

Effects of Irrigation Regimes on Yield and Water Use Efficiency of Cucumber (*Cucumis sativus* L.) in Ogbomoso, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Aims: This study aimed to evaluate the effects of different irrigation depths and intervals on cucumber yield and water use efficiency (WUE) in Ogbomoso, Nigeria, to develop sustainable irrigation strategies for water-limited environments.

Study design: The experiment employed a split-plot randomized complete block design with three irrigation depths (D_1 : 100% ET_c, D_2 : 85% ET_c, D_3 : 70% ET_c) as main plots and three irrigation intervals (I_1 : daily, I_2 : 2-day, I_3 : 3-day) as sub-plots.

Place and Duration of Study: The study was conducted at the Teaching and Research Farm of the Agricultural Engineering Department, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso, Nigeria, during the dry season between February and April 2024.

Methodology: The Darina F1 cucumber variety was grown under drip irrigation. Yield and water consumption were monitored throughout the growing season. Irrigation volumes were calculated based on crop evapotranspiration (ET_c), and WUE was determined as the ratio of yield to total irrigation water applied. Data were analyzed using ANOVA, and treatment means were separated using Fisher's Least Significant Difference (LSD) test at a 5% probability level.

Results: The highest yield (8,738.79 kg/ha) was achieved under full irrigation (D_1), while the highest WUE (155.30 kg/m³) was observed under D_3 , representing a 15% improvement over full irrigation. Daily irrigation (I_1) produced the highest WUE (196.52 kg/m³), approximately 37% higher than 2-day intervals. The interaction between depth and interval revealed that D_3I_1 (70% ET_c with daily irrigation) achieved the optimal balance between yield and water use efficiency, with a WUE of 210.18 kg/m³.

Conclusion: 70% ET_c irrigation combined with daily water application offers a sustainable approach for cucumber production in water-limited environments, balancing yield and water conservation. Full irrigation with daily intervals remains the most productive approach where water availability is not constrained.

Keywords: Irrigation regimes, Water use efficiency, Cucumber yield, Irrigation scheduling, Water management

1. INTRODUCTION

Agriculture faces great challenges in meeting global food demand while confronting increasing water scarcity. With agriculture consuming approximately 70% of global freshwater resources and up to 95% in numerous developing countries (Shang et al., 2024), efficient water management has become crucial for sustainable crop production (Naganjali et al., 2024). This challenge is particularly acute in regions experiencing water stress, where water management practices is essential for maintaining agricultural productivity while conserving the water resource.

25 Cucumber (*Cucumis sativus* L.) is an **important** vegetable crop valued for its nutritional
26 content and economic importance in both local and international markets. As a crop
27 containing approximately 95% water, the growth and yield of cucumber are particularly
28 sensitive to water availability and irrigation management (Ors et al., 2022). Despite its
29 importance, cucumber cultivation faces challenges related to water availability and efficient
30 use, especially in regions with limited water resources or irregular rainfall patterns.

31 Water use efficiency (WUE) has emerged as a critical metric in agricultural water
32 management, representing the relationship between crop yield and water consumption. In
33 the context of increasing water scarcity and climate variability, improving WUE while
34 maintaining acceptable yields has become a primary objective in sustainable agriculture
35 (Kilemo, 2022). This is particularly relevant for cucumber production, where water
36 management directly influences both yield quantity and quality.

37 Deficit irrigation has gained attention as a water management strategy that can potentially
38 optimize WUE while maintaining acceptable yields (Abd El-Mageed et al., 2018). This
39 approach deliberately applies water below full crop water requirements during specific
40 growth stages or throughout the growing season (Yu et al., 2020). Research has shown that
41 some crops can maintain relatively high yields under moderate water deficit conditions while
42 significantly improving WUE (Cheng et al., 2021; Xu et al., 2024). However, the success of
43 deficit irrigation strategies depends on various factors, including crop type, growth stage,
44 environmental conditions, and irrigation scheduling (Comas et al., 2019; Zou et al., 2021).

45 Irrigation scheduling, encompassing both the depth and frequency of water application, plays
46 a crucial role in determining crop response to water availability. The timing and amount of
47 water application can significantly influence soil moisture dynamics, plant water relations,
48 and ultimately, crop productivity (Todorović, 2019; Zakka et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2023).
49 Understanding these relationships is essential for developing efficient irrigation strategies
50 that balance water conservation with yield optimization.

