



Simulation-aided study of herbicide patch spraying: Influence of spraying features and weed spatial distributions

Sylvain Villette, Thibault Maillot, Jean-Philippe Guillemin, Jean Paul
Douzals

► To cite this version:

Sylvain Villette, Thibault Maillot, Jean-Philippe Guillemin, Jean Paul Douzals. Simulation-aided study of herbicide patch spraying: Influence of spraying features and weed spatial distributions. Computers and Electronics in Agriculture, 2021, 182, pp.105981. 10.1016/j.compag.2020.105981 . hal-03129976

HAL Id: hal-03129976

<https://institut-agro-dijon.hal.science/hal-03129976>

Submitted on 1 Jun 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0
International License

Simulation-aided study of herbicide patch spraying: influence of spraying features and weed spatial distributions

S. Villette ^{a*}, T. Maillot ^a, J.P. Guillemain ^a, J.P. Douzals ^b

^a Agroécologie, AgroSup Dijon, INRAE, Univ. Bourgogne, Univ. Bourgogne Franche-Comté, F-21000 Dijon, France

^b UMR ITAP, INRAE, Montpellier SupAgro, Univ. Montpellier, 361 rue Jean-François Breton, F-34196 Montpellier cedex 05, France

* Corresponding author

E-mail address: sylvain.villette@agrosupdijon.fr

Abstract:

Patch spraying is a technological way to reduce herbicide amounts required to control weeds by triggering spraying only where weeds lie. Nevertheless, the adoption rate of this technology by farmers is still low and there is a lack of efficient tools to assess patch herbicide applications depending on spraying features and weed spatial distributions. To avoid unrealistic in-field experiments, a virtual patch sprayer is designed and computer simulations are carried out to quantify herbicide reduction possibilities and assess the ability to apply the right rate on weed patches to ensure herbicide efficiency. The spray application simulator combines the theoretical description of the sprayer using various boom section widths (from 0.5 to 24 m) with experimental data describing various nozzle spray patterns obtained from three commercial nozzles. Virtual weed infestation maps are designed using random locations of weed patches with various spatial aggregation degrees modelled by different weed coverage rates and elliptical patch sizes. Simulation results are analysed through two performance indicators: i) the herbicide reduction ratio obtained with patch spraying compared to a uniform broadcast application (on the entire field area), ii) the proportion of weed patch area on which the application rate is higher than 85% of the prescribed application rate. Computer simulations enable to estimate a simplified relationship to quantify the reduction of herbicide use as a

function of the weed coverage rate, the size of weed patches and the boom section width. This demonstrates that computer simulations provide practical tools to estimate the sprayer spatial resolution required to reach a given herbicide reduction target according to the weed spatial distribution. Simulations also demonstrate that the use of narrow section widths equipped with traditional nozzles leads to a significant proportion of weed areas exposed to herbicide under-application in the case of small patches.

Keywords: computer simulation; virtual sprayer; patch spraying; herbicide use reduction; under-application.

1. Introduction

Weeds are known to be the most harmful pests (Oerke, 2006), reducing yields and harvest quality because of their competition with crops, harvest pollution or other pest organism propagation. Thus, weed control efficiency is essential to maintain agricultural production, and the most popular approach relies on chemical-based solutions consisting of uniform herbicide applications across fields. However, this approach is reaching its limits regarding environmental concerns, health issues and herbicide-resistant weed problems.

Since weeds are generally spatially aggregated and occur in patches (Cousens and Croft, 2000), various works have addressed site-specific or patch spraying for post-emergence herbicide applications (Gonzalez-de-Soto et al., 2016; Paice et al., 1995; Rasmussen et al., 2019; Shearer and Jones, 1991; Stafford and Miller, 1993). They have considered variable-rate applications or binary intermittent on/off applications. Thus, numerous remote (Thorp and Tian, 2004) and ground-based (Wang et al., 2019) weed detection techniques have been designed, for map-based or real-time approaches. Recent works demonstrated that new weed detection algorithms reached high level of crop-weed classification accuracy especially in the case of row crops such as 94.5% of good classification in maize (Gao et al., 2018). Therefore, current detection techniques provide accurate and high resolution weed maps (1.78 mm/pixel in Gao et al. (2018)). Moreover, the development of fast switching control actuators and RTK GPS auto-steer systems have improved the spatial accuracy of patch spraying. Thus, new sprayers enable to open or close each nozzle with a satisfying accuracy following the travel direction as measured by Gonzalez-de-Soto et al. (2016) who reported an average distance error of only 44 mm with a standard deviation of 66 mm using a unmanned patch sprayer

51 designed for on/off applications. These results were obtained with a robot speed of 3 km/h and an area to be
52 treated divided into cells of 0.5×0.5 m. The accuracy of commercial sprayers has also been recently studied
53 by Rasmussen et al. (2019) with a weed map divided into 1 m² grid squares. The authors measured that 89-
54 96% of weed target areas were actually sprayed with 3 m boom sections at a travel speeds of 6-8 km/h, 89-
55 92% with 0.5 m boom sections at low travel speeds (2.5-3 km/h) and 77-85% with 0.5 m boom sections at 4
56 to 4.5 km/h. Considering the incorrectly sprayed area outside the weed patches, the sprayed area reached 42-
57 108% of the target areas with 3 m boom sections at 6-8 km/h but only 2-4% with 0.5 boom sections at low
58 travel speeds (2.5-3 km/h) and 7-8% with 0.5 boom sections at 4 to 4.5 km/h.

59

60 For two decades, various experimental works assessed patch sprayer prototypes and conducted field trials to
61 estimate on the reduction of herbicide amounts required for weed control (compared to a uniform broadcast
62 application). For example, in maize, Gutjahr et al. (2012) used a sprayer with an on/off control and equipped
63 of three tanks with three herbicides against three weed groups. The herbicides were applied separately with
64 spray boom sections of 9 m in width according to three binary application maps with a resolution of 9×9 m.
65 Then, the average herbicide reduction was 10% for annual broadleaf weeds, 34% for annual grass weeds and
66 93% for perennial weeds. For the same crop, in four maize fields, Castaldi et al. (2017) obtained herbicide
67 reductions from 14 to 39.2% using spray boom sections of 2 m in width and binary weed maps with a
68 resolution set at 2×2 m. In another recent study, Esau et al. (2018) reach an herbicide reduction of 78.5% in
69 wild blueberry fields infested of hair cap moss by using a real-time detection device and a sprayer equipped
70 of boom section of 1.5 m in width. These few results illustrate that the reduction of herbicide amount varied
71 over a wide range depending on herbicide spraying parameters and uncontrolled weed spatial distributions.
72 Consequently, experimental studies showed potential reductions expected by using patch sprayers but they
73 are not suitable to investigate how spraying features and weed spatial distributions affects herbicides
74 reductions. Moreover, in most studies, the size of weed map cells is larger than the sprayer footprint and
75 limits the application resolution.

