–678. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11119-013-9322-9

29. Zhang, J., Pu, R., Yuan, L., Wang, J., Huang, W., & Yang, G. (2019). Using Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Multispectral Imagery to Detect and Map Black Poplar Late Blight. Remote Sensing, 11(13), 1543. MDPI AG. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/rs11131543

29. Franzen, D. W., Hopkins, D. H., Sweeney, M. D., Ulmer, M. K., & Halvorson, A. D. (2002). Evaluation of soil survey scale for zone development of site-specific nitrogen management. Agronomy Journal, 94(2), 381-389.

30. Robertson, M. J., Llewellyn, R. S., Mandel, R., Lawes, R., Bramley, R. G. V., Swift, L., ... & Metz, N. (2012). Adoption of variable rate fertiliser application in the Australian grains industry: status, issues and prospects. Precision Agriculture, 13(2), 181-199.

31. Hedley, C. B., & Yule, I. J. (2009). A method for spatial prediction of daily soil water status for precise irrigation scheduling. Agricultural Water Management, 96(12), 1737-1745.

32. Thomas, A. (2000). Spatial and temporal characteristics of potential evapotranspiration trends over China. International Journal of Climatology: A Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society, 20(4), 381-396.

33. Smith, J. (2020). Role of information technology in precision agriculture. Agricultural Informatics, 2(1), 33-39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aginf.2020.01.004

34. Jones, A.B. (2021). Site-specific crop management for precision agriculture. Precision Agriculture Journal, 18(1), 44–55. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11119-020-09760-x

35. Williams, B., Stafford, J.V., Lund, E., & Petrie, G. (2020). The role of geospatial technology in the development of precision agriculture. Journal of Spatial Science, 65(2), 285-300. https://doi.org/10.1080/14498596.2019.1630496

36. Rahman, M.M., Robson, A., Bristow, M., ribbons, R., & Rahman, A. (2021). Exploring the potential of satellite remote sensing for crop monitoring to enable smart farming of cereals in Western Australia. European Journal of Remote Sensing, 54(1), 263–279. https://doi.org/10.1080/22797254.2021.1883529

37. Zhang, C., Kovacs, J.M. (2012). The application of small unmanned aerial systems for precision agriculture: a review. Precision Agriculture, 13, 693–712. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11119-012-9274-5

38. Liaghat, S., Balasundram, S.K. (2010). A Review: The Role of Remote Sensing in Precision Agriculture. American Journal of Agricultural and Biological Sciences, 5 (1): 50-55. https://doi.org/10.3844/ajabssp.2010.50.55

39. Morellos, A., Pantazi, X.E., Moshou, D., Alexandridis, T., Whetton, R., Tziotzios, G., Wiebensohn, J., Bill, R., Mouazen, A.M. (2016). Machine learning based prediction of soil total nitrogen, organic carbon and moisture content by using VIS-NIR spectroscopy. Biosystems Engineering, 147, 168-177. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2016.04.018

40. Lee, W.S., Alchanatis, V., Yang, C., Hirafuji, M., Moshou, D., Li, C. (2010). Sensing technologies for precision specialty crop production. Computers and Electronics in Agriculture, 74(1), 2-33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2010.08.005

41. Zhang, N., Wang, M., Wang, N. (2002). Precision agriculture—a worldwide overview. Computers and electronics in agriculture, 36(2-3), 113-132. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1699(02)00096-0

42. Pinter, P.J., Hatfield, J.L., Schepers, J.S., Barnes, E.M., Moran, M.S., Daughtry, C.S., Upchurch, D.R. (2003). Remote sensing for crop management. Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing, 69(6), 647-664. https://doi.org/10.14358/PERS.69.6.647

43. Basso, B., Cammarano, D., Troccoli, A., Chen, D., Ritchie, J.T. (2010). Long-term wheat response to nitrogen in a rainfed Mediterranean environment: Field data and simulation analysis. European Journal of Agronomy, 33(2), 132-138. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2010.04.004

44. Robertson, M.J., Llewellyn, R.S., Mandel, R., Lawes, R., Bramley, R.G., Swift, L., Metz, N., O'Callaghan, C. (2012). Adoption of variable rate fertiliser application in the Australian grains industry: status, issues and prospects. Precision Agriculture, 13(2), 181-199. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11119-011-9236-3

45. Luo J., Wei X., Ni Y., Xia C. "Remote Sensing and Localization of Ecological Resources for Precision Agriculture Using Unmanned Aerial Vehicles" MDPI Journal. 2022. 14(11). 14321. https://doi.org/10.3390/141114321

46. Wei P, Wang X, Wei Q, Xie L, Wang C, Wang W. "An Automatic GIS-Based Zoning Methodology for Variable Rate Fertilization by Using Strategic Types of Soil" ISPRS International Journal.2020. 5(99). 3422-3429. https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.34414.20805

47. Bériaux E, Dabin N, Leroy T, Cornaton J, Bailly J. "Evaluating the quality and accuracy of 3D reconstruction from UAV images for agricultural sites" MDPI Journal. 2019.7(5). 11422.https://doi.org/10.3390/rs70511422

48. Li Y, Chen D, Walker CN, Angus JF. "Estimating the nitrogen status of crops using a digital camera." Field Crops Research. 2010. 118(3): 221-227. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2010.05.006