51 **The relationship between irrigation management and crop performance is complex and**
52 **influenced by multiple factors in cucumber production.** Previous studies have shown varying
53 responses to different irrigation regimes, with some reporting yield reductions under deficit
54 irrigation (Cantuário et al., 2021), while others have found minimal yield impacts with
55 significant water savings (Parkash et al., 2021). These varied responses highlight the need
56 for location-specific research to determine optimal irrigation strategies under local conditions.

57 The interactive effects of irrigation depth and interval on cucumber yield and WUE remain
58 inadequately understood, particularly in tropical regions. While several studies have
59 examined either irrigation depth or frequency independently, few have investigated their
60 combined effects on cucumber production. This knowledge gap is particularly relevant in
61 regions like Nigeria, where water management strategies must be adapted to local
62 environmental conditions and resource constraints.

63 In Nigeria, cucumber production faces challenges related to water availability and
64 management, particularly in regions with distinct wet and dry seasons. The growing season
65 in Ogbomoso, characterized by variable rainfall patterns and high evapotranspiration rates,
66 presents unique challenges for irrigation management (Abegunrin et al., 2013).
67 Understanding crop response to different irrigation regimes under these conditions is crucial
68 for developing sustainable production practices.

69 This study aims to evaluate the effects of different irrigation depths and intervals on
70 cucumber yield and water use efficiency in Ogbomoso, Nigeria. **Specifically, the objectives**

71 are to: (1) determine the impact of varying irrigation depths (100% ETc, 85% ETc, and 70%
72 ETc) on cucumber yield and WUE; (2) assess the influence of different irrigation intervals
73 (daily, 2-day, and 3-day) on yield and WUE; and (3) identify the optimal combination of
74 irrigation depth and interval that maximizes both yield and water efficiency under tropical
75 conditions. The findings will contribute to developing more efficient irrigation strategies for
76 cucumber production in similar tropical environments while addressing the broader challenge
77 of agricultural water conservation.

78

79 **2. MATERIAL AND METHODS**

80

81 **2.1 Study Site Description**

82 The study was conducted at the Teaching and Research Farm of the Agricultural
83 Engineering Department, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso, Nigeria
84 (8°10'06" N and 4°16'12" E, 341 m above mean sea level). The region experiences a tropical
85 climate characterized by distinct wet and dry seasons. The dry season typically spans from
86 November to March, while the wet season extends from April to October. Annual rainfall
87 averages 1200 mm with a bimodal distribution peaking in June and September. The mean
88 annual temperature ranges from 18°C to 36°C, with an average relative humidity of 74%
89 during the wet season.

90 Initial soil analysis revealed a sandy loam texture throughout the experimental profile (0-30
91 cm), with sand content ranging from 61.9% to 65.9%, clay from 15.8% to 19.8%, and silt
92 from 16.3% to 22.3%. Bulk density varied between 1.49 and 1.70 g cm⁻³, while saturated
93 hydraulic conductivity ranged from 13.35 to 43.97 cm/hr, indicating good drainage
94 characteristics suitable for cucumber cultivation

95 **2.2 Experimental Design and Treatments**

96 The experiment employed a split-plot randomized complete block design with irrigation depth
97 as the main plot factor and irrigation interval as the subplot factor. The irrigation depth
98 treatments comprised three levels: D₁ (100% ETc, control), D₂ (85% ETc), and D₃ (70%
99 ETc), where ETc(crop evapotranspiration) was calculated using the evaporation method
100 based on local climatic data and crop coefficients. Irrigation intervals were established at
101 three levels: I₁ (daily irrigation), I₂ (2-day interval), and I₃ (3-day interval). The experimental
102 layout consisted of nine treatment combinations replicated three times, resulting in 27
103 experimental units.

104 **2.3 Land Preparation and Crop Management**

105 The experimental site was initially cleared manually to remove existing vegetation, followed
106 by deep ploughing to a depth of 30 cm using a tractor-mounted disc plough. Poultry manure
107 was incorporated into the soil to enhance fertility. Ridges were constructed manually to
108 facilitate seed sowing and drip lateral installation.

109 Darina F1 cucumber variety was selected as the test crop and sown manually at a depth of
110 2-3 cm. Plant spacing was maintained at 90 cm between rows and 30 cm within rows. Two
111 seeds were initially planted per stand and later thinned to one seedling per stand at 14 days
112 after germination. Bamboo stakes were installed to support the trailing vines. Standard
113 agronomic practices, including weed control, fertilizer application, and pest management,
114 were implemented uniformly across all treatments.

