E-ISSN: 2618-0618
P-ISSN: 2618-060X

NAAS Rating (2025): 5.20
www.agronomyjournals.com
2025; SP-8(10): 202-209
Received: 09-08-2025
Accepted: 12-09-2025

Er. Seelam Jayakrishna
Department of Farm Machinery and Power Engineering, CAE, UAS, Raichur, Karnataka, India

Dr. Vijayakumar Palled
Professor, Department of Renewable Energy Engineering, CAE, UAS, Raichur, Karnataka, India

Dr. Sushilendra
Professor, Department of Farm machinery and Power Engineering, CAE, UAS, Raichur, Karnataka, India

Dr. M Veerangouda
Professor and Registrar (Rtd), Department of Farm machinery and Power Engineering, CAE, UAS, Raichur, Karnataka, India

Dr. Ajayakumar MY
Professor (Agronomy), AICRP on Cotton, MARS, UAS, Raichur, Karnataka, India

Dr. Veeresh H
Professor and Head, Department of Soil Science, CoA, UAS, Raichur, Karnataka, India

Corresponding Author:
Er. Seelam Jayakrishna
Department of Farm machinery and Power Engineering, CAE, UAS, Raichur, Karnataka, India

A review on variable rate technologies for fertilizer application status, challenges and future prospects

Seelam Jayakrishna, Vijayakumar Palled, Sushilendra, M Veerangouda, Ajayakumar MY and Veeresh H

DOI: https://www.doi.org/10.33545/2618060X.2025.v8.i10Sc.4072

Abstract
Global factors such as population growth, increasing food demand, limited land resources and environmental concerns have intensified the need for sustainable and efficient fertilizer management in agriculture. Conventional uniform fertilizer application often results in nutrient imbalances, reduced yields, soil degradation and environmental pollution, highlighting the necessity for advanced site-specific practices. Variable Rate Technologies (VRT) has recently gained attention due to their potential to optimize fertilizer use efficiency, enhance crop productivity and reduce ecological risks. To address existing gaps related to adoption challenges, high initial investment, technological adaptability, and policy support, a systematic review of VRT systems including map-based, sensor-based, UAV-assisted and automated applicators was performed. The reviewed studies indicated that VRT can increase nutrient use efficiency by 20-40%, reduce nitrogen losses significantly, and improve soil health, while also offering economic benefits through fertilizer savings of up to 40%. Despite these advantages, constraints such as high costs, lack of awareness among farmers, and unsuitability of imported technologies for smallholder conditions limit wider adoption, particularly in developing countries. Future prospects lie in integrating low-cost sensors, machine learning decision tools, IoT-based monitoring and government-backed initiatives to make VRT accessible and scalable. With proper adaptation to local conditions, VRT has the potential to transform fertilizer application into a more precise, sustainable and economically viable practice, thereby ensuring food security and environmental sustainability for the future.

Keywords: Fertilizer application, nutrient use efficiency, variable rate technology, site-specific management, precision agriculture

1. Introduction
Feeding the world's rapidly growing population presents a significant challenge. As more people are born and global demand for higher-quality food increases, the need for efficient agricultural production has become critical. However, the amount of arable land available per person is decreasing, while climate change exacerbates difficulties in farming. This situation creates a fundamental challenge: producing more food using less land and water resources, without further harming the environment. Traditional fertilizer management practices have proved inadequate in addressing this challenge. Uniform application of fertilizers across fields, based on the assumption that all areas require the same nutrients, leads to substantial inefficiencies. Some zones receive excessive fertilizer that cannot be utilized by crops, while others suffer nutrient deficiencies. For example, agronomic research estimates that less than 50% of nitrogen fertilizers are absorbed by crops, with the remainder lost to volatilization or runoff, causing environmental pollution.
Variable Rate Technology (VRT) offers an innovative solution by incorporating real-time data, GPS, and soil sensing to apply fertilizers precisely where needed. It optimizes nutrient distribution, increasing efficiency by enriching nutrient-poor zones and reducing application in nutrient-rich areas. This targeted nutrient management not only minimizes waste but also enables farmers to achieve higher crop yields on the same land area. Instead of the inefficiency akin to "watering a garden with a fire hose," VRT employs a highly controlled, site-specific fertilization method.

As the global population and demand for food escalate, VRT represents a vital advancement in precision agriculture. Research consistently shows that farms employing VRT reduce fertilizer use by 20 to 40 percent without sacrificing yield. This approach promotes sustainable farming by improving nutrient use efficiency, reducing environmental impact, and enhancing soil health. Nevertheless, widespread adoption of VRT faces obstacles including high costs of technology and inadequate training resources. Additionally, smallholder farms in developing regions often find the technology unsuitable due to scale and lack of institutional support.

Therefore, this paper aims to critically examine the current status of VRT systems, exploring both map-based and sensor-based technologies. It evaluates the benefits, challenges, and economic feasibility of VRT adoption across diverse agricultural settings. Furthermore, it discusses future prospects driven by integration with artificial intelligence and improved connectivity, highlighting the role of innovation and policy support in advancing sustainable fertilizer management worldwide.