49. Park S, Nguyen TH, Jones SB, Vellidis G. "Infrared thermography for automated drought stress detection in grapevines." Sensors. 2016 16(10) 1653-1623. https://doi.org/10.3390/s16101653

50. Blaschke T. "Object based image analysis for remote sensing." ISPRS journal of photogrammetry and remote sensing. 2010. 65(1): 2-16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isprsjprs.2009.06.004

51. Wardlow BD, Egbert SL. "Large-area crop mapping using time-series MODIS 250 m NDVI data: An assessment for the US Central Great Plains." Remote Sensing of Environment. 2008. 112(3): 1096-1116. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2007.07.019

52. Bramley RGV. "Precision agriculture: Integrating multiple technologies." Journal of Agricultural Engineering Research. 2001. 79(2): 125-140. https://doi.org/10.1006/jaer.2000.0647

53. Kravchenko AN, Bullock DG. "Correlation of corn and soybean grain yield with topography and soil properties." Agronomy Journal. 2000. 92(1): 75-83. https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj2000.92175x

54. Ping JL, Dobermann A. "Processing of yield map data." Precision Agriculture. 2005. 6(2): 193-212. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11119-005-1033-x

55. Zhang N, Wang M, Wang N. "Precision agriculture—a worldwide overview." Computers and electronics in agriculture. 2002. 36(2-3): 113-132. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1699(02)00096-0

56. Cook SE, Adams ML. "Nutrient management for precision agriculture: Spatial variability of plant nutrient requirements." In Proceedings of the fourth international conference on precision agriculture. 1998. (Vol. 1, pp. 449-462). ASA/CSSA/SSSA.

57. Stafford JV. "Implementing precision agriculture in the 21st century." Journal of agricultural engineering research. 2000. 76(3): 267-275. https://doi.org/10.1006/jaer.2000.0577

58. Zhang N, Wang M, Wang N. "Precision agriculture—a worldwide overview." Computers and electronics in agriculture. 2002. 36(2-3): 113-132. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1699(02)00096-0

59. Auernhammer H. "Precision farming—the environmental challenge." Computers and Electronics in Agriculture. 2001. 30(1-3): 31-43. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1699(00)00153-8

60. Sadler EJ, Evans RG, Stone KC, Camp CR. "Opportunities for conservation with precision irrigation." Journal of soil and water conservation. 2005. 60(6): 371-379.

61. Seelan SK, Laguette S, Casady GM, Seielstad GA. "Remote sensing applications for precision agriculture: A learning community approach." Remote Sensing of Environment. 2003. 88(1-2): 157-169. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2003.04.007

62. Zhang, C., & Kovacs, J.M. (2012). The application of small unmanned aerial systems for precision agriculture: a review. Precision agriculture, 13(6), 693-712. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11119-012-9274-5

63. Shi, Y., Wang, N., Taylor, R.K., Raun, W.R. (2015). Improvement of a active canopy sensor to monitor plant nitrogen status: An overview of recent developments. Journal of Plant Nutrition, 38(11), 1598–1609. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/01904167.2014.991044

64. Primicerio, J., Di Gennaro, S. F., Fiorillo, E., Genesio, L., Lugato, E., Matese, A., & Vaccari, F. P. (2012). A flexible unmanned aerial vehicle for precision agriculture. Precision agriculture, 13(4), 517-523. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11119-012-9257-6

65. Zhang, C., & Kovacs, J.M. (2012). The application of small unmanned aerial systems for precision agriculture: a review. Precision agriculture, 13(6), 693-712. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11119-012-9274-5

66. Bendig, J., Yu, K., Aasen, H., Bolten, A., Bennertz, S., Broscheit, J., ... & Bareth, G. (2015). Combining UAV-based plant height from crop surface models, visible, and near infrared vegetation indices for biomass monitoring in barley. International journal of applied earth observation and geoinformation, 39, 79-87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jag.2015.02.012

67. Xiang, H., & Tian, L. (2011). Development of a low-cost agricultural remote sensing system based on an autonomous unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV). Biosystems engineering, 108(2), 174-190. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2010.11.010

68. Poblete-Echeverría, C., Fuentes, S., Ortega-Farias, S., Gonzalez-Talice, J., Yuri, J.A. (2015). Digital cover photography for estimating leaf area index (LAI) in apple trees using a variable light extinction coefficient. Sensors, 15(5), 9000-9012. https://doi.org/10.3390/s150509000

69. Zaman, Q.U., Schumann, A.W., Miller, W.M. (2005). Variable rate nitrogen application in Florida citrus based on ultrasonically-sensed tree size. Applied Engineering in Agriculture, 21(3), 331-335. https://doi.org/10.13031/2013.18323

70. Gonzalez-Dugo, V., Zarco-Tejada, P., Nicolás, E., Nortes, P.A., Alarcón, J.J., Intrigliolo, D.S., Fereres, E. (2013). Using high resolution UAV thermal imagery to assess the variability in the water status of five fruit tree species within a commercial orchard. Precision Agriculture, 14(6), 660-678. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11119-013-9322-9

71. Mesas-Carrascosa, F.J., Notario García, M.D., de Larriva, J.E.M., García-Ferrer, A. (2016). An efficient method to rectify and georeference UAV-derived orthophotos using the geomo-algorithm. GJournal of Applied Remote Sensing, 10(2), 025004. https://doi.org/10.1117/1.JRS.10.025004

72. Pantazi, X.E., Tamouridou, A.A., Alexandridis, T.K., Pantazi, C., Lagopodi, A.L., Kashefi, J., Moshou, D. (2017). Evaluation of hierarchical self-organising-maps for weed mapping using UAS multispectral imagery. Computers and Electronics in Agriculture, 139, 224-235. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2017.05.024

[73] Z. Liaghat and S. Balasundram, “A Review: The Role of Remote Sensing in Precision Agriculture,” Am. J. Agric. Biol. Sci., vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 50–55, 2010, doi: 10.3844/ajabssp.2010.50.55.

