International Journal of Recent Development in Engineering and Technology
Website: www.ijrdet.com (ISSN 2347-6435 (Online) Volume 15, Issue 05, May 2026)

Precision Farming at the Crossroads: Economic Viability, Adoption Barriers, and the Smallholder Dilemma

Rohit Verma[1], Vinod Kumar[2]

[1,2]*Department of Management, Guru Kashi University, India*

***Abstract*-- The global agricultural sector stands at a critical inflection point, wherein precision farming technologies encompassing GPS-guided machinery, remote sensors, geographic information systems (GIS), and variable-rate technology (VRT) hold transformative potential for optimising resource utilisation, improving crop yields, and fostering environmental sustainability. Yet, a persistent paradox exists: despite more than three decades of demonstrated benefits, actual adoption rates remain discouragingly low, particularly among smallholder farmers who form the backbone of food production in developing economies. Drawing on a model-based economic investigation across three farm archetypes in Baden-Wuerttemberg, Germany representing 11 ha, 58 ha, and 303 ha—this study rigorously examines the cost-benefit dynamics of two technology groups: input-saving technologies (IST) such as steering assistants, and yield-enhancing technologies (YET) such as site-specific nitrogen fertilisation systems. Employing cost and performance accounting methodologies alongside sensitivity analysis, the findings reveal that economies of scale decisively govern technology viability, with profitability thresholds for IST requiring a minimum farm size of approximately 100-149 ha, while YET becomes economically viable from approximately 29-45 ha. The study underscores that farm size, yield level, and investment costs are the most consequential determinants of adoption, whereas variables such as European Green Deal fertiliser mandates exert limited economic influence. The paper concludes by articulating a call for targeted policy interventions, financial subsidisation, cooperative machinery-sharing models, and capacity-building programmes to bridge the adoption chasm and democratise the benefits of digital agriculture.**

***Keywords*--Precision Farming, Smallholder Agriculture, Economic Viability, Input-Saving Technology, Yield-Enhancing Technology**

I. INTRODUCTION

Agriculture has always been the foundation of human civilisation, and yet it remains one of the most precarious and resource-intensive sectors in the modern economy. As the global population is projected to reach 9.8 billion by 2050, the pressure on food systems to produce more with less less land, less water, fewer chemical inputs has never been more acute (Godfray et al., 2010).

In this context, the emergence of precision farming technology represents not merely a technological upgrade but a fundamental reimagining of how agricultural production can be managed, measured, and optimised. As India's Finance Minister Nirmala Sitharaman has consistently emphasised in Union Budget speeches technology is not a luxury but an enabler of equity and efficiency and nowhere is this principle more apt than in agriculture.

Precision farming, alternatively referred to as precision agriculture, encompasses an integrated system of advanced technologies global positioning systems (GPS), geographic information systems (GIS), remote sensing, variable-rate technology (VRT), yield monitors, and drone-based surveillance—that collectively enable site-specific, data-driven management of crop production (Jain & Singh, 2019). The foundational premise is deceptively straightforward: rather than applying uniform inputs across an entire field, precision farming allows farmers to tailor seed rates, fertiliser quantities, irrigation volumes, and pesticide applications to the specific needs of discrete micro-zones within a field, as determined by real-time and historical spatial data.

The economic logic underpinning this approach is compelling. By eliminating input waste, reducing over-application of agrochemicals, and identifying yield-limiting factors at a granular level, precision farming holds the promise of simultaneously cutting costs and boosting revenues (Bullock & Lowenberg-DeBoer, 2015). Research has consistently demonstrated that practices such as variable-rate nitrogen fertilisation can reduce fertiliser expenditure by 10–20% while maintaining or improving yields; GPS-guided steering assistants can reduce field overlap during planting and spraying by 5–15%, translating into direct savings in fuel and inputs (Tey & Brindal, 2012).

Yet, this narrative of transformative promise coexists uneasily with a stubborn empirical reality: adoption rates of precision farming technologies remain remarkably low, especially in small-structured agricultural regions. Studies from Bavaria, Germany, reveal that fewer than 5% of surveyed farmers use site-specific fertilisation technology, despite the region's relatively high agricultural development (Kernecker et al., cited in Verma, 2024).