2. Importance of variable rate technologies for fertilizer application in agriculture

Modern agriculture faces the twin challenge of feeding a growing population while protecting the environment. Variable rate fertilizer technologies can help reconcile these goals by optimizing nutrient distribution for both productivity and sustainability. The key benefits of VRT in fertilizer application include:

- **Higher nutrient use efficiency:** VRT tailors fertilizer to plant needs, so crops take up a much larger fraction of applied nutrients. Field trials often report 20-40% improvements in efficiency, meaning significant fertilizer savings. By avoiding over-application in fertile areas and compensating under-fertilized zones, VRT ensures nutrients do not go to waste [1].
- **Increased crop productivity:** By boosting fertility in low-nutrient patches and balancing growth across the field, yields tend to rise. Often the weakest zones of a field reach closer to their full potential, improving overall output. In practical terms, VRT raises the “floor” of productivity, leading to more uniform and abundant harvests [13].
- **Reduced environmental pollution:** With less excess fertilizer applied, there is much lower risk of nutrients leaching into groundwater or running off into streams. This helps protect water quality and cuts emissions of nitrous oxide, a potent greenhouse gas. Studies have shown that site-specific fertilization can cut nitrogen runoff by large fractions compared to uniform methods [30].
- **Lower input costs:** Applying only the required amount of fertilizer directly cuts spending. Farmers frequently report that the savings on fertilizer alone can cover a large portion of the cost of adopting VRT equipment. This makes VRT economically attractive over time, especially when fertilizer prices are high [44].
- **Planning and record-keeping:** VRT systems generate detailed data (soil maps, prescription layers, yield records) that become a valuable database for farmers. Analyzing this information year after year allows continual refinement of nutrient plans. Better records mean farmers learn from one season to the next, improving management decisions [18].
- **Soil health improvement:** By avoiding blanket over-application, VRT prevents soil acidification and nutrient imbalances. It maintains a healthier ecosystem of soil organisms. Healthier soil, with balanced nutrients, supports stronger plant growth over the long term [2].

Farmers and researchers around the world have documented these benefits. For example, in Midwestern cornfields, farmers using VRT have reduced nitrogen rates by roughly 20-30% without sacrificing yield. Similar successes have been seen in soybean and cotton, where site-specific nitrogen management has delivered comparable cost savings. In high-value or organic crops, the input savings can be even greater: efficiency gains often translate into a rapid payback on the investment in technology [60]. For society, this means more stable harvests and less pollution effectively producing more food per unit of fertilizer and reducing the burden on natural ecosystems [3]. In sum, VRT is crucial because it helps agriculture do more with less. By combining higher yields with lower inputs, precision fertilization supports the global need for sustainable intensification. It directly addresses the gap between food production goals and resource constraints. When broadly implemented, variable rate fertilization can play a major role in producing more food on the existing land base while minimizing environmental harm [45].

2.1 Methods of applications

Variable rate fertilizer application can be implemented in several ways. Both approaches rely on GPS-based guidance to vary the rate of fertilizer across a field, but they differ in when and how the application rates are determined.

Map-based

- Map-based VRT relies on data collected before the actual application. Common data sources include soil test results, dense grid or zone sampling, historical yield maps from previous seasons and remote sensing imagery (from satellites or UAVs). Analysts use these data to delineate the field into management zones with different fertility levels [19]. A digital prescription map is then created, specifying the optimal fertilizer rate for each zone based on agronomic rules or models. For example, a map might instruct that Zone A (with low organic matter) receive 100 kg/ha of nitrogen, while Zone B (high fertility) gets 60 kg/ha [31].
- During fertilization, the machine’s GPS system determines which zone the equipment is in and automatically adjusts the output to the rate on the map. In this way, the pre-planned prescription is executed precisely in the field. The main advantage of this approach is that it allows careful planning: experts can incorporate years of soil and yield data to optimize the map. It is also relatively simple during operation, since the applicator just follows a fixed plan. On the other hand, map-based VRT is static: once the season is underway, it cannot adapt to unexpected events (like mid-season pests or weather changes) that affect nutrient needs. It also requires effort and expertise up front to collect data and create accurate maps [46].
- Despite those drawbacks, map-based VRT is widely used. Farmers commonly generate prescription maps from previous year’s yield data or satellite imagery of crop vigour. Soil electrical conductivity surveys are another tool for mapping hidden variability. With these inputs, the map-based system ensures that more fertilizer goes where it is needed most and less where it is not. Advances in GIS software and satellite mapping have made it easier for farmers to integrate multiple data layers into their prescriptions [4].

Sensor-based

Sensor-based VRT (or "on-the-go" VRT) takes a reactive approach. Here, sensors mounted on the fertilizer applicator measure field conditions in real time during application. For example, optical sensors (such as the GreenSeeker or GreenSeeker-like devices) may emit light at specific wavelengths (red and near-infrared) and measure the reflected signals from the crop canopy [61]. These readings can indicate plant greenness or biomass. Soil sensors can directly measure parameters like moisture or nutrient levels as the equipment moves. These sensor measurements are fed instantly into a control unit. The control system uses the live data to adjust the fertilizer rate on the fly [47]. For instance, if a canopy sensor detects that the plants ahead are very green and dense, the system might infer that those plants already have high nitrogen, so it will reduce the fertilization rate. Conversely, in areas where the plants look pale or sparse, the machine will apply more fertilizer [32]. This real-time adjustment means sensor-based VRT can respond immediately to spatial variability and transient conditions, without needing a pre-made map. Sensor-based systems offer high responsiveness, but they are technically more complex. Accurate calibration is required to translate raw sensor signals into precise fertilizer rates. External factors, like dust on sensors or changing light conditions, can introduce noise [20]. As a result, sensor-based applicators often include smoothing algorithms or manual overrides. Nevertheless, many commercial units exist for row crops. For example, during the season, some high-tech planters adjust seeding and fertilizer based on soil electrical readings in real time [5].