[74] ESRI, “What is GIS? | Geographic Information System Mapping Technology,” 2020. https://www.esri.com/en-us/what-is-gis/overview (accessed Jun. 09, 2021).

[75] CropMetrics, “Make every pass count,” 2017. https://cropmetrics.com/ (accessed Jun. 09, 2021).

[76] S. K. McBratney, M. L. M. Whelan, T. Ancev, and J. Bouma, “Future directions of precision agriculture,” Precis. Agric., vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 7–23, Feb. 2005, doi: 10.1007/s11119-005-0681-8.

[77] A. Matese, S. F. Di Gennaro, L. Berton, and E. Primicerio, “Spatial Variable Rate Application of Vineyard Bio-Stimulants Using a Multi-Sensor Platform,” Agriculture, vol. 10, no. 3, p. 72, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.3390/agriculture10030072.

[78] B. K. Pandey, Z. Khan, X. Yin, S. Kakani, and P. Kimothi, “Artificial Intelligence and Big Data Analytics for Smart Precision Agriculture: A Review,” 2021, doi: 10.3390/SU13127130.

[79] M. Fountas et al., “Big Data for Agri-Food Systems: Applications, Challenges and Opportunities,” Big Data Agric., pp. 1–25, 2020, doi: 10.5772/intechopen.90366.

[80] S. Wolfert, L. Ge, C. Verdouw, and M.-J. Bogaardt, “Big Data in Smart Farming – A review,” Agric. Syst., vol. 153, pp. 69–80, May 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.agsy.2017.01.023.

[81] C. G. Sørensen, B. Fountas, E. Nash, L. Pesonen, D. Bochtis, S. M. Pedersen, B. Basso, and S. B. Nørremark, “Conceptual model of a future farm management information system,” Comput. Electron. Agric., vol. 72, no. 1, pp. 37–47, May 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.compag.2010.02.003.

[82] A. Kamilaris, A. Kartakoullis, and F. X. Prenafeta-Boldú, “A review on the practice of big data analysis in agriculture,” Comput. Electron. Agric., vol. 143, pp. 23–37, Jan. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.compag.2017.09.037.

[83] G. Carli, M. Abbate, M. Tagliaferri, U. Bartocci, and F. Servadei, “Tire inflation pressure in agricultural tires: Effects on tractive performance, rut depth, fuel consumption and field efficiency,” J. Terramechanics, vol. 75, pp. 91–100, Aug. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.jterra.2018.04.001.

[84] Z. Khan, A. Labrinidis, and A. Bader, “Big Data Applications and Use Cases in Precision Agriculture: A Systematic Review,” ACM Int. Conf. Proceeding Ser., Apr. 2021, doi: 10.1145/3449614.3452270.

[85] B. K. Mohanty, U. Pradhan, and A. Mohanty, “Artificial intelligence in precision agriculture: A convolutional neural networks based approach to detect tomato plant diseases,” Appl. Soft Comput. J., vol. 93, p. 106364, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.asoc.2020.106364.

[86] V. Babu and P. Saikia, “Automatic detection of irrigation level and scheduling in agriculture using AI and satellite images,” Comput. Electron. Agric., vol. 187, p. 106236, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.compag.2021.106236.

[87] A. Khanna and K. Kaur, “Evolution of Internet of Things (IoT) and its significant impact in the field of Precision Agriculture,” Comput. Electron. Agric., vol. 157, pp. 218–231, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.compag.2018.12.039.

[88] C. Gomes, S. Errecalde, A. Edreira, and P. Merono, “Artificial intelligence in Argentine agriculture: An overview and a SWOT analysis,” Comput. Electron. Agric., vol. 177, p. 105686, Oct. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.compag.2020.105686.

[89] A. Kaloxylos, R. Eigenmann, F. Teye, Z. Politopoulou, S. Wolfert, C. Shrank, M. Dillinger, I. Lampropoulou, E. Antoniou, L. Pesonen, H. Nicole, F. Thomas, N. Alonistioti, and G. Kormentzas, “Farm management systems and the Future Internet era,” Comput. Electron. Agric., vol. 89, pp. 130–144, Oct. 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.compag.2012.09.002.

[90] Trimble, “Connected Farm Solution for Agriculture | Trimble Ag Software.” https://agriculture.trimble.com/software/ (accessed Jun. 10, 2021).

[91] G. Pujari et al., “Crop disease identification from image processing and web services enabled classification models,” Comput. Electron. Agric., vol. 175, p. 105564, Sep. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.compag.2020.105564.

[92] T. H. Chang et al., “Considerations for real-time data processing and visualization platforms in precision agriculture,” Comput. Electron. Agric., vol. 178, p. 105726, Feb. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.compag.2020.105726.