76 To highlight more general trends and results, some authors have proposed establishing models to describe
77 spraying performances relating to weed spatial distribution characteristics and sprayer key features. Wallinga
78 et al. (1998) used distance measurements to describe weed spatial distribution and suggested to interpret the

79 cumulative distribution function of point-nearest weed distances as an estimate of the amount of herbicide
80 that an ideal patch sprayer can use relative to a whole field application. The ideal patch sprayer was assumed
81 to apply a full rate of herbicide to a circular zone around each weed, irrespective of actual sprayer technical
82 constraints. The authors estimated the herbicide reduction: 15% for a sprayer operating at a spatial resolution
83 of 4 m, 38% at 2 m, 59% at 1 m and 76% at 0.5 m. The establishment of such relationship between herbicide
84 reduction and spraying spatial resolution is interesting but the curve provided by the author only correspond
85 to one specific weed spatial distribution characterised on a very small plot (32.4×18 m). Moreover the
86 circular application assumed for the ideal sprayer differs from how actual sprayer works. Carroll and Holden
87 (2009) addressed the performance of a patch sprayer depending from control time, forward speed and boom
88 section width. In particular, they simulated patch spraying on a set of weed maps established with a
89 resolution of 1 m/pixel and classified in nine categories. They computed a spray application index and
90 modelled this index as a function of two variables (*i.e.* boom section width and control time) and three
91 regression parameters. The values of these three parameters were computed for each weed map class. The
92 choice of this global index does not enable to estimate the herbicide reduction or the proportion of weeds
93 correctly sprayed. Recently, Franco et al. (2017) addressed the problem of selecting the appropriate precision
94 spraying technology for weed management. They performed simulations using two virtual weed maps built
95 with a high number of small circular patches or only few bigger circular patches respectively. The spraying
96 was simulated with section width of 1 to 40 m. As in the other studies, the authors observed that the potential
97 herbicide savings not only depend on spraying resolution, but also on the weed coverage rate and the spatial
98 distribution of weed patches. Franco et al. (2017) modelled the relative sprayed area as the sum of the weed
99 coverage rate and a function of the total width of the boom and the width of each boom section. This
100 regression model was deduced from only two simulated weed maps with very close weed coverage rates
101 (10% and 10.9%) and cannot be generalized for a wide range of coverage rates. Furthermore, the model does
102 not integrate any independent variable related to patch size or weed aggregation degree.

103 Virtual experiments based on numerical simulations appear as the best approach to characterize herbicide
104 patch spraying when various sprayer resolutions and various weed spatial distributions need to be compared.
105 Nevertheless, at the present time, there is still a lack of patch spraying model to describe interaction of
106 parameters that affect the reduction of herbicide amount. Moreover, from the best of our knowledge, all

herbicide spraying simulations presented in the literature assumed a uniform application of herbicide on the sprayed areas. This does not take into account the uneven application in the transverse direction that occurs when narrow boom sections or individual nozzles are controlled independently involving a lack of multiple spray overlapping. Although this risk of under-application has been identified for decades (Paice et al., 1995), no study has addressed or characterized this patch spraying weakness, which can lead to weed-control failure and emergence of herbicide-resistant weeds (Neve and Powles, 2005).

The objective of the present work is to develop a computer simulation model of intermittent on-off patch spraying to investigate the influence of nozzle spray patterns, boom section widths, weed infestation rates and weed spatial distributions on herbicide reduction, as well as on under-application area occurrence. The paper demonstrates that the use of computer simulations enables to establish a simplified relationship to quantify the reduction of herbicide use as a function of the spatial weed distribution (defined by weed elliptical patch size and coverage rate) and the boom section width. It also demonstrates that computer simulations enable to estimate the weed area rate exposed to herbicide under-applications related to nozzle spray patterns and section widths in the case of narrow weed patches.

2. Materials and Methods


Herbicide patch spraying was simulated combining virtual weed maps and a virtual sprayer. The virtual weed maps were designed using random locations of weed patches with various spatial aggregation degrees modelled by different weed coverage rates and elliptical patch sizes (*cf.* section 2.1). A virtual spraying was designed using experimental nozzle spray patterns (*cf.* section 2.2.1) and simulating the herbicide application with different boom section widths (*cf.* section 2.2.2). Two indicators were computed to assess the reduction of herbicide amount and the application efficiency (*cf.* section 2.3). The algorithms have been developed with the software Matlab (2019).

2.1 Modelling infestation map

In this paper, virtual binary maps were used to simulate weed maps that could be derived from weed detection and localization devices used on crops or bare soil. These maps include virtual weed patches that are perfectly defined and localised in the field. In order to put the emphasis on the impact of weed patch size

133 and coverage rate, and on the ability of the sprayer to apply herbicide on weeds, the binary weed maps were
134 simulated by placing full elliptical patches at random positions on virtual field bands. The theoretical shape
135 of weed patches tends to be elliptical because of natural dispersal processes and elongated in the direction of
136 field traffic (Dieleman and Mortensen, 1999; Paice et al., 1998) because of seed movements caused by soil
137 tillage and crop harvesting (Barroso et al., 2006; Cousens and Croft, 2000). Therefore, in this paper, the
138 representation of weed patches were simplified by considering elliptical patches oriented in the direction of
139 cultivation operations (that is also the travel direction of the virtual sprayer) in accordance with the
140 anisotropy in patch expansion due to directional management practices (Humston et al., 2005). Thus,
141 elementary elliptical patches were defined by only two parameters: their width (w_w) and length (l_w). Because
142 of the random distribution of the elementary ellipses, their overlapping provides a greater variety of shapes,
143 size and orientation for weed patches resulting from the aggregation of several elementary ellipses.

144 The virtual field bands were 72 m in width, 20 000 m in length, and computed with a spatial resolution of
145 0.025×0.025 m/pixel (*i.e.* pixels of 6.25 cm^2). For the simulations, the bands were made of 20 successive
146 segments of 1000 m so that 20 cumulative values of the parameters of interest can be computed (*i.e.* on band
147 lengths from 1000 to 20 000 m) and the convergence of the assessment indicators can be checked (see
148 section 2.3). The band width corresponds to a central sprayer pass with a working width of 24 m and two
149 adjacent bands. This ensures to avoid edge effects due to patch location bias or lack of spray overlap on
150 central pass borders. A set of virtual field bands were computed for various weed coverage rates set at 5, 10,
151 20, 30, 40 and 50% of the total area; various ellipse lengths of 0.5, 1, 2, 4, 8, 16 and 32 m; and various width
152 to length ratios of 0.2, 0.5 and 1 (ellipses are circles when the ratio is 1). Thus, a set of weed patch maps
153 were simulated representing various infestation rates and aggregation degrees. Considering the same weed
154 coverage rate, the aggregation degree increases when the size of ellipses increases. Because of the random
155 distribution of ellipses, their overlapping provides a variety of shapes for distinct weed patches. Fig. 1
156 illustrates two examples of virtual weed infestation maps presenting the same global coverage rate but
157 obtained for two contrasted patch sizes.