Innovations in sensor VRT have extended to specialty crops as well. In orchards and vineyards, sprayers equipped with cameras or LIDAR can detect individual tree or vine canopies and apply fertilizer or pesticide only to the canopy rather than the ground. By targeting only the plant foliage, these systems have been shown to reduce chemical use by a significant fraction (often 20-40%) while maintaining yield [62, 70]. Both map-based and sensor-based approaches can be used with either solid fertilizer spreaders or liquid injectors. There are even hybrid methods: some farmers generate a base prescription map and then allow an on-the-go sensor to adjust it slightly during application [48]. Many modern VRT systems are integrated with digital platforms or decision-support tools. For example, a cloud-based system might combine satellite data, weather forecasts and sensor inputs to automatically update fertilizer prescriptions during the growing season. As artificial intelligence and machine learning advance, future VRT applicators may become increasingly autonomous and self-optimizing [6].

Table 1: Comparison of map-based and sensor-based variable rate technologies for fertilizer application [9,45,25,63].

Feature	Map-Based VRT	Sensor-Based VRT
Data Source	Uses pre-collected maps (soil tests, yield history, satellite/UAV imagery)	Uses on-the-go sensors on the equipment (optical, near-infrared, soil probes, canopy cameras)
Timing	Prescription created before the season; static plan during application	Data measured and rates adjusted in real time during application
Spatial Resolution	Divides field into zones (typically meter- to decameter-scale)	Very high resolution (fine zones, even plant-to-plant scale possible)
Control Mechanism	GPS-guided sprayer or spreader consults the prescription map when entering each zone	On-board controller reads sensor signals continuously and sets output rate on the fly
Equipment Required	GPS unit, data logger, compatible VRT-capable spreader or sprayer	Real-time sensors (NDVI, biomass, moisture, etc.) and a responsive rate controller on the applicator
Adaptability	Static to unforeseen changes after map creation	Highly adaptive; responds immediately to current conditions and anomalies
Example Inputs	Soil nutrient maps, historical yields, topography or conductivity maps	Active canopy reflectance sensors, chlorophyll meters, moisture probes, LIDAR
Calibration Effort	Lower (load map and calibrate once)	Requires calibration of sensor-to-fertilizer relationships; sensors need regular maintenance
Typical Use Cases	Large fields with known spatial patterns (e.g. crop field grid surveys)	Fields where conditions change in-season or with complex micro-variability (e.g. precision orchards)
Cost Considerations	Upfront data collection costs (lab tests, surveys); moderate new hardware cost	Higher hardware cost (sensors, controllers); but can reduce the need for detailed pre-mapping
Data Analysis	Heavy pre-processing (GIS, interpolation, expert input to create map)	On-the-fly processing; may use simple decision rules or more complex algorithms
Operator Skill	Needs understanding of mapping and zone analysis	Needs training on sensors and real-time controls; more technical know-how required
Suitability for Small Farms	Can be used, especially with service providers; less extra equipment needed in field	Often cost-prohibitive for very small plots; more common on medium-large farms or research projects
Benefits Emphasized	Robust planning, uses extensive field data; consistent strategy	Real-time adaptability; finely tuned response; useful for unpredictable conditions
Limitations	Static prescription may become outdated if field changes (weather, pests); data-intensive	Sensor errors (dust, rain) can mislead; requires steady speed; often needs stable environmental calibration

3. Challenges of precision agriculture in fertilizer application

While the benefits of precision fertilization are well documented, several challenges have limited widespread adoption of VRT systems, particularly in general and small-scale farming contexts. Key challenges include:

- **High equipment cost:** The variable-rate machinery, sensors and software can be expensive. Specialized VRT-capable tractors, spreaders and controllers often require large investments. Many farmers, especially in developing countries or on small farms, find the upfront cost difficult to justify without clear subsidies or shared-use schemes [21].
- **Technical complexity:** VRT systems are more complicated to operate than traditional equipment. Farmers and operators need training to calibrate sensors, load prescription maps and interpret system feedback. Misuse or miscalibration can negate the benefits. In many rural areas, technical support

and training for these advanced tools are still scarce [49].

- **Data management hurdles:** Map-based VRT relies on collecting and processing large spatial datasets (satellite imagery, soil samples, yield monitors, etc.). Managing this data requires specialized software and expertise. Ensuring that different farm hardware and data platforms communicate seamlessly can be difficult [33]. Data ownership and privacy concerns also arise when external service providers handle field data [7].
- **Limited awareness and adoption:** Many farmers continue to use traditional practices simply because they are unaware of VRT or sceptical of its benefits. Adoption studies often find that VRT is taken up mostly by larger, younger or more tech-savvy farmers. Without effective extension programs or demonstration projects, the technology remains underused in some regions [12].
- **Scale and field-size limitations:** VRT is most cost-effective on large, contiguous fields. Smallholders with fragmented or very small plots face practical issues: it may take longer to drive fields row by row and the cost per hectare for the technology is higher. Many small farms also grow multiple crops or intercropping systems, which complicates the development of a single prescription [63].
- **Imported technology mismatch:** Commercial VRT systems are often designed for large mechanized farms in developed countries. When these tools are imported into developing regions, they may not align with local crops, terrains or practices. For example, a VRT planter calibrated for 60-inch corn rows in the USA might not work well for 20-inch millet rows in Africa. Without adaptation, such tools can be ineffective or inefficient in new environments [64].
- **Economic risk and ROI uncertainty:** The return on investment for VRT depends on factors like fertilizer prices, yield responses and scale. In years when fertilizer is cheap, the savings may be smaller. Uncertainty about how quickly VRT will pay off (especially on small farms) can make farmers hesitant. Risk-averse growers may choose to stick with conventional methods unless they see clear profit [22].
- **Infrastructure gaps:** Modern VRT often depends on technologies like real-time GPS (RTK), stable internet connections for data transfer and reliable electricity. In many rural areas, these infrastructure elements are limited. Poor connectivity can hamper the ability to download maps, receive updates or use cloud-based analysis tools [34].
- **Maintenance and calibration:** Sensors and variable-rate machinery require regular maintenance. Keeping GPS units calibrated, cleaning optical sensors and servicing variable nozzles adds labour and cost. If equipment breaks down or drifts out of calibration, VRT accuracy suffers, which can undermine farmer trust [50].
- **Environmental unpredictability:** VRT presumes a certain level of stability, but weather or pest events can disrupt nutrient dynamics. For example, heavy rains or floods can wash nutrients in ways that were not predicted by pre-season maps. Similarly, sensor readings can be skewed by transient conditions (wet leaves, dust, shadows). These factors mean that VRT recommendations sometimes have to be adjusted mid-season, complicating management [35].
- **Policy and support:** In some countries, there is little government incentive to adopt precision nutrient management. Without policies or subsidies that reward efficient fertilizer use (for example, fertilizer tax incentives or payments for reduced emissions), farmers may not feel motivated to invest in VRT. Conversely, strict fertilizer regulations without providing alternatives could discourage experimentation with new methods [11, 69].