Similar patterns are observed in Switzerland, where adoption of electronic measuring systems among smallholders stands at roughly 17%, and even this figure overstates the uptake of site-specific management practices (Groher et al., cited in Verma, 2024).

This divergence between potential and practice is neither accidental nor simply a matter of technological unfamiliarity. It is, at its core, an economic problem one shaped by the interplay of investment costs, farm size, expected returns, learning curves, and access to capital and knowledge infrastructure. As Finger et al. (cited in Verma, 2024) argue, a broader application of precision farming technologies should be actively encouraged given their demonstrable economic and environmental advantages, yet the structural barriers preventing this expansion remain insufficiently understood, particularly for smallholder contexts.

The importance of understanding this landscape has been amplified by global policy mandates. The European Commission's Farm to Fork Strategy, as part of the broader European Green Deal, sets ambitious targets for reducing fertiliser use by 20% and pesticide application by 50% by 2030. Meeting these targets without sacrificing yields will require precisely the kind of site-specific, data-informed management that precision farming enables. However, mandating outcomes without addressing the economic and structural impediments to adoption risks creating an inequitable burden that falls disproportionately on smaller farming operations (Arnall et al., 2018).

India, too, faces a version of this challenge at scale. With over 86% of its farmers classified as smallholders—cultivating less than two hectares the economic and structural barriers to precision farming adoption are even more pronounced than in European contexts (World Bank, 2019). The Indian government's Digital Agriculture Mission and various state-level agri-tech initiatives signal awareness of this imperative, yet translating policy intent into on-ground adoption requires a granular understanding of the economic calculus that each farmer must navigate.

It is against this backdrop that the present paper situates its inquiry. By rigorously examining the economic factors that determine the viability of precision farming adoption across different farm sizes—and by identifying which of these factors lie within the farmer's sphere of influencethe study aims to generate actionable insights for farmers, policymakers, extension services, and technology developers alike.

The analysis draws on a model-based investigation of three farm archetypes in Baden-Wuerttemberg, Germany, chosen for their representativeness of small, medium, and large-scale agricultural operations, and examines two distinct categories of precision farming technology: input-saving technologies (IST) and yield-enhancing technologies (YET).

Ultimately, this paper argues that precision farming is not simply a technical solution in search of problems it is a profoundly economic and social intervention whose transformative potential can only be realised if the structural conditions enabling its equitable adoption are deliberately and systematically constructed. The challenge, as with so many dimensions of economic reform, is not a lack of solutions but a lack of the institutional architecture required to make those solutions universally accessible.

II. Literature Review

The scholarly literature on precision farming has expanded substantially over the past two decades, reflecting both the rapid technological evolution in the field and the growing urgency of addressing agricultural productivity and sustainability challenges. This review synthesises key contributions across three thematic dimensions: the documented economic benefits of precision farming, the structural and institutional barriers to its adoption, and the policy frameworks that have been proposed or implemented to accelerate uptake.

2.1 Economic Benefits and Productivity Gains

The economic case for precision farming rests on a substantial body of empirical evidence. A landmark meta-analysis by Bullock and Lowenberg-DeBoer (2015) examined outcomes from over 200 field experiments and found that precision farming technologies particularly variable-rate input application and yield monitoring consistently improved farm profitability and operational efficiency. The study estimated average net returns from precision agriculture practices to be positive across a majority of contexts, though the magnitude varied considerably with farm size and crop type.

Velandia et al. (2017) extended this analysis to examine the revenue-side effects of precision agriculture, demonstrating that site-specific management of crop inputs led to statistically significant improvements in crop yields relative to uniform-rate application practices.

Critically, these yield gains were accompanied by reductions in input costs, creating a dual benefit that strengthened the economic case for adoption even when upfront technology costs were accounted for.