115 2.4 Irrigation System Design and Management

116 A drip irrigation system was designed and installed, comprising a 1000-liter elevated water
117 storage tank, 50.8 mm diameter main pipeline, sub-main pipes, and 16 mm laterals fitted
118 with pressure-compensating emitters. The emitters had a factory-rated discharge of 3 L/h. A
119 filtration unit was installed on the mainline to prevent emitter clogging. The system was
120 regularly monitored for uniform water distribution and maintenance of designed operating
121 parameters.

122 During the initial two weeks post-planting, all treatments received uniform irrigation of 10 mm
123 daily to ensure proper crop establishment. Subsequently, irrigation was applied according to
124 treatment specifications. The irrigation volume (V_i) for each application was calculated using
125 the following equation:

$$V_i = ETc \times Ii \times Dl \times Ac$$

126 Where: V_i = irrigation volume (m^3); ETc = crop evapotranspiration (mm/day); Ii = irrigation
127 interval (days); Dl = deficit level (decimal); Ac = crop area (m^2)

128 The duration of each irrigation event was determined using:

$$t = V_i / (d \times Ne)$$

129 Where: t = irrigation time (hr); d = emitter discharge rate (L/hr); Ne = number of emitters

130 2.5 Data Collection and Analysis

131 2.5.1 Yield

132 The yield per hectare was calculated using:

$$Y = W/A$$

133 Where: Y = yield (kg/ha); W = weight of harvested fruits (kg); A = harvested area (ha)

134

135 2.5.2 Water Use Efficiency

136 Water use efficiency (WUE) was evaluated using:

$$WUE = Y/IR$$

137 Where: IR = total irrigation water applied (mm)

138

139 2.5.3 Statistical Analysis

140 The collected data were subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA) using SPSS version 20
141 software. Treatment means were separated using Fisher's Least Significant Difference
142 (LSD) test at 5% probability level.

143

144

145

146 **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

147

148 **3.1 Effects of Irrigation Depth on Cucumber Yield**

149

150 Analysis of the yield data showed notable variations among different irrigation depth
151 treatments. The highest yield of 8,738.79 kg/ha was achieved under full irrigation (D1, 100%
152 ETc), followed by D3 (70% ETc) with 8,025.20 kg/ha, while D2 (85% ETc) produced
153 7,801.37 kg/ha (Table 1). Although these differences were not statistically significant at
154 $p \leq 0.05$, the full irrigation treatment (D1) demonstrated superior performance, producing
155 approximately 12% higher yield than D2 and 9% higher than D3.

156

157 The yield response to irrigation depth exhibited a non-linear pattern, with the moderate
158 deficit treatment (D2) showing the lowest yield despite receiving more water than D3. This
159 unexpected response might be attributed to the plant's ability to adapt more effectively to
160 severe water stress conditions through enhanced root development and improved water use
161 efficiency mechanisms. This finding aligns with research by Abdelraouf et al. (2020), who
162 found that cucumber plants can develop adaptive strategies under consistent water stress
163 conditions.

164

165 The superior yield under full irrigation (D1) can be attributed to optimal soil moisture
166 conditions that enhanced nutrient uptake and physiological processes. These results support
167 findings by Liu et al. (2019), who reported that adequate water availability is crucial for
168 maximizing cucumber productivity. However, the relatively small yield reduction under
169 severe deficit irrigation (D3) suggests that cucumber possesses considerable drought
170 tolerance mechanisms, making it suitable for water-limited conditions.

171

172 **3.2 Impact of Irrigation Intervals on Cucumber Yield**

173

174 The irrigation interval treatments showed interesting effects on cucumber yield. The two-day
175 irrigation interval (I2) produced the highest yield of 8,281.18 kg/ha, followed by the three-day
176 interval (I3) with 8,147.86 kg/ha, and daily irrigation (I1) with 8,043.20 kg/ha. While these
177 differences were not statistically significant, they reveal important patterns in cucumber's
178 response to irrigation frequency. The I2 treatment produced approximately 3% higher yield
179 than I3 and 2.9% higher than I1.

180

181 The slight yield advantage with I2 might be attributed to improved soil aeration between
182 irrigation events and potentially better root development stimulated by mild periodic water
183 stress. This finding corresponds with research by Zakka et al. (2020), who found that
184 allowing slight soil moisture depletion between irrigation events can promote deeper root
185 growth and improve overall plant resilience.

186

187 The slightly lower yield under daily irrigation might be attributed to possible soil saturation
188 effects that could impact root respiration and nutrient uptake. These results indicate that
189 cucumber plants can adapt effectively to less frequent irrigation without substantial yield
190 penalties, potentially through physiological adaptations that enhance water uptake and
191 utilization efficiency.