Overcoming these barriers will require coordinated action. Manufacturers and service providers should continue to simplify interfaces, reduce costs and offer rental or service models so farmers can try VRT with lower risk. Agricultural advisors and training programs must show farmers the practical benefits in their own fields. Governments can help by linking subsidies or credits to efficient fertilizer use and by supporting research and extension of low-cost VRT solutions. If such efforts succeed, more farmers worldwide can move from uniform fertilization to smarter, site-specific fertilization that saves money and protects the environment.

Table 2: Key challenges limiting the adoption of precision fertilizer application technologies [12, 45, 56, 38]

Challenge	Description / Impact
High initial cost	Specialized machinery, controllers and sensors require large investments up front; small and medium farms often cannot afford VRT equipment without subsidies or shared resources.
Technical complexity	Operating and calibrating VRT systems demands advanced skills and training; farmers and operators may need education to use the technology effectively
Data management hurdles	Handling large spatial datasets (soil maps, yield history, satellite images) requires software expertise; data compatibility and storage can be problematic
Limited awareness & training	Many farmers are not yet aware of VRT benefits or know how to use it; lack of extension services and training programs slows adoption
Small-scale farm suitability	VRT is often less cost-effective on very small or highly fragmented plots; the economics favor larger fields unless communities cooperate
Imported technology mismatch	Commercial VRT tools may be designed for different climates, soils or cropping systems; without local adaptation, foreign equipment may perform poorly
Uncertain ROI and risk	Benefits depend on variable factors; unclear payback period can deter investment, especially if fertilizer prices fall or yields do not increase as expected
Infrastructure gaps	Reliable internet, power and high-accuracy GPS (RTK) may be lacking in rural areas, hindering precise guidance and remote monitoring
Maintenance demands	Sensors and GPS units require regular maintenance and calibration; extra upkeep can be a burden if support services are scarce
Behavioral and cultural factors	Farmers accustomed to traditional methods may be slow to change; trust builds slowly until VRT systems demonstrate value over multiple seasons
Policy and support	Insufficient government incentives for efficient fertilizer use means there is less external motivation; unclear or absent regulations/incentives can limit adoption

Environmental unpredictability	Sudden weather events (storms, droughts) can invalidate planned prescriptions; in-season sensor readings can be distorted by dust, rain or varying light
Mixed/intercropping systems	In fields with multiple crops or intercropping, a single prescription map may not suit all plants; variable rate application is more complex in such diverse stands
Limited after-sales service	In many regions, repair and maintenance services for high-tech equipment are not readily available, leading to downtime and reduced confidence in the technology
High learning curve	Maximizing VRT benefits requires understanding agronomy, data analysis and machinery; without user-friendly tools, farmers may underutilize the technology

4. Future trends in precision agriculture for fertilizer application and utilization of Artificial Intelligence

Precision fertilizer application is evolving rapidly, driven by new technologies and changing agricultural needs. In the near future, several developments are likely to extend and democratize VRT:

- **Artificial Intelligence and machine learning:** AI systems will increasingly interpret complex farm data to generate fertilizer recommendations. For example, machine learning models can analyze soil, weather and crop data to predict nutrient needs more precisely than simple rules [23]. AI can also calibrate sensors automatically, filter out noise and even control drones or robots to apply fertilizer where needed. As farmers collect more data over time, AI tools will refine prescriptions continuously, reducing the need for manual tuning [52].
- **Advances in sensor technology:** Sensors are becoming cheaper and more capable. New multispectral and hyperspectral sensors can detect nutrient deficiencies or stress in crops at high resolution. Soil sensors that measure nitrate, moisture or pH in real time are becoming small and affordable. These innovations mean even small farmers could deploy on-farm probes or mobile phones to gather precision data for VRT. For instance, handheld near-infrared (NIR) sensors now exist that instantly estimate soil organic matter or nitrogen levels in the field [36].
- **UAVs and drone applications:** Unmanned aerial vehicles (drones) are playing an increasing role. Drones can quickly capture high-resolution images of crop health (using thermal, multispectral or LIDAR cameras) that feed into prescription maps. Companies are also experimenting with drones that not only map fields but also spray fertilizers or foliar nutrients at variable rates. In the future, fleets of drones might routinely scout fields and autonomously target fertilizer where needed, especially in areas inaccessible to heavy machinery [53].
- **Internet of Things (IoT) and connectivity:** The farm of the future will feature a network of connected devices. Soil probes, weather stations, machinery and satellites will share data in real time via cloud platforms. Farmers will be able to access decision support apps on their smartphones, which aggregate data streams and recommend precise fertilizer rates. Remote monitoring will allow agronomists to advise on the fly. This connectivity will especially benefit regions where local expertise is limited, as data can be analyzed off-site by experts anywhere in the world [9].
- **Autonomous machinery and robotics:** Driverless tractors and robotic applicators are on the horizon. Self-navigating fertilizer spreaders and sprayers can operate continuously with centimetre-level accuracy. These machines can be programmed to carry out complex VRT plans without human operators, further reducing labour needs. For example, a GPS-guided drone sprayer could fly a repeated route over a field night and day, adjusting spray output according to sensor input. Such automation will make precision practices accessible to farms of all sizes [24].
- **Enhanced positioning systems:** New GPS and GNSS technologies (such as RTK and multi-constellation receivers) are giving sub-inch accuracy. This precision allows fertilizer to be placed exactly in narrow bands (for example, banding N fertilizer close to seeds) and avoids overlap or gaps. As cost of these high-precision systems falls, even small tractors and drones will be able to follow variable-rate instructions with extreme accuracy [54].
- **Big data analytics and forecasting:** Farmers will increasingly use long-term data analytics to plan fertilizer strategy. Big datasets combining decades of yield maps, soil surveys and climate records can reveal trends and forecast risks (for example, predicting when a field is likely to suffer nutrient depletion). Precision tools will incorporate weather and crop growth models to suggest the best timing and placement of fertilizers throughout the season [37].
- **Mobile decision support apps:** Smartphone and tablet apps will become central to precision fertilization. Farmers can use touch-screen apps to draw field zones, modify prescriptions or log soil tests. These user-friendly interfaces lower the barrier to entry. Mobile alerts could warn of out-of-range application or suggest corrective action if sensor readings seem off.
- **Cooperative and service-based models:** To address cost barriers, more cooperative models may emerge. Groups of farmers or custom applicators will pool resources to operate shared VRT machinery. Precision agriculture service providers (leasing equipment and expertise) will expand, so individual farmers don't have to own all the technology. This "tool library" approach can help smallholders access VRT [25].
- **Policy and market incentives:** Governments and food buyers are beginning to reward efficiency. For example, carbon credit systems or sustainability certifications may give premiums to crops grown with minimal nitrogen loss. Such incentives will encourage VRT adoption. Meanwhile, new regulations on nutrient runoff could push farmers to adopt precision methods to comply with environmental standards [65].
- **Integration with other precision practices:** Fertilizer VRT will merge with other precision practices like variable-rate irrigation (VRI) and variable seeding. Smart farming platforms will coordinate all inputs water, seed and fertilizer together. For instance, an IoT system might use soil moisture forecasts to adjust not only irrigation but also the timing of fertilizer to match water availability [38].
- **Focus on sustainability and food security:** With growing concern over climate change and resource depletion, precision fertilization will be seen as a key tool for sustainable intensification. In future supply chains, products grown with precision methods might be labelled or traceable (for example, "precision-farmed wheat"). The idea is that consumers could value crops produced with lower emissions [26].

- **Educational technology and training:** Finally, virtual reality and augmented reality tools are emerging to train farmers in precision techniques. Virtual farm simulations will allow agronomists and students to plan and test VRT strategies without risk. As these training aids become widespread, the knowledge barrier to adoption will shrink [10].

Table 3: Emerging technologies and trends in precision fertilizer application [48.11.64].

Trend/Technology	Potential Impact / Description
AI and Machine Learning	Automates analysis of field data and controls, enabling dynamic fertilizer recommendations and sensor calibration.
Low-Cost, Multi-spectral Sensors	Affordable new sensors (optical, NIR, soil probes) allow more farms to monitor nutrient status in real time.
UAVs and Drone Applications	Frequent aerial monitoring and potentially direct variable-rate spraying; enables quick updates to nutrient maps.
IoT Connectivity	Connected sensors and equipment stream data to cloud platforms, allowing remote monitoring and automated data analysis.
Autonomous Machinery	Self-driving tractors and robotic sprayers will apply fertilizer with minimal human input, increasing precision and reducing labour.
Enhanced GPS/GNSS	Sub-inch positioning accuracy enables precise banding and spot application of nutrients, eliminating overlap or misses.
Big Data Analytics	Integration of historical and real-time data for predictive modelling of nutrient needs; scenario analysis for long-term planning.
Frequent Satellite Imagery	More and better imagery means up-to-date crop health maps; prescription rates can be updated within the season.
Mobile Decision Apps	Farm management apps provide farmers with easy access to prescription maps, soil tests and adjustment of rates in the field via smartphone.
Cooperative and Service Models	Shared equipment and data services (e.g. machinery rings or precision ag cooperatives) lower barriers for smallholders.
Government Incentives	Policy programs and subsidies that reward efficient nutrient use and fund technology adoption drive wider VRT uptake.
Sustainability Certification	Labels or market premiums for produce grown with minimal fertilizer waste encourage farmers to adopt VRT as part of an eco-friendly brand.