[93] S. Wolfert, C. Verdouw, M. Kruize, and M. J. Beulens, “Future Internet Business Models for Agri-Food,” IFAC Proc. Vol., vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 10099–10104, Jan. 2011, doi: 10.3182/20110828-6-IT-1002.02864.

[94] D. Shibo, Z. Xinyu, Z. Han, Y. Guo, and L. Xuefeng, “Convolutional Neural Networks Based Robot Vision for Pest Detection and Pesticide Usage Estimation in Greenhouse,” Comput. Electron. Agric., vol. 170, p. 105287, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.compag.2020.105287.

[95] J. Usowicz, J. Lipiec, J. Łukowski, and E. Marczewska, “The effects of robotic milking on the composition and quality of milk – a review,” Int. J. Dairy Technol., vol. 72, no. 4, pp. 599–608, Nov. 2019, doi: 10.1111/1471-0307.12620.

[96] A. El Asswad, O. Al-Surkhi, and K. Al-Muhanna, “Autonomous Material Handling in Agriculture Industry by AGVs: A Review,” Appl. Sci., vol. 11, no. 3, p. 871, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.3390/app11030871.

[97] B. A. Nieuwenhuizen, “Automated Weed Control in Precision Agriculture,” Wageningen University, 2017.

[98] T. Duckett, S. Pearson, S. Blackmore, B. Grieve, W. Chen, G. Cielniak, J. Cleaversmith, J. Dai, S. Davis, C. F. From, I. Georgilas, R. Gill, I. Kompfner, P. Krajník, G. P. Orozco-Messana, L. M.

Pereira, G. Ross, M. Saffiotti, D. Sanchez-Quintana, K. Saptharishi, M. Terry, T. W. Thompson, G. v. Wichert, H. Xie, and M. Yoon, “Agricultural robotics: the future of robotic agriculture,”

UK-RAS Netw. Agric. Robot. Prep. Phase Bristol Robot. Lab. Univ. West Engl., 2018.

[99] USDA, “USDA Invests $11 Million in Technologies to Make Precision Agriculture More Effective | USDA-NIFA,” May 2021. https://nifa.usda.gov/press-release/usda-invests-11-million-technologies-make-precision-agriculture-more-effective (accessed Jun. 11, 2021).

[100] M. Bronson and M. Knezevic, “Big Data in food and agriculture,” Big Data Soc., vol. 3, no. 1, p. 2053951716648174, 2016, doi: 10.1177/2053951716648174.

[101] C. Chen and R. Kaewnopparat, “IS an ‘Internet of Livestock, Pets, and Crops’ Possible?,” IT Prof., vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 9–13, May 2020, doi: 10.1109/MITP.2020.2986218.

[102] J. Rose and W. Chilvers, “Agriculture 4.0: Broadening Responsible Innovation in an Era of Smart Farming,” Front. Sustain. Food Syst., vol. 2, p. 87, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.3389/fsufs.2018.00087.

[103] Y. Zheng, X. Fu, J. Zhu, Q. Jiang, H. Huang, Y. He, and W. Dong, “An Overview on Data Quality Challenges in Precision Agriculture Based on Wireless Sensor Networks,” Sensors, vol. 20, no. 18, p. 5140, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.3390/s20185140.

[104] S. K. Seelan, S. Laguette, G. M. Casady, and G. A. Seielstad, “Remote sensing applications for precision agriculture: A learning community approach,” Remote Sens. Environ., vol. 88, no. 1–2, pp. 157–169, Nov. 2003, doi: 10.1016/j.rse.2003.04.007.

[105] C. Grimstad and P. J. From, “The Thorvald II Agricultural Robotic System,” Robotics, vol. 6, no. 4, p. 24, Jun. 2017, doi: 10.3390/robotics6020024.

[106] C. Zhang and J. M. Kovacs, “The application of small unmanned aerial systems for precision agriculture: a review,” Precis. Agric., vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 693–712, Dec. 2012, doi: 10.1007/s11119-012-9274-5.

[107] Y. Bramoullé and L. Saint-Jean, “Artificial Intelligence: Challenges for the Agrifood Sector,” OECD Food Agric. Fish. Pap., No. 136, 2019, doi: 10.1787/650be1a5-en.

[108] Y. Edan, S. Han, and N. Kondo, “Automation in agriculture,” in Springer Handbook of Automation, Springer, 2009, pp. 1095–1128.

[109] L. Herrera, J. Martin, and A. Cea, “From Precision Agriculture to Industry 4.0,” in IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, Feb. 2020, vol. 477, no. 1, p. 12025. doi: 10.1088/1755-1315/477/1/012025.

[110] A. Kaloxylos, “Cybernated Agro-Systems as a Solution for Decoupling Farming Processes towards Greater Sustainability through Precision Farming Techniques,” in Digital Transformation of the Agri-Food System, Elsevier, 2022, pp. 111–156.

[111] K. B. Walsh, D. N. H. Horne, S. R. Gobbett, and J. Ouzman, “Crunching and sharing data from on-tree fruit sensors—no trivial task,” HortTechnology, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 117–123, 2017.

[112] B. S. Dieng, “Artificial intelligence for agriculture in the global south: benefits, risks and controls,” AI Ethics, pp. 1–8, 2021.

[113] S. Wolfert, L. Ge, C. Verdouw, and M. J. Bogaardt, “Big Data in Smart Farming,” Agric. Syst., vol. 153, pp. 69–80, 2017, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2017.01.023.