158

159 **Fig. 1.** Example of areas extracted from weed maps simulated for small elliptical ($l_w = 1$ m, $w_w = 0.2$ m)
 160 patches (upper row) and large elliptical ($l_w = 32$ m, $w_w = 16$ m) patches (bottom row) with a coverage rate of
 161 20%.

162 2.2 Modelling patch spraying

163 Several virtual spraying configurations were developed as based on the replication of simulated transverse
 164 spray distribution patterns derived from experimental measurements or theoretical shapes.

165 2.2.1 Transverse spray patterns




166 Different transverse spray patterns (TSP) were considered to model the spray deposit under single nozzles.
 167 First, a rectangular pattern was designed as the uniform distribution of the product sprayed by a fictitious
 168 idealized nozzle. This theoretical spray pattern was centred under the nozzle and the spray width was set
 169 equal to the nozzle spacing s_N . Thus, this provides a uniform coverage over the length of a boom section
 170 when all nozzles of the section are switched on. Moreover, this uniform distribution is obtained without any
 171 overlap of the sprays of adjoining nozzles and it is not affected by the boom height. This idealized situation
 172 was traditionally assumed (mostly implicitly) for patch spraying simulations in the literature (Franco et al.,
 173 2017). Second, more realistic spray patterns were deduced from experimental measurements for three
 174 commercial nozzles with different spray top angles and different distribution shapes: a low-drift flat fan

175 nozzle with a wide angle (CVI 110 02 supplied by Albuz Company), a low-drift flat fan nozzle with a
176 narrow angle (IDK 90 02 supplied by Lechler Company) and an even flat fan narrow angle nozzle (TPE
177 80 03 supplied by Teejet Company). The transverse spray distributions of the CVI and IDK nozzles were
178 measured at Julius Kühn-Institute, Braunschweig, Germany by Herbst (2019) using a 25 mm channel spray
179 patternator. The experiments were carried out by placing the nozzles at 0.6 m height, with a constant water
180 pressure of 2 bar. For each of these two kinds of nozzle, the reference spray pattern was computed as the
181 average curve resulting from nine measurements corresponding to three repetitions with three different
182 nozzles of the same series. The spray pattern of the even flat fan nozzle was derived from measurements
183 carried out with a 60 mm channel spray patternator and published by Hassen et al. (2013) for a TPE 80 03
184 placed at 0.5 m height, with a constant water pressure of 2 bar.

185 For the three actual nozzles, the TSP at a specified boom height h was deduced from the reference TSP
186 measured at the original experimental height h_0 following the method described by Mahalinga Iyer and Wills
187 (1978). Once the TSP of a single nozzle has been computed at a specified height h , the distribution curve was
188 resampled each 25 mm so that the spatial sampling was the same for all nozzles and all simulated boom
189 heights.

190 Then, the spray pattern under the whole boom or under a particular boom section was deduced by summing
191 all corresponding nozzle patterns after translating them with respect to the nozzle spacing (set at 0.5 m). The
192 virtual flow rate was normalized so that the mean application rate was set at the unit value in arbitrary units
193 (AU) after overlapping of the spray patterns.

194 In order to select relevant boom heights for each kind of nozzle, the coefficient of variation (CV) of the spray
195 deposit (ISO 5682-3, 2017) was computed as a function of the boom height. This was numerically computed
196 considering a boom width of 24 m and according to standard specifications (ISO 16119-2, 2013) by
197 simulating a 100 mm groove patternator. Fig. 2 illustrates the curves of CV values drawn with respect to the
198 boom height for the three actual nozzles (CVI 110 02, IDK 90 02 and TPE 80 03). The curves reached
199 minimum values at particular boom heights that are optimal heights regarding spraying uniformity.



201 **Fig. 2.** Coefficient of variation (CV) of the spray deposit with respect to the boom height for three different
202 actual nozzles: CVI 110 02 (top), IDK 90 02 (middle) and TPE 80 03 (bottom). CV values were computed
203 considering a boom width of 24 m and a nozzle spacing of 0.5 m.

204 Table 2 presents the six operating conditions selected for the study. For each actual nozzle, the boom heights
205 were chosen near to the optimal values. The selected values were rounded to the nearest 0.05 m to keep a
206 practical meaning. For all selected heights, the CV values were lower than 7%, corresponding to a uniform
207 spray in accordance with ISO 16119-2 2013. An additional indicator δCV_h was computed to compare the
208 sensitivity of the CV (*i.e.* spray uniformity) to the boom height for each selected situation. This indicator was
209 defined as follows:

$$210 \quad \delta CV_h = MAX (CV(h_s + \delta h), CV(h_s - \delta h)) - CV(h_s) \quad (1)$$

211 where, $CV(z)$ is the value of the CV when the boom height is set at z , h_s is the boom height corresponding to
212 the selected spraying situation, δh is the variation of the boom height. In table 2, δCV_h was computed when
213 δh was 0.05 m (the smallest step according to the assumption made before).

214 For the six nozzle operating conditions, Fig. 3 illustrates the spray patterns obtained for a set of adjoining
215 nozzles as well as the resulting cumulated application rate along the boom width (*i.e.* after overlapping of the
216 spray of each individual nozzle).

217

218 **Table 2**

219 Main characteristics of the six nozzle operating conditions. CV is the coefficient of variation and δCV_h is
 220 the maximal increase of the CV value when the boom height fluctuates plus or minus 0.05 m.

Operating condition	Nozzle	Shape of the transverse spray pattern	Boom height h_s (m)	CV (%)	δCV_h
C1	Fictitious	Perfect rectangle	All values	0	0
C2	CVI 110 02	Triangular	0.5	3.6	6.6
C3	IDK 90 02	Triangular	0.5	6.3	0.8
C4	IDK 90 02	Triangular	0.7	3.9	3.6
C5	TPE 80 03	Even	0.35	2.7	14.0
C6	TPE 80 03	Even	0.65	1.9	4.4

221




Fig. 3. Transverse spray patterns of adjoining single nozzles (thin lines alternatively grey or black for successive neighbouring nozzles) and global boom transverse spray patterns resulting from cumulated applications (bold line). The corresponding mean application rate (dotted line) along the boom is at the unit value (in Arbitrary Unit (AU)) for all operating conditions C1 to C6 (Table 2).

2.2.2 Nozzle control depending on weed presence

228 The patch sprayer was simulated using a simple model. The virtual boom was equipped with 48 nozzles
229 spaced every $s_N = 0.5$ m. The nozzles were grouped together to form fixed section widths, which were
230 independently controlled. Simulations were implemented with sections of 1, 2, 4, 6, 12, 24 and 48 nozzles
231 (corresponding to section widths from 0.5 to 24 m). The spraying simulator was developed to obtain a spatial
232 distribution of the spray deposit considering the spray overlap between adjacent nozzles, adjacent sections
233 and adjacent sprayer passes (passes were spaced according to the sprayer boom width).