Beyond direct profitability effects, the literature documents significant long-term economic advantages stemming from improved resource stewardship. Rejesus et al. (2018) demonstrated that precision irrigation management enabled by soil moisture sensors and GPS-guided water application systems reduced water consumption by 15–30% while maintaining equivalent yield outcomes, an advantage of particular significance in water-scarce regions. Similarly, Karami et al. (2019) documented precision farming's role in optimising nutrient management, reducing nitrogen leaching and associated soil degradation, thereby protecting the long-run productive capacity of agricultural land—a form of natural capital preservation with direct economic value.

The role of remote sensing in enabling precision crop management has received growing scholarly attention. García-Torres and López-Granados (2019) reviewed advances in satellite and drone-based remote sensing, documenting their capacity to identify within-field variability in soil conditions, crop stress, pest pressure, and weed invasion at spatial resolutions previously unattainable. These capabilities, when integrated with GIS platforms, allow for decision support systems that dynamically adjust management recommendations in real time, reducing the information asymmetry that has historically led to over-application of inputs.

2.2 Barriers to Adoption: Economic, Structural, and Informational

Despite the demonstrated benefits, the adoption of precision farming technologies has been consistently slower than technological availability would suggest. Mishra and El-Osta (2019) identified high initial capital investment as the single most significant barrier to adoption among American farmers, a finding echoed across geographies. The upfront cost of equipping a farm with a comprehensive suite of precision technologies including GPS receivers, variable-rate applicators, yield monitors, and the software systems required to integrate them can range from tens of thousands to several hundred thousand euros or dollars, depending on the scale of operation and the complexity of the technology package.

This capital barrier is compounded by the structure of agricultural financing in many countries. Smallholder farmers, who typically lack collateral, credit history, or access to formal financial institutions, are least able to fund these investments independently (World Bank, 2019).

Even where credit is available, the uncertain and often lagged returns from precision farming investments which depend on weather, commodity prices, and local soil conditions can make lenders reluctant to extend favourable terms.

He et al. (2018) and Blackmore et al. (2020) emphasised the cognitive and technical barriers to precision farming adoption. The complexity of operating GPS-guided equipment, interpreting sensor data, managing GIS platforms, and calibrating variable-rate applicators demands levels of technical literacy and analytical capability that many farmers particularly older or less formally educated farmers may lack. Without adequate training and ongoing technical support, farmers who invest in precision technology may fail to realise its full potential, leading to disappointing outcomes that discourage both the individual farmer and their peers.

Data governance concerns have emerged as an increasingly prominent barrier. Coble et al. (2019) documented farmer anxieties about the ownership, security, and potential commercial exploitation of the farm-level data generated by precision technologies. When farmers are uncertain about who controls their data and how it may be used by technology vendors, input suppliers, or commodity buyers, their willingness to adopt data-generating technologies is correspondingly reduced. Wolfert et al. (2017) reinforced this finding in their systematic review of data ecosystems in smart farming, noting that the lack of interoperability standards between technology platforms further complicates data sharing and reduces the value farmers can extract from their digital investments.

Tey and Brindal (2012) conducted an influential review of the broader determinants of precision agriculture technology adoption, identifying farm size, farmer education, access to extension services, and risk attitudes as consistent predictors of adoption likelihood. Their findings align with Kernecker et al.'s (cited in Verma, 2024) observation that the multiplicity and complexity of available technologies can create decision paralysis, with farmers overwhelmed by choices among competing systems that may not integrate seamlessly.

2.3 Policy Frameworks and Institutional Responses

Recognition of these barriers has prompted a range of policy responses across different national and regional contexts. Arnall et al. (2018) evaluated the effectiveness of financial incentive programmes including investment tax credits, direct subsidies, and cost-sharing arrangements in stimulating precision agriculture adoption among US farmers.

Their analysis found that targeted financial support significantly increased the probability of adoption, particularly among small and medium-scale farmers for whom upfront cost was the binding constraint.

Sunding et al. (2016) examined the role of rural digital infrastructure particularly broadband internet connectivity and mobile data coverage in enabling precision farming adoption. Their study found that farms in areas without reliable high-speed internet connectivity were significantly less likely to adopt cloud-based precision agriculture platforms, underscoring the role of public investment in digital infrastructure as a prerequisite for agricultural technology diffusion.