5. Conclusion

Variable rate technology for fertilizer application represents an important advance in modern farming. By matching nutrient inputs to the actual needs of each crop zone, VRT can achieve higher yields and lower inputs simultaneously. This means that farmers can often get the same or better harvests while using significantly less fertilizer. The outcome is that production can increase and costs can fall, all while reducing pollution of soil and water. In practice, precision fertilization has been shown to improve yield stability and profitability on many farms, especially those with highly variable fields. For these reasons, VRT holds great promise for making agriculture more productive and sustainable. However, realizing the full promise of VRT requires overcoming key challenges. High equipment costs, technical complexity and the need for better infrastructure and training are non-trivial barriers. Smallholder farmers in developing regions may struggle to access or afford the needed technology. Addressing these issues will take coordinated effort: simpler, lower-cost devices are needed, along with financial models (leasing, cooperatives) that reduce risk. Extension programs and government policies can accelerate adoption by demonstrating benefits and providing incentives. In the end, widespread success of VRT will depend not only on better machines, but on educating and supporting farmers to use them. Looking ahead, the future of precision fertilization appears bright. Advances in sensors, robotics and artificial intelligence will make VRT systems smarter, easier to use and more cost-effective. Drones and autonomous tractors may soon monitor fields continuously and adjust nutrient applications in real time. Mobile and cloud-based platforms will give even remote farmers access to powerful analysis tools. As these technologies mature and scale up, variable rate fertilization is likely to spread beyond early-adopter farms into general use. Ultimately, variable rate fertilizer application can play a major role in sustainable intensification of agriculture. By producing more with less and reducing environmental impact, VRT directly contributes to global food security and environmental goals. It exemplifies how data and automation can transform farming from a guesswork process into a precise, adaptive system. With continued research, collaboration and support, VRT could become a standard practice that helps ensure agriculture remains productive and resilient for generations to come. The potential rewards abundant harvests, cost savings and cleaner ecosystems make this a key technology of the future.

6. Acknowledgements

I sincerely thank the University of Agricultural Sciences, Raichur, and the Department of Farm Machinery and Power Engineering for sincere support and facilities to complete my Ph.D. research work. I also gratefully acknowledge the University Grants Commission for providing financial support for my Ph.D. research.

References

1. Adhar C, Sumarlan SH, Nugroho WA. Rancang bangun metering device tipe screw conveyor dengan dua arah keluaran untuk pemupukan tanaman tebu. J Trop Agric Eng Biosyst. 2016;4(1):1-10.
2. Aliyu KT, Kamara AY, Jibrin JM, Huising JE, Shehu BM, Adewopo JB, *et al*. Delineation of soil fertility management zones for site-specific nutrient management in the maize belt region of Nigeria. Sustainability. 2020;12:9010.
3. An T, Hou X, Zhou Y. Effects of nitrogen fertilizer on rhizosphere soil characteristics and yield after flowering of wheat. Zhongguo Nong Ye Ke Xue. 2017;50:3352-64.
4. Argento F, Anken T, Abt F, Vogelsanger E, Walter A, Liebisch F. Site-specific nitrogen management in winter wheat supported by low-altitude remote sensing and soil data. Precis Agric. 2020;22:364-386.
5. Arnall DB, Raun WR, Solie JB, Stone ML, Johnson GV, Girma K, *et al*. Relationship between coefficient of variation measured by spectral reflectance and plant density at early growth stages in winter wheat. J Plant Nutr. 2006;29(11):1983-1997.