234 Instead of applying the herbicide on the whole simulated field, the model allowed site-specific spraying by
235 switching on each section only when weeds (at least one pixel of the weed map) were present under the
236 "weed detection width" of the section. Since nozzles were spaced every 0.5 m, the weed detection width of a
237 section composed of N_N nozzles was assumed to be $N_N \times 0.5$ m. For example, in the case of nozzles
238 controlled independently, the weed detection width was of 0.5 m centred under each nozzle as depicted in
239 Fig. 4. Depending on the nozzle type (*i.e.* depending on TSP), the spray width can extend more or less
240 widely from the detection width.

241 The on/off nozzle control on weed presence was assumed to be perfect: an instantaneous application was
242 assumed, without any delay in sprayer response time or any smoothed herbicide rate transition in the travel
243 direction (Carroll and Holden, 2009). Furthermore, herbicide applications are simulated considering spray
244 patterns as measured in static situation using conventional spray patternators irrespective of any in-field
245 spray pattern change or displacement related to travel speeds (Lebeau, 2004), wind conditions (Faqiri and
246 Krishnan, 2005; Krishnan et al., 1993), or boom movements (Langenakens et al., 1999; Ramon and De
247 Baerdemaeker, 1997). These simplified operating conditions are nevertheless representative of practical
248 herbicide application at low travel speeds (frequently required by real-time weed detection systems and
249 autonomous sprayer robot) in no-wind conditions.

250 Carrying out simulations, herbicide application maps were obtained with the same spatial resolution as the
251 input weed maps (*i.e.* 0.025×0.025 m/pixel). The application was at the target rate when the value of the
252 application map pixels reached the unit value (in Arbitrary Unit).




Fig. 4. Illustration of the weed detection width and the spray width in the case of nozzles controlled individually (only one nozzle is switched on in this example).

2.3 Spraying indicators

Two indicators were designed to assess the reduction of herbicide use and herbicide application efficiency. These indicators were computed on the surface corresponding to the virtual sprayer pass for the all length of the virtual field. The reduction of herbicide use was analysed through the dimensionless sprayed amount ratio τ_Q defined as:

$$\tau_Q = \frac{Q_S}{Q_T} \quad (2)$$

where: Q_S is the amount of herbicide used in the case of a patch application and Q_T is the amount of herbicide required for uniform application at the target application rate on the entire field area.

264 To measure the efficiency of the spray application, a second indicator was defined as the proportion of weed
265 patch area on which the application rate is higher than α percent of the prescribed application rate:

$$266 \quad \tau_{WA>\alpha} = \frac{A_{WA>\alpha}}{A_W} \quad (3)$$

267 where: $A_{WA>\alpha}$ is the weed area on which the application rate is higher than α percent of the prescribed
268 application rate and A_W is the total weed coverage area in the field.

269 In this paper, the threshold α was arbitrary set at 85% to provide a simple indicator related to the proportion
270 of weed area receiving an application rate considered high enough to be lethal. The value of 85% was chosen
271 lower than the minimal value of the application rate obtained after overlapping (Fig. 3), so that $\tau_{WA>85\%}$
272 would be 100% in the case of a blanket application on the whole field.

273 The values of the two assessment indicators are included in the bounded interval [0, 1]. For each spraying
274 situation, the indicator values were computed on 20 iterations of the cumulative lengths of the virtual fields
275 (*i.e.* from 1000 to 20 000 m in length). The convergence of the indicator values was checked by computing
276 the maximum difference between the last value and the last five iteration values. The convergence was
277 achieved slower in the case of biggest patches (32 m in length), nevertheless the maximum difference was
278 lower than 0.013 for all situations when 20 iterations were computed. For most situations, the convergence
279 was reached more rapidly during the first iterations. However, in this study the final value obtained for
280 20 000 m was used for all situations.

281 3. Results

282 Combining six weed coverage rates, seven patch lengths, three width to length ratios and seven boom section
283 widths, 882 spraying simulations were computed for each of the six operating conditions C1 to C6 (Table 2).
284 The results of these simulations were analysed regarding the sprayed amount ratio τ_Q and the ratio $\tau_{WA>85\%}$
285 of weed area exposed to more than 85% of the target application rate.

286 3.1 Analysis of the sprayed amount ratio

287 For all spraying simulations, the sprayed amount ratio τ_Q was analysed with respect to the boom section
 288 width. For example, for the operating condition C1, Fig. 5 depicts the evolution of τ_Q as a function of the
 289 boom section width for various weed coverage rates and for two contrasted examples of weed spatial
 290 distributions (*i.e.* weed patches of 0.2 and 8 m in width). Overall, τ_Q increases (*i.e.* herbicide reduction
 291 decreases) with the section width or the weed coverage rate. Furthermore, considering the same global
 292 coverage rate, the reduction of herbicide use is more important in the case of weeds aggregated in large
 293 patches than in the case of weeds dispersed in small patches. Fig. 5 also shows that the patch size directly
 294 affects the sensitivity of the herbicide reduction to the section width and the coverage rate. In a more refined
 295 way, in the case of small patches of 0.2 m in width, with a low weed coverage rate of 5%, the required
 296 amount of herbicide is very sensitive to the boom section width. The herbicide amount is approximately 19%
 297 with 1-nozzle sections, 50% with 4-nozzle sections and almost 87% with 12-nozzle sections. Moreover,
 298 regarding the effect of the infestation rate, the amount of herbicide approximately rises to 61% and 95% for 1
 299 and 4-nozzle sections respectively when the coverage rate reaches 20%. In the case of large patches of 8 m in
 300 width, the reduction of herbicide use is more important no matter the spray section width and the infestation
 301 rate. Moreover, the ratio τ_Q is less sensitive to the spray section width and the infestation rate. In this case,
 302 the difference observed in the ratio between the use of narrow or large section widths is highly reduced. For
 303 example, when the weed coverage rate is 10%, the ratio τ_Q is 11% with 1-nozzle sections, 19% with 12-
 304 nozzle sections and less than 30% with 24-nozzle sections.

305 Comparing all simulations, the results show that the ratio τ_Q is not affected by the operating conditions (C1
 306 to C6) thanks to the virtual flow rate normalization used in this study (*cf.* section 2.2.1). This normalization
 307 ensures that the mean value of the application rate obtained after overlapping is the same for all kind of
 308 nozzle and operating conditions (C1 to C6) for the same boom section width and same virtual weed spatial
 309 distribution (*i.e.* same weed coverage rate and same patch size). It also ensures that the herbicide amount
 310 virtually applied by a single nozzle is the same whatever its spray pattern. However, the surface area on
 311 which the same amount is sprayed by a single nozzle obviously depends on the nozzle spray pattern.

312 The simulation results have been used to study the impact of the weed spatial distribution on the sprayed
 313 amount ratio τ_Q . For constant values of weed coverage rate, section width and spray pattern, simulations
 314 show that the ratio only depended on patch width regardless their lengths in the travel direction. This is
 315 explained by the number of switched-on sections that are only depending on the width of the patches and by
 316 the cumulated surface area of patches that is constant for a given infestation rate whatever the patch shape.