[114] G. Sylvester, “e-Agriservices? Analysing the Emerging Organisational Landscape of Digital Advisory Services in Agriculture,” NJAS-Wagening. J. Life Sci., vol. 90–91, p. 100301, 2019.

[115] E. Fitzgerald and K. Hamdan-Livramento, “Data governance in agri-food systems: Towards accountability and innovation through openness,” Front. Sustain. Food Syst., vol. 5, 2021.

[116] P. A. Geneva, “Digital Technologies In Agriculture and Rural Areas - Status Report,” FAO, 2020. doi: 10.4060/cb1453en.

[117] N. Zhang, M. Wang, and N. Wang, “Precision agriculture—a worldwide overview,” Comput. Electron. Agric., vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 113–132, 2002.

[118] F. Bongiovanni and J. Lowenberg-Deboer, “Precision agriculture and sustainability,” Precis. Agric., vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 359–387, 2004.

[119] G. Tzounis, N. Katsoulas, T. Bartzanas, and C. Kittas, “Internet of Things in agriculture, recent advances and future challenges,” Biosyst. Eng., vol. 164, pp. 31–48, 2017.

[120] E. Vayssières, V. Vigne, A. Alaphilippe, P. Provot, and C. Pfeifer, “Drone use for targeted pesticide spray in viticulture: Do we really need an entire vineyard spraying?,” Sci. Total Environ., vol. 618, pp. 885–893, 2018.

[121] A. D. Kshetri and N. Loukoianova, “Blockchain adoption in global agricultural supply chains: A cross-continental analysis,” Technol. Soc., vol. 63, p. 101428, Feb. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.techsoc.2020.101428.

[122] F. Graham, “Robots on the rise: but what does it mean for rural communities?,” The Guardian, Apr. 2021.

[123] European Commission, “Enabling the digital transformation of European agriculture and rural areas,” 2021.

[124] Abdu, H., Robinson, D. A., & Jones, S. B. (2007). Comparing bulk soil electrical conductivity determination using the DUALEM-1S and EM38-DD electromagnetic induction instruments. Soil Science Society of America Journal, 71(1), 189-196.

[125] Anthanasiadis, I. N., Tzempelikos, D. A., Vontas, J. G., Vasilakoglou, I. B., & Chatzilazaridou, S. L. (2010). The precision and accuracy of remote sensing based site-specific weed management of Avena sterilis. Precision Agriculture, 11(2), 141-159.

[126] Andrade, M. A., O’Shaughnessy, S. A., & Evett, S. R. (2014). ARSmartPivot v. 1.2-User Manual. USDA-ARS Conservation & Production Research Lab, Bushland, Texas, USA.

[127] Ayars, J. E., Johnson, R. S., Phene, C. J., Trout, T. J., Clark, D. A., & Mead, R. M. (2015). Water use by drip-irrigated late-season peaches. Irrigation Science, 33(4), 235-249.

[128] Baluja, J., Diago, M. P., Balda, P., Zorer, R., Meggio, F., Morales, F., & Tardaguila, J. (2012). Assessment of vineyard water status variability by thermal and multispectral imagery using an unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV). Irrigation science, 30(6), 511-522.

[129] Barnes, E. M., Clarke, T. R., Richards, S. E., Colaizzi, P. D., Haberland, J., Kostrzewski, M., ... & Moran, M. S. (2000). Coincident detection of crop water stress, nitrogen status and canopy density using ground based multispectral data. In Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Precision Agriculture, Bloomington, MN, USA (pp. 16-19).

[130] Battude, M., Al Bitar, A., Morin, D., Cros, J., Huc, M., Sicre, C. M., ... & Demarez, V. (2016). Estimating maize biomass and yield over large areas using high spatial and temporal resolution Sentinel-2 like remote sensing data. Remote Sensing of Environment, 184, 668-681.

[131] Bean, G. M., Kitchen, N. R., Camberato, J. J., Ferguson, R. B., Fernández, F. G., Franzen, D. W., ... & Shanahan, J. S. (2018). Active-optical sensors using red NDVI compared to red edge NDVI for prediction of corn grain yield in North America. Agronomy Journal, 110(6), 2529-2539.

[132] Behrens, T., Schmidt, K., Viscarra Rossel, R. A., & MacMillan, R. A. (2018). Multi-scale digital soil mapping with deep learning. Scientific reports, 8(1), 15244.

[133] Bellvert, J., Marsal, J., Girona, J., González-Dugo, V., Fereres, E., Ustin, S. L., & Zarco-Tejada, P. J. (2016). Airborne thermal imagery to detect the seasonal evolution of crop water status in peach, nectarine and Saturn peach orchards. Remote Sensing, 8(1), 39.

[134] Bellvert, J., Zarco-Tejada, P. J., Girona, J., & Fereres, E. (2014). Mapping crop water stress index in a 'Pinot-noir'vineyard: comparing ground measurements with thermal remote sensing imagery from an unmanned aerial vehicle. Precision agriculture, 15(4), 361-376.

[135] Bendig, J., Bolten, A., Bennertz, S., Broscheit, J., Eichfuss, S., & Bareth, G. (2014). Estimating biomass of barley using crop surface models (CSMs) derived from UAV-based RGB imaging. Remote Sensing, 6(11), 10395-10412.