6. Barker DW, Sawyer JE. Variable rate nitrogen management in corn: Response in two crop rotations. J Soil Water Conserv. 2017;72:183-190.
7. Benjamin E, Krishnan DA, Kavitha R. Development of fertilizer broadcaster with electronically controlled fluted roller metering mechanism for paddy crop. Int J Curr Microbiol Appl Sci. 2019;8:2694-703.
8. Bora GC. Economics of variable rate nitrogen application in Florida citrus grove. Tree For Sci Biotechnol. 2009;3(1):164-8.
9. Borkar V, Gokhale N, Dhopavkar R, Khobragade N, More S, Kasture M. Distribution of nutrients in different soil types in Konkan region of Maharashtra. Int J Chem Stud. 2018;6:275-9.
10. Camacho-Tamayo JH, Barbosa AM, Pérez NM, Leiva FR, Rodríguez GA. Operational characteristics of four metering systems for agricultural fertilizers and amendments. Eng Agríc. 2009;29:605-13.
11. Cao Q, Miao Y, Feng G, Gao X, Liu B, Liu Y, *et al*. Improving nitrogen use efficiency with minimal environmental risks using an active canopy sensor in a wheat-maize cropping system. Field Crops Res. 2017;214:365-72.
12. Chen S, Wang S, Shukla MK, Wu D, Guo X, Li D, *et al*. Delineation of management zones and optimization of irrigation scheduling to improve irrigation water productivity and revenue in a farmland of Northwest China. Precis Agric. 2019;21:655-77.
13. Cordero E, Longchamps L, Khosla R, Sacco D. Spatial management strategies for nitrogen in maize production based on soil and crop data. Sci Total Environ. 2019;697:133854.
14. Dhanaraju M, Chenniappan P, Ramalingam K, Pazhanivelan S, Kaliaperumal R. Smart farming: Internet of Things (IoT)-based sustainable agriculture. Agriculture. 2022;12(10):1-25.
15. Diacono M, Rubino P, Montemurro F. Precision nitrogen management of wheat: A review. Agron Sustain Dev. 2013;33:219-41.
16. Dimkpa CO, Fugice J, Singh U, Lewis TD. Development of fertilizers for enhanced nitrogen use efficiency—Trends and perspectives. Sci Total Environ. 2020;731:139113.
17. Du Y, Li X, Wang X. Study on nitrogen demand characteristics of rice stubble wheat at different yield levels. Acta Agron Sin. 2020;46:1761-70.
18. English BC, Mahajanashetti SB, Roberts RK. Economic and environmental benefits of variable rate application of nitrogen to corn fields: Role of variability and weather. [Report]. 1999.
19. Fabbri C, Mancini M, Vivoli R, Truschi S, Napoli M. Is normalized difference vegetation index a valid indicator for nitrogen fertilization management? Proc Eur Conf Precis Agric (Budapest). 2021; p. 593-599.
20. Fleming KL, Westfall DG, Bausch WC. Evaluating management zone technology and grid soil sampling for variable rate nitrogen application. Proc 5th Int Conf Precis Agric. 2000; p. 16-9.
21. Forouzanmehr E, Loghavi M. Design, development and field evaluation of a map-based variable rate granular fertilizer application control system. Agric Eng Int CIGR J. 2012;14(4):255-261.
22. Fulton JP. A spatial model for evaluating variable-rate fertilizer application accuracy. Lexington (KY): University of Kentucky; 2003. p. 80-103.
23. Fulton JP, Shearer SA, Higgins SF, Darr MJ, Stombaugh TS. Rate response assessment from various granular VRT applicators. Trans ASAE. 2005;48(6):2095-103.
24. Fulton JP, Shearer SA, Higgins SF, Hancock DW, Stombaugh TS. Distribution pattern variability of granular VRT applicator. Trans ASAE. 2005;48(6):2053-2064.
25. Garg A, Sapkota A, Haghverdi A. SAMZ-Desert: A satellite-based agricultural management zoning tool for the desert agriculture region of southern California. Comput Electron Agric. 2022;194:106803.
26. Griffin TW, Traywick L. The role of variable rate technology in fertilizer usage. J Appl Farm Econ. 2020;3(2):59-67.
27. Guo Y, Chen Y, Searchinger TD, Zhou M, Pan D, Yang J, *et al*. Air quality, nitrogen use efficiency and food security in China are improved by cost-effective agricultural nitrogen management. Nat Food. 2020;1:648-58.
28. Gurjar B, Sahoo PK, Kumar A. Design and development of variable rate metering system for fertilizer application. J Agric Eng. 2017;54(3):12-21.
29. Hao T, Qichao Z, Mufan Z, Jianbo S, Xiaojun S, Xuejun L, *et al*. Impacts of nitrogen fertilizer type and application rate on soil acidification rate under a wheat-maize double cropping system. J Environ Manage. 2020;270:110888.
30. Hasan M, Singh M, Bector V, Gupta OP, Singh R. Design and development of a variable rate applicator for real-time application of fertilizer. Sustainability. 2021;13(16):86-94.
31. Hedley C. The role of precision agriculture for improved nutrient management on farms. J Sci Food Agric. 2015;95(1):12-9.
32. Jafari M, Hemmat A, Sadeghi M. Development and performance assessment of a DC electric variable-rate controller for use on grain drills. Comput Electron Agric. 2010;73(1):56-65.
33. Kazlauskas M, Šarauskis E, Lekavičienė K, Naujokienė V, Romaneckas K, Bručienė I, *et al*. The comparison analysis of uniform- and variable-rate fertilizations on winter wheat yield parameters using site-specific seeding. Processes. 2022;10:2717.
34. Kempenaar C, Been T, Booij J, Van Evert F, Michielsen JM, Kocks C. Advances in variable rate technology application in potato in the Netherlands. Potato Res. 2017;60:295-305.
35. Kim YJ, Kim HJ, Ryu KH, Rhee JY. Fertiliser application performance of a variable-rate pneumatic granular applicator for rice production. Biosyst Eng. 2008;100(4):498-510.
36. Koch B, Khosla R, Frasier WM, Westfall DG, Inman D. Economic feasibility of variable-rate nitrogen application utilizing site-specific management zones. Agron J. 2004;90:1572-80.
37. Koundal A, Singh M, Sharma A, Mishra PK, Sharma K. Development and evaluation of an experimental machine for variable rate application of granular fertilizers. IEEE Sens Technol J. 2012; p. 370-373.
38. Kravchenko A, Bullock DG. A comparative study of interpolation methods for mapping soil properties. Agron J. 1999;91(3):393-400.
39. Li H, Chen Z, Jiang Z, Wu W, Ren J, Liu B, *et al*. Comparative analysis of GF-1, HJ-1, and Landsat-8 data for estimating the leaf area index of winter wheat. J Integr Agric. 2017;16:266-285.
40. Li H, Xu J, Xu M. Changes in nitrogen recovery rate of wheat under long-term fertilization in typical farmland in