317 Using successive regression analyses to fit the curves representing τ_Q as a function of the section width for
 318 different weed coverage rates and patch sizes, a mathematical expression has been designed to model the
 319 ratio τ_Q as follows:


$$320 \quad \hat{\tau}_Q = 1 - (1 - \tau_w)^{\left(1 + \frac{4w_s}{\pi w_w}\right)} \quad (4)$$

321 where: $\hat{\tau}_Q$ is the estimated value of τ_Q , τ_w is the weed coverage rate (in $[0, 1]$), w_w is the width of the weed
 322 patches (in m) and w_s is the boom section width (in m).

323 The section width w_s is also expressed as follows:


$$324 \quad w_s = N_N \times s_N \quad (5)$$

325 where: N_N is the nozzle number of the section and s_N is the nozzle spacing (which was set at 0.5 m in this
 326 study).



327

328 **Fig. 5.** Herbicide sprayed amount ratio τ_Q with respect to the section width (expressed in number of nozzles
 329 spaced 0.5 m apart) for small patches of 0.2 m in width (top) and large patches of 8 m in width (bottom) for
 330 various weed coverage rates (τ_w). +: results of spraying simulations carried out for operating conditions C2;
 331 continuous line: results of the model designed in Eq. (4).



332


333 **Fig. 6.** Comparison of the values of the modelled sprayed amount ratio $\hat{\tau}_Q$ with respect to the values of the
 334 ratio τ_Q computed from 5292 simulations. The straight line (in grey) is the first bisector ($\hat{\tau}_Q = \tau_Q$).

335 For an example of two weed patch widths (0.2 and 8 m in width), Fig. 5 shows how the herbicide amount
 336 ratio values deduced from simulations are fitted by the model designed in Eq. (4). More comprehensively,
 337 Fig.6 presents the values of the modelled ratio $\hat{\tau}_Q$ computed with Eq. (4) with respect to the values of the
 338 ratio τ_Q derived from the 5292 computer simulations (882 spraying simulations considering 6 nozzle
 339 operating conditions). The figure shows that Eq. (4) provides a good estimation of τ_Q ($R^2 = 0.9998$). The
 340 interest of Eq. (4) is that it summarizes all simulation results and provides a convenient expression to
 341 understand how the spatial resolution of the sprayer and the spatial distribution of weeds affect herbicide
 342 reduction in the case of patch spraying. This analytical expression links the different variables affecting the
 343 reduction of herbicide and makes it easy to express one of the variables in relation to the others. In particular,
 344 it enables to determine the width of the boom section, which required achieving an herbicide reduction target
 345 in the case of an imposed weed spatial distribution. For example, Fig. 7 shows the ranges of weed spatial
 346 distributions (defined in terms of weed coverage rate and patch width) for a reduction target of at least 50%
 347 (reduction goal of the French “Plan Ecophyto II+” by 2025). According to this figure, when the patch size is
 348 greater than 2 m and the weed coverage rate less than 20%, the objective of reducing the herbicide amount

349 by 50% (compared to a uniform broadcast application) can be achieved using boom sections of 3 m (6
 350 nozzles). Nevertheless, for the same reduction target, nozzles need to be controlled individually when the
 351 coverage rate is 40%. The limit curves plotted in Fig. 7 are deduced from Eq. (4) as follows:

$$352 \quad \tau_w < 1 - \left(1 - \tau_{Qmax}\right)^{\left(\frac{\pi w_w}{\pi w_w + 4 w_s}\right)} \quad (6)$$

353 where: τ_{Qmax} is the maximal value of τ_Q to reach the herbicide reduction target.




354
 355 **Fig. 7.** Boom section width (expressed in number of nozzles spaced 0.5 m apart) required to reach an
 356 herbicide amount reduction of 50%.

357 3.2 Analysis of the proportion of weed area exposed to under-application

358 The above results show that the normalization used in this study ensures to obtain the same herbicide amount
 359 use for a given weed infestation map and a given section width for all operating conditions. Thus, it is
 360 interesting to investigate how the operating condition (*i.e.* transverse spray pattern) could affect the local
 361 application rate with respect to the prescribed rate, through the localization and quantification of under-
 362 applications.

363 Fig. 8 illustrates an example of simulation output obtained in the case of individual nozzles controlled
364 independently with the operating condition C2 (*i.e.* using a 110° spray angle nozzles placed at 0.5 m in
365 height) and when the weed coverage rate was fixed at 10%. Fig. 8 presents an extract of weed map where
366 grey patches are weed patches, the corresponding application map and the application map restricted to weed
367 areas only. This figure shows that depending on the position of the patch relative to the centre of the nozzle
368 and depending on the resulting number of adjacent nozzles switched on, the product rate received by weeds
369 in the patch may vary. In other words, some weed patches are exposed to the prescribed dose, but some other
370 weed areas are exposed to under-application, which can lead to a weed-control failure on some areas.



371

372 **Fig. 8.** Example of herbicide application in the case of small patches ($l_e = 1$ m, $w_e = 0.2$ m), individual
 373 nozzles controlled independently and operating condition C2: extract from a virtual weed map (top),
 374 application map (middle), application rate on the weed patches (bottom). The colour scale is representative

375 of the application rate expressed in percentage of the prescribed dose. (For interpretation of the references to
376 colours in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)


377 In order to study how section width and coverage rate affect the ratio $\tau_{WA>85\%}$, and thus quantify the area
378 exposed to an application rate close to the prescribed dose, spraying simulations have been carried out using
379 virtual infestation maps (*cf.* section 2.1). Fig. 9 depicted the results of simulations computed for the operating
380 conditions C1 to C6 and when weeds were assumed to lie on small elliptical patches of constant size ($l_w = 1$
381 m, $w_w = 0.2$ m). In the case of a perfect rectangular spray pattern (C1), the application rate is obviously the
382 same on the entire sprayed surface whatever the number of adjacent nozzles that are switched on
383 simultaneously. Consequently, $\tau_{WA>85\%}$ is 100% for all weed coverage rates and all section widths.
384 Nevertheless, no commercial nozzle provides this idealized spray pattern. For all other configurations (C2 to
385 C6), the first observation that can be drawn from the curves is that reducing the boom section width results in
386 decreasing the value of ratio $\tau_{WA>85\%}$ and thus increasing the proportion of weed areas receiving an
387 insufficient herbicide rate. Thus, in the case of small patches and use of narrow section widths (*i.e.* less than
388 four), a significant proportion of weed areas receives an insufficient application rate to ensure weed control
389 and is exposed to a sublethal dose. Moreover, two groups of operating conditions are highlighted in Fig. 9:
390 C2, C4 and C6 on one side, and C3 and C5 on the other. The curves of the first group show similar results.
391 Indeed, in these operating conditions, the proportion of weed area on which the application rate is higher
392 than 85 % of the rated dosage can drop to approximately 40% when nozzles are controlled individually. On
393 the opposite, C3 and C5 provide the most favourable results with $\tau_{WA>85\%}$ higher than 77% for C3 (standard
394 90° spray angle nozzle at 0.5 m height) and 94% for C5 (even 80° spray nozzle at 35 cm height) in the case
395 of nozzles controlled individually.