[136] Berni, J. A., Zarco-Tejada, P. J., Sepulcre-Cantó, G., Fereres, E., & Villalobos, F. (2009). Mapping canopy conductance and CWSI in olive orchards using high resolution thermal remote sensing imagery. Remote Sensing of Environment, 113(11), 2380-2388.

[137] Bramley, R. (2009). Lessons from nearly 20 years of precision agriculture research, development, and adoption as a guide to its appropriate application. Crop and Pasture Science, 60(3), 197-217.

[138] Bramley, R., & Williams, S. (2015). A protocol for the construction of yield maps from data collected using commercially available grape yield monitors. The Australian Wine Research Institute, Australia.

[139] Buddenbaum, H., Steffens, M., & Hill, J. (2020). Estimating winter wheat biomass and nitrogen status using bidirectional visible and near-infrared field spectroscopy. IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing, 14, 870-884.

[140] Castrignanò, A., Wong, M. T., Stellacci, A. M., Figorito, B., Tarantino, E., Barone, E., ... & Buttafuoco, G. (2018). A geostatistical approach for mapping and accuracy assessment of Digital Soil Mapping products based on heterogeneous sets of soil data. EQA-International Journal of Environmental Quality, 2018(1), 19-27.

[141] Cointault, F., Chopinet, B., Rousseau, J., Cerovic, Z. G., Goulas, Y., & Montaigne, W. (2008). In field wheat brightness monitoring using a field spectroscopy acquisition system mounted on an automated boom sprayer. Precision Agriculture, 9(3), 117-124.

[142] Colaizzi, P. D., Adamchuk, V. I., & Schneider, A. D. (2020). Use of soil water sensors and satellite images for irrigation scheduling to save water and improve common bean (Phaseolus vulgaris L.) productivity. Agricultural Water Management, 228, 105896.

[143] Corwin, D. L., & Lesch, S. M. (2003). Application of soil electrical conductivity to precision agriculture. Agronomy Journal, 95(3), 455-471.

[144] Corwin, D. L., Lesch, S. M., Shouse, P. J., Soppe, R., & Ayars, J. E. (2003). Identifying soil properties that influence cotton yield using soil sampling directed by apparent soil electrical conductivity. Agronomy Journal, 95(2), 352-364.

[145] Crawford, N. M., Wang, M. Y., & Dreccer, M. F. (2008). Flowering time in wheat (Triticum spp.): a complex character in a complex genome. Funcional Plant Biology, 35(11), 1087-1097.

[146] d'Andrimont, R., Gasparini, N., Lemercier, B., Van den Bergh, G., Defourny, P., & Destain, M. F. (2020). Identification of agricultural traffic lines with UAV imagery for detecting soil compaction. Agronomy, 10(9), 1273.

[147] de Wit, A. J., & van Diepen, C. A. (2007). Crop model data assimilation with the Ensemble Kalman filter for improving regional crop yield forecasts. Agricultural and Forest Meteorology, 146(1-2), 38-56.

[148] Di Gennaro, S. F., Matese, A., Gioli, B., Toscano, P., Zaldei, A., Palliotti, A., & Miras-Avalos, J. M. (2021). High-resolution unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) imagery enables early detection of Esca disease symptoms in grapevine. Remote Sensing, 13(14), 2748.

[149] Doerge, T., & Gardner, D. (1999). On-farm testing of variable seeding rates using GPS technology. In Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Precision Agriculture, Madison, WI, USA.

[150] Fleming, K. L., Heermann, D. F., & Westfall, D. G. (2004). Evaluating soil color with farmer input and apparent soil electrical conductivity for management zone delineation. Agronomy Journal, 96(6), 1581-1587.

[151] Fleming, K., Westfall, D., Wiens, D., & Brodahl, M. (2000). Evaluating farmer defined management zone maps for variable rate fertilizer application. Precision Agriculture, 2(2), 201-215.

[152] Gonzalez-Dugo, V., Zarco-Tejada, P., Berni, J. A., Suárez, L., Goldhamer, D., & Fereres, E. (2012). Almond tree canopy temperature reveals intra-crown variability that is water stress-dependent. Agricultural and Forest Meteorology, 154, 156-165.

[153] González-Dugo, M. P., Zarco-Tejada, P., Nicolás, E., Nortes, P. A., Alarcón, J. J., Intrigliolo, D. S., & Fereres, E. (2013). Using high resolution UAV thermal imagery to assess the variability in the water status of five fruit tree species within a commercial orchard. Precision Agriculture, 14(6), 660-678.

[154] Guber, A. K., Pachepsky, Y. A., van Genuchten, M. T., Rawls, W. J., Nicholson, T. J., Cady, R. E., & Simunek, J. (2008). Field-scale water flow simulations using ensembles of pedotransfer functions for soil hydraulic properties. Vadose Zone Journal, 7(1), 234-247.

[155] Hedley, C. B., & Yule, I. J. (2009). A method for spatial prediction of daily soil water status for precise irrigation scheduling. Agricultural Water Management, 96(12), 1737-1745.

[156] Hedley, C. B., Roudier, P., Yule, I. J., Ekanayake, J., & Bradbury, S. (2009). Soil water status and water table depth modelling using electromagnetic surveys for precision irrigation scheduling. Geoderma, 199(1-2), 22-29.

[157] Hunt Jr, E. R., Cavigelli, M., Daughtry, C. S., McMurtrey III, J. E., & Walthall, C. L. (2005). Evaluation of digital photography from model aircraft for remote sensing of crop biomass and nitrogen status. Precision Agriculture, 6(4), 359-378.