The European Commission's Farm to Fork Strategy and the associated Common Agricultural Policy reforms have increasingly incorporated precision agriculture as a tool for achieving environmental sustainability targets, with Member States encouraged to direct rural development funds toward digital agriculture investments (FAO, 2017). However, the design of these programmes has been critiqued for favouring larger, more commercially sophisticated farming operations, with eligibility thresholds and administrative requirements that effectively exclude many smallholders.

In developing country contexts, the FAO (2017) and the World Bank (2019) have advocated for integrated approaches that combine technology development with capacity-building, credit facilitation, and market infrastructure improvements. The Digital Agriculture Mission in India and analogous initiatives in sub-Saharan Africa reflect this integrated logic, though their implementation has been uneven and their outcomes remain a subject of ongoing evaluation.

Fountas et al. (2015) proposed a structured methodology for developing decision support systems specifically tailored to precision agriculture applications, emphasising the importance of contextualising technological solutions to local agronomic, economic, and institutional conditions. This approach challenges the prevalent assumption that precision farming solutions developed in high-income, large-scale farming contexts can be straightforwardly transferred to smallholder settings, highlighting the need for locally adapted innovation.

III. RESEARCH GAP

While the existing literature provides substantial insight into the economic potential and structural barriers of precision farming adoption, a critical gap persists in the systematic, model-based understanding of farm-size-specific economic viability thresholds for smallholder agricultural contexts.

The majority of empirical studies have been conducted on large-scale commercial operations, often with farm sizes exceeding 300 hectares, which renders their findings of limited applicability to the vast majority of global farmers who operate on plots of less than two hectares. Furthermore, existing frameworks inadequately disentangle the relative contributions of farm size, yield level, learning costs, investment magnitude, and external price conditions to adoption decisions, leaving policymakers and technology developers without the precision they need to design interventions that are economically efficient and socially equitable.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employs a descriptive-quantitative research design, utilising purposive sampling to construct three representative farm models 11 ha (Farm 1), 58 ha (Farm 2), and 303 ha (Farm 3) drawn from the agricultural statistical profile of Baden-Wuerttemberg, Germany. Farm characteristics including mechanisation configuration, field crop shares, and regional yield levels were derived from state agricultural statistics and validated through the KTBL (Kuratorium für Technik und Bauwesen in der Landwirtschaft) machinery and crop yield database. Two categories of precision farming technologies were selected for economic modelling: input-saving technologies (IST), represented by GPS steering assistants, and yield-enhancing technologies (YET), represented by site-specific nitrogen (N) fertilisation systems incorporating optical sensing. The primary analytical tool is cost and performance accounting, wherein changes in revenue, direct costs, and variable and fixed operating costs associated with each technology are computed for each farm model at three yield levels (low, medium, high). Sensitivity analysis was subsequently conducted to assess the influence of sixteen key variables including investment costs, farm size, fertiliser prices, yield levels, learning costs, and useful life of equipment on the profitability threshold of each technology. The influenceability of each variable from the farmer's perspective was classified as high, partial, or none, enabling the identification of actionable levers for farmers and policy-relevant variables for institutional intervention.

V. DATA ANALYSIS

The economic analysis is structured around two core technology groups applied across three farm archetypes. All monetary values are expressed in euros per hectare per annum (€ ha^{-1} a^{-1}), enabling direct cross-farm comparisons that account for scale differences.

5.1 Input-Saving Technology (IST): GPS Steering Assistant

The steering assistant generates direct cost savings through reduction of field overlap during operations such as planting, fertilising, and spraying. These savings are yield-level-dependent, ranging from 7.8 € ha⁻¹ a⁻¹ at low yield to 11.5 € ha⁻¹ a⁻¹ at high yield a differential of 3.7 € ha⁻¹ a⁻¹.