396 The operating conditions C3 and C4 correspond to the same flat fan nozzle (90° spray angle) but differ by
397 the boom height, which is higher for C4. Fig. 9 shows that the C4 operating condition gives the most
398 unfavourable ratio values (increasing weed areas exposed to under-application) compared to the C3
399 operating condition. Similar results are observed for the C5 and C6 operating conditions. The differences
400 observed between C3 and C4, respectively C5 and C6 are due to the proportion of overlap between adjacent
401 sprays. The overlap is less than 100% in the case of C3 and more than 100% in the case of C4 due to the use

402 of the same nozzle at two different boom heights (higher in C4 than in C3). Consequently, when only one
 403 standard flat fan nozzle is switched on, the overlap is not achieved and the application rate on the sprayed
 404 area is lower in the case of C4 than in the case C3 since the same herbicide amount is applied on a wider
 405 spray width in C4 than in C3. These phenomena are all the more marked between C5 and C6 since even
 406 spray flat fan nozzles are designed for banding application and to give even coverage from a single nozzle.
 407 Thus, the trapezoidal shape of the transverse spray pattern obtained with an even nozzle leads to a very
 408 limited overlap in C5 so that the application rate remain close to the prescribed rate on the sprayed area
 409 whatever the number of adjacent nozzles simultaneously switched on (including the case of a single nozzle).

410 Regarding the operating conditions from C2 to C6, C3 and C5 provide the most favourable results because
 411 they correspond to conditions where the overlap between adjacent sprays is limited. In other words, these are
 412 conditions where the transverse spray patterns of a single nozzle are the narrowest. Consequently, in C3 and
 413 C5 the application rate remains high in the detection area (0.5 m in width) centred under the nozzle although
 414 only one nozzle is switched on. Comparing C3 and C5, the ratio $\tau_{WA>85\%}$ is better when the even spray flat
 415 fan nozzle is used (C5) since the shape of the transverse spray pattern is adapted to spraying with single
 416 nozzles. Nevertheless, when several adjacent nozzles are switched simultaneously, the spraying uniformity
 417 (*i.e.* the CV value) is very sensitive to the boom height. Thus, regarding δCV_h the operating condition C5 is
 418 the most sensitive spraying situation to boom height variations (*cf.* Table 2). With this in mind, the use of
 419 even nozzles with very limited overlaps (C5) appears as a good solution to reduce the risk of under-
 420 application on small weed patches only when the boom height is controlled very accurately. However, the
 421 quality of the spraying lacks of robustness in the case of boom height variations. In comparison to the
 422 reference scenario C5, decreasing or increasing the boom height would lead to local under- or over-
 423 application with a risk of weed control failure or lack of herbicide selectivity towards the crop.

424 When the number of nozzles per section is greater than four, the impact of the nozzle type is significantly
 425 reduced. Nevertheless, the problem of under-application on section borders still exist.



426

427

428

429

430

431

Fig. 9. Analysis of the weed area on which the application rate is higher than 85% ($\tau_{WA>85\%}$) with respect to the weed coverage rate, in the case of small patches ($l_e = 1$ m, $w_e = 0.2$ m) and different operation conditions from C1 to C6 (Table 2). The section width (expressed in number of nozzles N_N) is indicated on the left of the curves. The number of section widths presented on each graph was changed depending on the operating condition to improve readability and avoid curve overlay (for curves close to $\tau_{WA>85\%} = 1$).

4. Discussion


The use of computer simulations enables to provide a practical and simple model to study how the weed distribution characteristics and the boom section width of the sprayer may affect both the quantitative reduction of herbicide amount expected by patch spraying and qualitative distribution of herbicide with under-dosed or overdosed areas. Examples of results presented in section 3.1 as well as the general expression of the sprayed amount ratio (Eq. (4)) confirm the general trends already observed by various authors such as Wallinga et al. (1998), and Rasmussen et al. (2019) who claimed that the herbicide reduction increased when the section width of the sprayer decreased due to less spraying outside the patches. A more refined analysis can be carried out by comparing to the results obtained by Franco et al. (2017), who modeled the relative sprayed area S as the sum of the weed coverage rate γ and a power function of the “precision of spraying” (L/w) as follows:

$$S = \gamma + \alpha \left(\frac{L}{w} \right)^\beta \quad (7)$$

where α and β are two regression parameters, L is the total width of the boom and w is the width of each boom section.

The regression analysis led by these authors was based on simulations carried out for two cases: one in the case of scattered circular patches with a weed coverage rate of 10.9% (leading to $\alpha = 0.56$ and $\beta = -0.73$) and another in the case of few significant circular patches with a coverage rate of 10% (leading to $\alpha = 0.29$ and $\beta = -1.01$). Since the authors implicitly assumes a perfect rectangular spray pattern for each nozzle, the sprayed area is not affected by any overlap effect and is directly proportional to the herbicide amount. Consequently, the relative sprayed area S computed by Franco et al. (2017) can be compared to τ_Q . Moreover, setting the boom width at 40 m, the authors expressed the relative sprayed area as a function of the boom section width. Fig. 10 presents the two regression models established by Franco et al. (2017) superimposed to data computed with Eq. (4) for a weed coverage rate set at 10%. Fig. 10 shows that the results obtained by these authors in the case of significant patches are similar to those derived from Eq. (4) with $w_w = 16$ m. In the case of scattered patches, the results are close to those computed with $w_w = 4$ m. The lack of information

concerning the patch diameters does not allow further interpretations or comparisons. Nevertheless, Fig. 10 shows that the expected reduction of herbicide amount (derived from Eq. (4)) is less optimistic than the results presented by Franco et al. (2017) when patch sizes are smaller. The results presented herein are also less optimistic when the weed coverage rate increases. The comparison of Eq. (7) to Eq. (4) puts the emphasis on the interest of Eq. (4) to provide an analytical expression of the sprayed amount ratio as a function of the weed coverage rate, the weed patch width and the boom section width irrespective of any other regression coefficients. Contrary to what may be inferred from Eq. (7), Eq. (4) also demonstrates that the sprayed amount ratio cannot be simply expressed as the sum of the weed coverage rate and a function independent of this weed coverage rate.



466

Fig. 10. Sprayed amount ratio computed for a weed coverage rate of 10% (continuous lines) and different patch width values (w_w , indicated on the curves) with respect to the section width (expressed in number of nozzles spaced 0.5 m apart). Results derived from Franco et al. (2017) in the cases of scattered patches (+) and significant patches (○) are reproduced and superimposed.