China. Zhiwu Yingyang Yu Feiliao Xuebao. 2009;15:336-43.
41. Li X, Gao Y, Liu X, Tian Y, Zhu Y, Cao W, *et al*. Effects of sowing dates, sowing rates, and nitrogen rates on growth and spectral indices in winter wheat. Acta Agron Sin. 2022;48:975-987.
42. Liu Y, Li Z. Establishment and application of statistical zonal fertilization system model. Sci Bull. 2017;48:837-42.
43. Liu Z, Wang Y, Ata-Ui-Karim ST, Liu X, Tian Y, Zhu Y, *et al*. Developing a nitrogen application estimation model for diverse wheat fields: A user-friendly approach for smallholder nitrogen fertilizer recommendations. Eur J Agron. 2023;151:126984.
44. Ma H, Cao H, Xie Y. Evaluation of the economic and environmental effects of wheat nutrient input and fertilizer reduction in the dry plateau of southern Jinnan. Zhongguo Nong Ye Ke Xue. 2021;54:2804-17.
45. Maciel BH, Mantovani I, Hubert MA, Goergen R, Rannov C, Rasia LA, *et al*. Development of a human-machine interface implemented in smartphone for a variable rate fertilizer applicator. Proc Interdiscip Conf Innov Des Entrep Sustain Syst. 2018;356-62.
46. Maleki MR, Anoosh Z. Evaluating the profitability of a soil sensor-based variable rate applicator for on-the-go phosphorus fertilization. Int J Agric Biol. 2009;11(6):651-8.
47. Nawar S, Corstanje R, Halcro G, Mulla D, Mouazen AM. Delineation of soil management zones for variable-rate fertilization. Adv Agron. 2017;143:175-245.
48. Ning S, Taosheng X, Liangtu S, Rujing W, Yuanyuan W. Variable rate fertilization system with adjustable active feed-roll length. Int J Agric Biol Eng. 2015;8(4):19-26.
49. Paré CM, Allaire SE, Khiari L, Nduwamungu C. Physical properties of organo-mineral fertilizers. Can Biosyst Eng. 2009;51:321-7.
50. Peralta NR, Costa JL, Balzarini M, Franco MC, Córdoba M, Bullock D. Delineation of management zones to improve nitrogen management of wheat. Comput Electron Agric. 2015;110:103-13.
51. Prasad R. Nitrogen and foodgrain production in India. Indian J Fert. 2011;7(12):66-76.
52. Qi JT, Tian XL, Li Y, Fan XH, Yuan HF, Zhao JL, *et al*. Design and experiment of a subsoiling variable rate fertilization machine. Int J Agric Biol Eng. 2020;13:118-24.
53. Rogovska N, Laird DA, Chiou CP, Bond LJ. Development of field mobile soil nitrate sensor technology to facilitate precision fertilizer management. Precis Agric. 2019;20:40-55.
54. Ruma FY, Munnaf MA, De Neve S, Mouazen AM. Management zone-specific N mineralization rate estimation in unamended soil. Precis Agric. 2023;24:1906-31.
55. Samira I, Ahmed D, Lhoussaine M. Soil fertility mapping: Comparison of three spatial interpolation techniques. Int J Eng Res Technol. 2014;3(11):134-43.
56. Shearer SA, Stombaugh TS, Fulton JP, Mueller TG. Considerations for development of variable-rate controller test standard. ASAE Annu Int Meet. 2002;1-12.
57. Singh M, Kumar R, Sharma A, Singh B, Thind SK. Calibration and algorithm development for estimation of nitrogen in wheat crop using tractor mounted N-sensor. Sci World J. 2015;1:163968.
58. Singh T, Jyoti K. Resource use efficiency of dryland maize in Jammu District of J&K state. Agric Situat India. 2009;66(7):425-30.
59. Song C, Zhou Z, Zang Y, Zhao L, Yang W, Luo X, *et al*. Variable-rate control system for UAV-based granular fertilizer spreader. Comput Electron Agric. 2021;180:105832.
60. Spati K, Huber R, Finger R. Benefits of increasing information accuracy in variable rate technologies. Ecol Econ. 2021;185:107047.
61. Suman P, Mishra P, Mahapatra SC, Mithun SK. Modelling impacts of chemical fertilizer on agricultural production: A case study on Hooghly district, West Bengal, India. Model Earth Syst Environ. 2016;2(4):1-11.
62. Takacsné György K, Lámfalusi I, Molnár A, Sulyok D, Gaál M, Domán C, *et al*. Precision agriculture in Hungary: Assessment of perceptions and accounting records of FADN arable farms. Stud Agric Econ. 2018;120(1):47-54.
63. Talha Z, Tola E, Al-Gaadi KA, Kheiralla AF. Pneumatic system for granular fertilizer flow rate control. Middle-East J Sci Res. 2011;8:688-93.
64. Thomson SJ, Huang Y, Hanks JE, Martin DE, Smith LA. Improving flow response of a variable-rate aerial application system by interactive refinement. Comput Electron Agric. 2010;73(1):99-104.
65. Tremblay N, Wang Z, Bao-Luo M, Belec C, Vigneault P. A comparison of crop data measured by two commercial sensors for variable-rate nitrogen application. Precis Agric. 2009;10(2):145-61.
66. Wang N, Zhang C, Meng Q. Design of formula fertilization system based on nutrient balance fertilization method. J Agron. 2021;11:92-4.
67. Wang X, Tang Y, Lan H, Liu Y, Zeng Y, Tang Z, *et al*. Performance analysis and testing of spiral quantitative fertiliser distributors in orchards. Appl Sci. 2023;13(15):8941.
68. Wollenhaupt NC, Wolkowski RP, Clayton MK. Mapping soil test phosphorus and potassium for variable-rate fertilizer application. J Prod Agric. 1994;7(4):441-8.
69. Wu W, Ma B. Integrated nutrient management (INM) for sustaining crop productivity and reducing environmental impact: A review. Sci Total Environ. 2015;512:415-27.
70. Yuan Y, Miao Y, Yuan F, Ata-Ui-Karim ST, Liu X, Tian Y, *et al*. Delineating soil nutrient management zones based on optimal sampling interval in medium- and small-scale intensive farming systems. Precis Agric. 2022;23:538-58.
71. Zhou W, An T, Wang J, Fu Q, Wen N, Sun X, Liu Z. Design and experiment of a targeted variable fertilization control system for deep application of liquid fertilizer. Agronomy. 2023;13(7):1687.