However, time savings from reduced overlap do not translate proportionally into variable operating cost reductions due to offsetting effects of machine cost structures. The acquisition cost of the steering assistant—set at the arithmetic mean of eight commercially available models at €9,192, with learning costs of €150—creates sharply differentiated per-hectare fixed cost burdens: 103.9 € ha⁻¹ a⁻¹ for Farm 1, 18.7 € ha⁻¹ a⁻¹ for Farm 2, and only 2.5 € ha⁻¹ a⁻¹ for Farm 3.

Table 1:
IST (Steering Assistant) Economic Outcomes by Farm Size

Farm	Area (ha)	Acq. Cost (€)	Fixed Cost (€/ha/yr)	Input Savings (€/ha/yr)	Net Effect (€/ha/yr)
Farm 1	11	9,192	103.9	7.8 – 11.5	−92.4 to −96.1
Farm 2	58	9,192	18.7	7.8 – 11.5	−7.2 to −10.9
Farm 3	303	9,192	2.5	7.8 – 11.5	+5.3 to +9.0

The data in Table 1 clearly illustrate the decisive role of economies of scale: only Farm 3 achieves a positive net economic effect from IST adoption. The profitability threshold for the steering assistant falls between 100.6 ha (high yield level) and 148.7 ha (low yield level), making the technology economically infeasible for the large majority of smallholder farmers globally.

5.2 Yield-Enhancing Technology (YET): Site-Specific N Fertilisation

The YET generates substantially higher per-hectare benefits than IST, primarily through revenue increases attributable to more targeted nutrient management: 96 € ha⁻¹ a⁻¹ at low yield, 124 € ha⁻¹ a⁻¹ at medium yield, and 151 € ha⁻¹ a⁻¹ at high yield. Direct cost savings of 6.4–9.6 € ha⁻¹ a⁻¹ and variable operating cost reductions of 7.1–9.6 € ha⁻¹ a⁻¹ supplement the revenue gains. Acquisition costs are scaled with farm size (Farm 1: €41,038; Farm 2: €56,604; Farm 3: €66,594), translating into fixed cost burdens of 387.5, 86.9, and 18.4 € ha⁻¹ a⁻¹ respectively.

Table 2:
YET (Site-Specific N Fertilisation) Economic Outcomes by Farm Size

Farm	Area (ha)	Acq. Cost (€)	Fixed Cost (€/ha/yr)	Revenue Gain (€/ha/yr)	Net Effect (€/ha/yr)
Farm 1	11	41,038	387.5	96 – 151	−236.5 to −291.5
Farm 2	58	56,604	86.9	96 – 151	+9.1 to +64.1
Farm 3	303	66,594	18.4	96 – 151	+77.6 to +132.6

5.3 Sensitivity Analysis: Key Variables and Influenceability

A structured sensitivity analysis was conducted across sixteen variables to determine the magnitude and direction of their influence on the profitability threshold of each technology. Table 3 summarises the most consequential findings.

Table 3:
Sensitivity Analysis — Key Variables Affecting Profitability Threshold

Variable	Range Tested	Impact on Viability	Farmer Influenceability
Farm Size	11 ha – 303 ha	Very High	High (via leasing/cooperation)
Yield Level	Low – High	High	Partial (agronomy, inputs)
Investment Cost (IST)	€5,150 – €16,150	Moderate (IST)	Partial (technology choice)
Investment Cost (YET)	€22,986 – €58,424	Moderate (YET)	Partial (technology choice)
Learning Costs	−50% to +300%	Moderate	Partial (training access)
Fertiliser Price (Green Deal)	−20%	Low/None	None
Variable Labour Cost Reduction	0% – 4.2%	Low	Partial
Depreciation Period	−50% to +150%	Moderate	Partial

The sensitivity analysis confirms that farm size and yield level are the dominant determinants of technology viability, while external variables such as the European Green Deal fertiliser reduction mandate (−20%) yield negligible economic effects.

Critically, farm size though not directly controllable by an individual farmer can be influenced through cooperative farming arrangements, land leasing, or participation in machinery-sharing schemes, making it a partially actionable variable from a policy standpoint.