Relevant comparisons with the other results found in the literature are limited because of major differences in methodology, input parameters, scale of observation or formulation of the outcomes. For example, Wallinga et al. (1998) considered on the one hand the spatial position of a number of seedlings and not a

474 weed coverage rate, and on the other hand they do not take into account the operating constraints of a sprayer
475 since their virtual sprayer applied the herbicide to a circular area around each weed.

476 In this work, full elliptical patches at random positions on virtual field bands modeled weed populations. The
477 assumption associated with the design of these maps is related to a weed coverage rate and not a weed
478 density stated in plants per meter. This choice is consistent with the weed maps usually obtained with
479 imaging systems (mounted on ground vehicle, UAV or satellite). Although the actual shape of weed patches
480 is more complex, the elliptical shape assumption provides a model directly parameterized by the size of the
481 patches. Thereby, this geometrical shape assumption is consistent with the objective of assessing the ability
482 of sprayers to reduce herbicide and meet farmers' expectations. Spraying simulations could be carried out in
483 the same way on actual weed maps, but the results would remain specific to few situations and the trends
484 would then be difficult to generalize.

485 Computer simulations are of practical use for farmers or manufacturers to estimate the sprayer spatial
486 resolution required to reach an herbicide reduction target according to the weed spatial distribution. The
487 simulations made it possible to build charts (such as presented in Fig. 7) to help users or manufacturers in the
488 choice of boom section widths according to the herbicide reduction target and weed infestation
489 characteristics (*i.e.* coverage rate and patch size). For example, referring to Fig.7, the choice of 6-nozzle
490 boom sections instead of individually controlled nozzles would reduce the sprayer cost while expecting a
491 herbicide use reduction of 50% when infestation rates are up to 30% and when weed patches are at least 4 m
492 wide.

493 In this paper, results assessed the potential reduction of the herbicide product with regard to a single weed
494 map for the all field. This corresponds to the case where farmers apply one herbicide or a mixture of
495 herbicide selected with regard to the dominant or most problematic weed species present in field.
496 Nevertheless, the results of several different simulations carried out with different weed maps can also be
497 considered to estimate the herbicide reduction when different herbicides are applied separately and
498 specifically on different weed classes (with different spatial distribution in the field). This corresponds to the
499 case where farmers decide to apply different herbicides with several successive sprayer passes. It also
500 corresponds to the use of sprayers equipped of multiple tanks as proposed by Gerhards and Oebel (2006) and

501 Gutjahr et al. (2012). Indeed, depending on weed classes, the weeds distributions can vary and induce
502 differences in herbicide application. Thus, applying separately different herbicides rather than a mixture
503 helps in reducing the global amount of herbicides used and is an effective strategy to avoid the selection of
504 herbicide-resistant weeds (Gutjahr et al., 2012).

505 Bearing in mind the assumptions underlying the study (*e.g.* perfect on and off switching of the nozzles, no
506 disturbance due to travel speeds, wind effects, ...), the results have to be seen as the better limits. For
507 example, Fig. 7 presents the most favorable results in terms of herbicide reduction reached for imposed weed
508 spatial distributions.

509 The computer simulations demonstrated that decreasing the weed patch size increases the sensitivity of
510 herbicide reduction to the boom section width. Thus, in the case of small patches, narrow section widths (less
511 than four nozzles) or nozzles controlled individually are required to reach the herbicide reduction objective.
512 In these situations, a substantial proportion of weed areas can be exposed to a sublethal application rate
513 because the spray deposit under a single nozzle is not constant and it is not possible to obtain a uniform
514 application rate on the whole transverse spraying distance without overlapping of several sprays. On some
515 areas, these situations can lead to weed-control failures, yield losses (for the crop) and an increase of weed
516 seedbanks. It can also promote survival and multiplication of herbicide-resistant weed specimens, since the
517 application of reduced herbicide rates (*i.e.* sublethal doses) on weeds is known, in particular, to select non-
518 target-site herbicide-resistant weed populations (Neve and Powles, 2005). Taking into account the results
519 presented in section 3.2, the use of even nozzles (C5) or low angle flat nozzles (C3) could be a way to reduce
520 the risk of local under-applications as long as the boom height is accurately controlled (especially in the case
521 of even nozzles). Overall, finding an actual nozzle that would provide a uniform application rate when it is
522 used with or without overlap and with a transverse spray pattern insensitive to the boom height is not
523 possible. Technical solutions to maintain the application rate at the prescribed value on all the detection area
524 could be set up by increasing the flow rate when very narrow sections or individual nozzles are switched on,
525 or by widening the spray section on both sides of the weed detection width. However, both of these
526 approaches would increase the herbicide amount required for the application.

527 Thus, future works will focus on the use of complementary computer simulations to help in designing more
528 flexible nozzle control in order to avoid under-applications on weeds while reaching a significant reduction
529 of herbicide use. Future works will also seek out and consider the effect of wind and travel speed conditions
530 on the deformation of the spray deposits and assess consequences of potential mistargeted applications.

531 **4. Conclusion**

532 The use of computer simulations appears as a relevant way to study weed patch spraying, especially
533 concerning the interaction of parameters that affect the global reduction of herbicide amount and potential
534 under-application occurrences. Based on a simplified representation of weed patches, simulations of patch
535 spraying have enabled to establish a model to estimate herbicide use reduction as a function of the boom
536 section width and the spatial weed distribution defined by patch size and coverage rate. The model is of
537 practical use to study the combined effects of sprayer features and weed spatial distribution characteristics on
538 herbicide use reduction. It provides users and manufacturers with simple tools to build charts and estimate
539 the sprayer spatial resolution required to reach a given herbicide reduction target according to the weed
540 distribution. In the case of small patches dispersed in the field, computer simulations have demonstrated that
541 individual nozzles controlled independently or at least narrow boom sections are required to reach a
542 significant herbicide reduction. In these situations, numerical simulations have also estimated the proportion
543 of weed area exposed to herbicide under-application because of the the lack of spray overlap. They related
544 this proportion to the section width and the nozzle spray pattern. This finding encourages using simulations
545 to help in developing more flexible nozzle control in order to avoid any risk of weed control failure and
546 selection of herbicide-resistant weeds while reaching a significant reduction of herbicide use. Although the
547 work has been devoted to weed control, it retains its interest in any patch spraying context with the objective
548 of reducing the amount of chemical inputs by switching on or off boom sections or individual nozzles
549 preventing from chemicals areas that do not require treatment.

550 **5. Acknowledgements**

551 The work was supported by the national superior institute of agronomic sciences, food and environment
552 (AgroSup Dijon), the French institute for research and innovation in agriculture, food, and the environment

553 (INRAE). The authors gratefully acknowledge Dr. A. Herbst, Julius Kühn-Institute (JKI) for providing
554 experimental data on transverse spray patterns.

555 **6. References**

556 Barroso, J., Navarrete, L., Sanchez Del Arco, M.J., Fernandez-Quintanilla, C., Lutman, P.J.W., Perry, N.H.,
557 hull, R.I., 2006. Dispersal of *Avena fatua* and *Avena sterilis* patches by natural dissemination, soil tillage and
558 combine harvesters. *Weed Research* 46, 118-128.