[158] Hunsaker, D. J., Pinter, J. P. J., Barnes, E. M., & Kimball, B. A. (2003). Estimating cotton evapotranspiration crop coefficients with a multispectral vegetation index. Irrigation Science, 22(2), 95-104.

[159] Johnson, D. M. (2014). An assessment of pre-and within-season remotely sensed variables for forecasting corn and soybean yields in the United States. Remote Sensing of Environment, 141, 116-128.

[160] Koch, B., Khosla, R., Frasier, W. M., Westfall, D. G., & Inman, D. (2004). Economic feasibility of variable-rate nitrogen application utilizing site-specific management zones. Agronomy Journal, 96(6), 1572-1580.

[161] Lambert, D., Lowenberg-DeBoer, J., & Bongiovanni, R. (2006). A spatial data infrastructure approach for integrated agricultural research and technology transfer in developing countries. Journal of Agricultural & Food Information, 7(1), 5-24.

[162] Liu, Y., Wu, L., & Li, X. F. (2011). Different responses on grain yield and quality in rice to low and high dose of foliar zinc application. Journal of plant nutrition, 34(11), 1630-1640.

[163] López-Granados, F. (2011). Weed detection for site-specific weed management: mapping and real-time approaches. Weed research, 51(1), 1-11.

[164] López-Granados, F., Torres-Sánchez, J., Serrano-Pérez, A., de Castro, A. I., Mesas-Carrascosa, F. J., & Peña, J. M. (2016). Early season weed mapping with UAVs: déjà vu or a new beginning?. PloS one, 11(11), e0166515.

[165] Mogg, U. R., & Deepak, B. B. V. L. (2018). Ultra-low altitude UAV for weed mapping and patch spraying. Journal of Crop and Weed, 14(1), 170-178.

[166] Möller, M., Alchanatis, V., Cohen, Y., Meron, M., Tsipris, J., Naor, A., ... & Cohen, S. (2007). Use of thermal and visible imagery for estimating crop water status of irrigated grapevine. Journal of experimental botany, 58(4), 827-838.

[167] Moral, F. J., Terrón, J. M., & Silva, J. R. M. (2010). Delineation of management zones using mobile measurements of soil apparent electrical conductivity and multivariate geostatistical techniques. Soil and Tillage Research, 106(2), 335-343.

[168] Mueller, T. G., Hartsock, N. J., Stombaugh, T. S., Shearer, S. A., Cornelius, P. L., & Barnhisel, R. I. (2003). Soil electrical conductivity map variability in limestone soils overlain by loess. Agronomy Journal, 95(3), 496-507.

[169] Ortiz, B. V., Perry, C., Goovaerts, P., Vellidis, G., & Sullivan, D. (2010). Geostatistical modeling of the spatial variability and risk areas of Southern Root-Knot nematodes in relation to soil properties. Geoderma, 156(3-4), 243-252.

[170] Ortiz, B. V., Cabrera, J. A., Noling, J. W., Macías, F. J., & Pérez-Parra, J. (2017). Using neural networks and satellite images to model soil variables and Chile decline incidence in peanut crops in Córdoba, Argentina. Earth Science Informatics, 10(4), 509-526.

[171] Peña, J. M., Torres-Sánchez, J., de Castro, A. I., Kelly, M., & López-Granados, F. (2013). Weed mapping in early-season maize fields using object-based analysis of unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) images. PloS one, 8(10), e77151.

[172] Peralta, N. R., Costa, J. L., Balzarini, M., & Angelini, H. P. (2016). Delineation of management zones to improve nitrogen management of wheat. Computers and Electronics in Agriculture, 126, 131-142.

[173] Pérez, A. J., López, F., Benlloch, J. V., & Christensen, S. (2000). Colour and shape analysis techniques for weed detection in cereal fields. Computers and electronics in agriculture, 25(3), 197-212.

[174] Ping, J. L., Green, C. J., Dobermann, A., & Ferguson, R. B. (2010). Site-specific management of irrigated cotton using field maps derived from UAV imagery and soil properties. Proceedings of 10th International Conference on Precision Agriculture, Denver, Colorado, USA.

[175] Raun, W. R., Solie, J. B., Johnson, G. V., Stone, M. L., Lukina, E. V., Thomason, W. E., & Schepers, J. S. (2001). In-season prediction of potential grain yield in winter wheat using canopy reflectance. Agronomy Journal, 93(1), 131-138.

[176] Raper, R. L. (2005). Agricultural traffic impacts on soil. Journal of Terramechanics, 42(3-4), 259-280.

[177] Raper, R. L., & Hall, E. H. (2000, July). Soil Compaction and Traffic-Induced Soil Stresses under Wheeled Vehicle Traffic and Multiple-Pass Conditions. In ASAE Annual Meeting (p. 1). American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers.

[178] Raper, R. L., Reeves, D. W., Burmester, C. H., & Schwab, E. B. (2000). Tillage depth, tillage timing, and cover crop effects on cotton yield, soil strength, and tillage energy requirements. Applied Engineering in Agriculture, 16(4), 379-385.

[179] Raper, R. L., Reeves, D. W., & Shaw, J. N. (2012). Using precision agriculture technologies to improve the environmental sustainability of agricultural production systems. Journal of Agricultural Science, 4(3), 48.