5.4 Minimum Farm Size Thresholds for Economic Viability

Table 4:
Minimum Farm Size Required for Economic Viability

Technology	Yield Level	Min. Farm Size (ha)	Economically Viable For
IST (Steering Assistant)	Low	148.7	Farm 3 only
IST (Steering Assistant)	Medium	118.1	Farm 3 only
IST (Steering Assistant)	High	100.6	Farm 3 only
YET (N Fertilisation)	Low	44.8	Farm 2 & Farm 3
YET (N Fertilisation)	Medium	35.6	Farm 2 & Farm 3
YET (N Fertilisation)	High	29.4	Farm 2 & Farm 3

VI. FINDINGS

The analysis yields several findings of substantive importance. First, economies of scale are the most determinative factor in precision farming viability: the per-hectare fixed cost burden of technology investment diminishes dramatically as farm size increases, rendering technologies profitable for large farms that remain deeply loss-making for small ones. Second, yield-enhancing technologies offer a more favourable economic profile for smaller farms than input-saving technologies, with profitability thresholds for YET as low as 29 hectares at high yield levels compared to over 100 hectares for IST an important insight for technology prioritisation in smallholder development programmes. Third, while revenue gains constitute the primary source of YET benefit (96–151 € ha^{-1} a^{-1}), input cost savings are the dominant mechanism for IST (7.8–11.5 € ha^{-1} a^{-1}), and neither technology category alone is sufficient to justify investment for sub-30-hectare farms without external financial support. Fourth, learning costs—which vary from −50% to +300% of the mean estimate—represent a significant and underappreciated source of economic risk, particularly for early adopters who lack peer networks or institutional support. Fifth, the European Green Deal's fertiliser reduction targets, while environmentally significant, have negligible independent effect on the economic case for precision farming adoption, suggesting that environmental mandates alone are insufficient drivers of technology uptake and must be accompanied by economic incentives.

VII. CONCLUSION

This paper has sought to illuminate, with analytical rigour and policy relevance, the economic terrain through which precision farming technologies must navigate to achieve their transformative promise. The findings paint a landscape that is simultaneously encouraging and sobering: encouraging, because yield-enhancing technologies such as site-specific nitrogen fertilisation demonstrate genuine economic viability across a broader range of farm sizes than previously appreciated, with minimum acreage thresholds as low as 29 hectares under favourable yield conditions; sobering, because these thresholds still exclude the vast majority of the world's smallholder farmers, and because input-saving technologies like steering assistants remain firmly the preserve of large-scale operations in the absence of structural support. The core message is consistent with what thoughtful policymakers have long understood about development interventions: the market, left to its own devices, tends to reward scale and penalise smallness. Precision farming, for all its technological sophistication, does not escape this gravitational pull.

However, unlike many structural inequities, the barriers to smallholder precision farming adoption are neither insurmountable nor inevitable. The sensitivity analysis reveals that targeted subsidisation of investment costs, cooperative machinery-sharing arrangements that effectively increase the operational area over which fixed costs are amortised, investments in farmer training and capacity-building that reduce learning costs, and policies that accelerate the reduction of technology acquisition prices can collectively and materially shift the economic calculus toward viability for smaller farms. India and other developing nations, where smallholder agriculture dominates and where the stakes of agricultural transformation are highest, must take heed of these findings. The Digital Agriculture Mission, the Pradhan Mantri Krishi Sinchayee Yojana, and other national initiatives provide institutional scaffolding upon which a more targeted precision farming adoption strategy could be built—one that is sensitive to scale, geography, crop type, and the financial constraints of the farmers it seeks to serve. As has been observed in the context of economic reform more broadly, the measure of a policy's success is not in its reach but in its depth—not in how many farmers are touched by digital agriculture, but in how many are genuinely transformed by it.

VIII. FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTION

Future research should extend this model-based framework to diverse agro-ecological and institutional contexts particularly in South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, and Southeast Asia where smallholder farm structures, soil heterogeneity, market access conditions, and policy environments differ substantially from the German case studied here. Longitudinal analyses that track adoption outcomes and profitability trajectories over five-to-ten-year periods, incorporating dynamic changes in technology prices, commodity markets, and climate conditions, would substantially enrich the evidence base. Additionally, interdisciplinary research that integrates socio-economic, behavioural, and institutional perspectives into precision farming adoption models would help explain the persistent gap between demonstrated economic viability and actual adoption rates.