559 Carroll, J.P., Holden, N.M., 2009. Modeling the relationship between patch sprayer performance and weed
560 distribution. *Transactions of the ASABE* 52, 1051-1056.

561 Castaldi, F., Pelosi, F., Pascucci, S., Casa, R., 2017. Assessing the potential of images from unmanned aerial
562 vehicles (UAV) to support herbicide patch spraying in maize. *Precision Agriculture* 18, 76-94.

563 Cousens, R., Croft, A.M., 2000. Weed populations and pathogens. *Weed Research* 40, 63-82.

564 Dieleman, J., Mortensen, D., 1999. Characterizing the spatial pattern of *Abutilon theophrasti* seedling
565 patches. *Weed Research* 39, 455-467.

566 Esau, T., Zaman, Q., Groulx, D., Farooque, A., Schumann, A., Chang, Y., 2018. Machine vision smart
567 sprayer for spot-application of agrochemical in wild blueberry fields. *Precision Agriculture* 19, 770-788.

568 Faqiri, N.L., Krishnan, P., 2005. Effect of nozzle pressure and wind condition on spray pattern displacement
569 of RF5 and 110-5R nozzles. *Applied Engineering in Agriculture* 21, 747-750.

570 Franco, C., Pedersen, S.M., Papaharalampos, H., Ørum, J.E., 2017. The value of precision for image-based
571 decision support in weed management. *Precision Agriculture* 18, 366-382.

572 Gao, J., Liao, W., Nuytens, D., Lootens, P., Vangeyte, J., Pižurica, A., He, Y., Pieters, J.G., 2018. Fusion of
573 pixel and object-based features for weed mapping using unmanned aerial vehicle imagery. *International*
574 *Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation* 67, 43-53.

575 Gerhards, R., Oebel, H., 2006. Practical experiences with a system for site-specific weed control in arable
576 crops using real-time image analysis and GPS-controlled patch spraying. *Weed Research* 46, 185-193.

577 Gonzalez-de-Soto, M., Emmi, L., Perez-Ruiz, M., Aguera, J., Gonzalez-de-Santos, P., 2016. Autonomous
578 systems for precise spraying – Evaluation of a robotised patch sprayer. *Biosystems Engineering* 146, 165-
579 182.

580 Gutjahr, C., Sokefeld, M., Gerhards, R., 2012. Evaluation of two patch spraying systems in winter wheat and
581 maize. *Weed Research* 52, 510-519.

582 Hassen, N.S., Sidik, N.A.C., Sheriff, J.M., 2013. Effect of nozzle type, angle and pressure on spray
583 volumetric distribution of broadcasting and banding application. *Journal of Mechanical Engineering*
584 *Research* 5, 76-81.

585 Herbst, A., 2019. Personnal communication: Results of the spray pattern measurements, Julius-Kühn-Institut
586 (JKI), Braunschweig, Germany.

587 Humston, R., Mortensen, D.A., Bjornstad, O.N., 2005. Anthropogenic forcing on the spatial dynamics of an
588 agricultural weed: the case of the common sunflower. *British Ecological Society* 42, 863-872.

589 ISO 5682-3, 2017. Equipment for crop protection — Spraying equipment — Part 3: Test method to assess
590 the performance of volume/area adjustment systems, International Organization for Standardization, Geneva,
591 Switzerland.

592 ISO 16119-2, 2013. Agricultural and forestry machinery — Environmental requirements for sprayers — Part
593 2: Horizontal boom sprayers, International Organization for Standardization, Geneva, Switzerland.

594 Krishnan, P., Gal, I., J. Kemble, L., L. Gottfried, S., 1993. Effect of Sprayer Bounce and Wind Condition on
595 Spray Pattern Displacement of TJ60-8004 Fan Nozzles. *Transactions of the ASAE* 36, 997-1000.

596 Langenakens, J.J., Clijmans, L., Ramon, H., De Baerdemaeker, J., 1999. The Effects of Vertical Sprayer
597 Boom Movements on the Uniformity of Spray Distribution. *Journal of Agricultural Engineering Research*
598 74, 281-291.

599 Lebeau, F., 2004. Modelling the dynamic distribution of spray deposits. *Biosystems engineering* 89, 255-
600 265.

601 Mahalinga Iyer, R., Wills, B.M.D., 1978. Factors determining the design of tractor-mounted sprayer
602 booms—sprayer nozzle characteristics. *Journal of Agricultural Engineering Research* 23, 37-43.

603 Matlab, 2019. Version 9.7. The MathWorks, Inc., Natick, Massachusetts, United States., The MathWorks,
604 Inc., Natick, Massachusetts, United States.

605 Neve, P., Powles, S., 2005. High survival frequencies at low herbicide use rates in populations of *Lolium*
606 *rigidum* result in rapid evolution of herbicide resistance. *Heredity* 95, 485-492.

607 Oerke, E.C., 2006. Crop losses to pests. *The Journal of Agricultural Science* 144, 31-43.

608 Paice, M.E.R., Day, W., Rew, L.J., Howard, A., 1998. A stochastic simulation model for evaluating the
609 concept of patch spraying. *Weed Research* 38, 373-388.

610 Paice, M.E.R., Miller, P.C.H., Bodle, J.D., 1995. An experimental sprayer for the spatially selective
611 application of herbicides. *Journal of Agricultural Engineering Research* 60, 107-116.

612 Ramon, H., De Baerdemaeker, J., 1997. Spray Boom Motions and Spray Distribution: Part 1, Derivation of a
613 Mathematical Relation. *Journal of Agricultural Engineering Research* 66, 23-29.

614 Rasmussen, J., Azim, S., Nielsen, J., Mikkelsen, B.F., Hørfarter, R., Christensen, S., 2019. A new method to
615 estimate the spatial correlation between planned and actual patch spraying of herbicides. *Precision*
616 *Agriculture*.

617 Shearer, S., Jones, P., 1991. Selective application of post-emergence herbicides using photoelectrics.
618 *Transactions of the ASAE* 34, 1661-1666.

619 Stafford, J., Miller, P., 1993. Spatially selective application of herbicide to cereal crops. *Computers and*
620 *Electronics in Agriculture* 9, 217-229.


621 Thorp, K.R., Tian, L.F., 2004. A review on remote sensing of weeds in agriculture. *Precision Agriculture* 5,
622 477-508.

623 Wallinga, Groeneveld, Lotz, 1998. Measures that describe weed spatial patterns at different levels of
624 resolution and their applications for patch spraying of weeds. *Weed Research* 38, 351-359.


625 Wang, A., Zhang, W., Wei, X., 2019. A review on weed detection using ground-based machine vision and
626 image processing techniques. *Computers and electronics in agriculture* 158, 226-240.

627


Virtual weed maps



Patch spraying simulation



Herbicide application maps



Assessment indicators:

- Herbicide use reduction
- Under-application risk