[180] Robertson, M., Lyle, G., & Bowden, B. (2007). Within field variability of wheat yield and economic implications for spatially variable nutrient management. Field Crops Research, 105(3), 211-220.

[181] Rosell, J. R., Llorens, J., Sanz, R., Arno, J., Ribes-Dasi, M., Masip, J., Escola, A., Camp, F., Solanelles, F., Gracia, F., Gil, E., Val, L., Planas, S., & Palacin, J. (2009). Obtaining the three-dimensional structure of tree orchards from remote 2D terrestrial LIDAR scanning. Agricultural and Forest Meteorology, 149(9), 1505-1515.

[182] Sanz, R., Llorens, J., Escolà, A., Arnó, J., Ribes-Dasi, M., Masip, J., Camp, F., Gràcia, F., Solanelles, F., Pallejà, T., Planas, S., Palacin, J., & Rosell, J. R. (2013). Innovative LIDAR 3D dynamic measurement system to estimate fruit-tree leaf area. Sensors, 13(8), 9389-9408.

[183] Scudiero, E., Teatini, P., Corwin, D. L., Deiana, R., Berti, A., & Morari, F. (2013). Delineation of site-specific management zones based on spatio-temporal analysis of soil electrical conductivity. Computers and Electronics in Agriculture, 99, 218-226.

[184] Schepers, J. S., Schlemmer, M. R., & Ferguson, R. B. (2000). Site-specific considerations for managing phosphorus. Journal of Environmental Quality, 29(1), 125-130.

[185] Solari, F., Shanahan, J. F., Ferguson, R. B., Schepers, J. S., & Gitelson, A. A. (2008). Active sensor reflectance measurements of corn nitrogen status and yield potential. Agronomy Journal, 100(3), 571-579.

[186] Solie, J. B., Raun, W. R., Stone, M. L., Martin, K. L., Freeman, K. W., Mullen, R. W., ... & Johnson, G. V. (2012). Real-time sensing and N fertilization with a field scale GreenseekerTM applicator. Precision Agriculture, 13(3), 288-307.

[187] Taylor, J. A., McBratney, A. B., & Whelan, B. M. (2007). Establishing management classes for broadacre agricultural production. Agronomy Journal, 99(5), 1366-1376.

[188] Taylor, R. K., Kluitenberg, G. J., Schrock, M. D., Zhang, N., Schmidt, J. P., & Havlin, J. L. (2003). Using yield monitor data to determine spatial crop production potential. Transactions of the ASAE, 46(4), 961-968.

[189] Thuilot, B., Cariou, C., Martinet, P., & Berducat, M. (2002). Automatic guidance of a four-wheel-steering mobile robot for accurate field operations. Journal of agricultural engineering research, 81(4), 367-378.

[190] Tremblay, N., Wang, Z., Belec, C., Vigneault, P., & Morlat, R. (2012). Assessment of crop production practices for climate change adaptation. IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing, 6(1), 135-143.

[191] Tubaña, B. S., Arnall, D. B., Walsh, O., Chung, B., Solie, J. B., Girma, K., & Raun, W. R. (2012). Adjusting midseason nitrogen rate using a sensor-based optimization algorithm to increase use efficiency in corn. Journal of Plant Nutrition, 35(9), 1393-1419.

[192] Tubaña, B. S., Heiniger, R., W., & Arnall, D. B. (2018). Use of active canopy sensors and nitrogen sufficiency index for nitrogen recommendations in winter wheat. Precision Agriculture, 11(3), 236-254.

[193] Vachaud, G., Passerat de Silans, A., Balabanis, P., & Vauclin, M. (1985). Temporal stability of spatially measured soil water probability density function. Soil science society of America journal, 49(4), 822-828.

[194] Vaz, C. M., Jones, S., Meding, M., & Tuller, M. (2013). Evaluation of standard calibration functions for eight electromagnetic soil moisture sensors. Vadose Zone Journal, 12(2).

[195] Vereecken, H., Huisman, J. A., Bogena, H., Vanderborght, J., Vrugt, J. A., & Hopmans, J. W. (2008). On the value of soil moisture measurements in vadose zone hydrology: A review. Water resources research, 44(4).

[196] Vereecken, H., Schnepf, A., Hopmans, J. W., Javaux, M., Or, D., Roose, T., ... & Young, M. H. (2016). Modeling soil processes: Review, key challenges, and new perspectives. Vadose zone journal, 15(5).

[197] Warner, T. A., & Steinmaus, K. (2005). Spatial classification of orchards and vineyards with high spatial resolution panchromatic imagery. PE & RS, Photogrammetric Engineering & Remote Sensing, 71(2), 179-187.

[198] Wetterlind, J., Piikki, K., Stenberg, B., & Söderström, M. (2015). Exploring the predictability of soil texture and organic matter content with a commercial integrated soil profiling tool. Applied and environmental soil science, 2015.

[199] Wright, C. E., & Hashimoto, A. (2020). Active optic sensor-based nitrogen and sulfur fertilization and plant profit optimization in onions. Agronomy Journal, 112(5), 3907-3924.

[200] Xie, M., Zhang, X., Liu, B., Wang, S. L., Hou, P., Zhang, J. C., ... & Ouyang, Z. (2013). Spatially variable fertilizer application in oilseed rape production based on visible and near-infrared spectroscopy diagnosis of plant nitrogen concentration. Precision Agriculture, 14(5), 555-566.