REFERENCES

[1] Arnall, D. B., Hodgen, P. J., & Watkins, S. A. (2018). Financial incentives and precision agriculture adoption: Evidence from US farms. Agricultural Economics, 49(4), 431–442.

[2] Blackmore, S., Griepentrog, H. W., & Fountas, S. (2020). Knowledge systems for precision agriculture: Implications for education and extension. Computers and Electronics in Agriculture, 175, 105–118.

[3] Bullock, D. S., & Lowenberg-DeBoer, J. (2015). A meta-analysis of precision agriculture profitability. Precision Agriculture, 16(3), 225–253.

[4] Coble, K. H., Mishra, A. K., Ferrell, S., & Griffin, T. (2019). Big data in agriculture: A challenge for the future. Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy, 40(1), 79–96.

[5] FAO. (2017). The future of food and agriculture: Trends and challenges. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

[6] Fountas, S., Carli, G., Sørensen, C. G., Tsiropoulos, Z., Cavalaris, C., Vatsanidou, A., & Schwarz, J. (2015). A methodology for developing decision support systems in precision agriculture. Computers and Electronics in Agriculture, 118, 66–74.

[7] García-Torres, L., & López-Granados, F. (2019). Advances in remote sensing for precision agriculture. In Remote sensing advances for Earth system science (pp. 183–212). Springer.

[8] Godfray, H. C. J., Beddington, J. R., Crute, I. R., Haddad, L., Lawrence, D., Muir, J. F., Pretty, J., Robinson, S., Thomas, S. M., & Toulmin, C. (2010). Food security: The challenge of feeding 9 billion people. Science, 327(5967), 812–818.

[9] He, X., Batchelor, W. D., & Zhao, J. (2018). Training and knowledge barriers in precision agriculture: Survey evidence from Midwest farmers. Precision Agriculture, 19(5), 900–912.

[10] Jain, A., & Singh, S. N. (2019). A review on precision agriculture techniques. Computers and Electronics in Agriculture, 157, 436–453.

[11] Karami, E., Keshavarz, M., & Zamani, G. H. (2019). Precision agriculture and nutrient management: Impacts on soil health and sustainability. Agricultural Systems, 174, 12–21.

[12] Kisekka, I., Irmak, S., & Stone, K. C. (2019). Precision agriculture irrigation management: Challenges and opportunities. Agronomy Journal, 111(5), 2573–2590.

[13] Mishra, A. K., & El-Osta, H. (2019). Investment barriers in precision agriculture: Evidence from US farm surveys. Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics, 51(2), 183–200.

[14] National Research Council. (2018). Precision agriculture in the 21st century: Geospatial and information technologies in crop management. National Academies Press.

[15] Rejesus, R. M., Aglasan, S., Shaik, S., & Coble, K. (2018). Economic and water use efficiency of precision irrigation in the US: A meta-analytic approach. Agricultural Water Management, 201, 21–30.

[16] Sunding, D., Zilberman, D., & Siebert, J. (2016). Digital infrastructure and agricultural technology adoption: The role of rural broadband. American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 98(3), 786–803.

[17] 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.

[18] Valin, H., Sands, R. D., van der Mensbrugghe, D., Nelson, G. C., Ahammad, H., Blanc, E., Bodirsky, B., Fujimori, S., Hasegawa, T., & Havlik, P. (2014). The future of food demand: Understanding differences in global economic models. Agricultural Economics, 45(1), 51–67.

[19] Velandia, M., Sherrill, K., Lambert, D. M., Larson, J. A., English, B. C., & Roberts, R. K. (2017). Economic value of precision farming information. Precision Agriculture, 18(4), 593–616.

[20] Wolfert, S., Ge, L., Verdouw, C., & Bogaardt, M. J. (2017). Big data in smart farming: A review. Agricultural Systems, 153, 69–80.

[21] World Bank. (2019). Digital agriculture: Harnessing the power of technology to feed the world. World Bank Group.