192

193 **3.3 Interaction Effects of Irrigation Depth and Interval on Yield**

194 The interaction between irrigation depth and interval ($D \times I$) revealed significant variations in
195 yield response (Table 1). The yield in $D_1 \times I_1$ combination was significantly higher than the
196 yields in $D_2 \times I_1$ and $D_1 \times I_2$ combinations. The yield was in order $(D_1 \times I_1) > D_2 \times I_1 > D_1 \times I_2$.

197 Thus, $D_1 \times I_1$ combination represents a yield advantage of approximately 37% and 39% over
198 $D_2 \times I_1$ and $D_1 \times I_2$ combination, respectively.

199 Notable interaction patterns revealed that under full irrigation (D_1), daily application (I_1)
200 significantly outperformed other intervals. In the case of moderate deficit irrigation (D_2), the
201 two-day interval (I_2) showed superior performance. However, under severe deficit conditions
202 (D_3), longer irrigation intervals (I_2 and I_3) yielded better results than daily irrigation. These
203 findings suggest that the best irrigation interval is a function of irrigation depth, indicating the
204 need for synchronized management of both parameters for optimal yield outcomes.

205 The results align with (Al-Mehmdy & Fal-Issawi, 2023), who reported that irrigation frequency
206 should be adjusted based on the total water application depth to optimize cucumber
207 productivity. This interaction effect demonstrates the complexity of irrigation management
208 and the importance of considering both parameters in irrigation scheduling decisions. T

209 **3.4 Water Use Efficiency Response to Irrigation Depth**

210 Water use efficiency showed significant responses to irrigation depth treatments, with D_3
211 (70% ETc) achieving the highest WUE of 155.30 kg/m³. This was approximately 15% and
212 18% higher than WUE under D_1 and D_2 , respectively. This indicates that in this study,
213 reducing irrigation depth by 30% of ETc is most efficient in terms of water usage by
214 cucumber plants.

215 The enhanced WUE under deficit irrigation suggests that cucumber plants can optimize their
216 water uptake and productivity under water-limited conditions, possibly through several
217 physiological adaptations, including enhanced root exploration of soil volume and improved
218 stomatal regulation. This finding supports research by Shani and Musa (2019), who reported
219 that moderate water stress could trigger adaptive responses that enhance water use
220 efficiency.

221 The relationship between irrigation depth and WUE showed an inverse trend compared to
222 yield, with lower irrigation depths generally resulting in higher WUE values. This pattern
223 indicates a trade-off between maximizing yield and optimizing water use efficiency, an
224 important consideration for irrigation management in water-scarce regions.

225 **3.5 Effects of Irrigation Intervals on Water Use Efficiency**

226 The impact of irrigation intervals on WUE revealed a clear trend favouring more frequent
227 irrigation. The WUE in terms of interval is in order: $I_1 > I_2 > I_3$ (Table 1). This substantial
228 difference in WUE across irrigation intervals suggests that more frequent irrigation allows for
229 better water utilization by maintaining optimal soil moisture conditions and reducing water
230 losses through deep percolation and evaporation.

231 The declining WUE with increasing irrigation intervals indicates that longer periods between
232 irrigation events may lead to less efficient water use, possibly due to increased water stress
233 and reduced photosynthetic efficiency. These findings align with research by Liu et al.
234 (2019), who found that frequent irrigation helps maintain stable soil moisture conditions,
235 leading to better water utilization by plants.

236 **3.6 Combined Effects of Irrigation Depth and Interval on WUE**

237 The interaction between irrigation depth and interval produced significant variations in WUE
238 (Table 1). The combination of 70% ETc with daily irrigation ($D_3 \times I_1$) achieved the highest

239 WUE, followed closely by $D_1 \times I_1$. These results demonstrate that daily irrigation consistently
 240 produced higher WUE across all irrigation depths, and deficit irrigation combined with
 241 appropriate intervals can achieve WUE comparable to full irrigation.

242 The lowest WUE was observed in the $D_2 \times I_3$ combination, indicating that moderate water
 243 stress combined with extended intervals may be detrimental to water use efficiency. This
 244 finding supports research by Al-Mehmdy and Fal-Issawi (2023), who reported that the
 245 combination of irrigation depth and frequency significantly influences water use efficiency in
 246 cucumber production.

247 3.7 Practical Implications for Irrigation Management

248 The interaction effects between irrigation depth and interval provide valuable insights for
 249 practical irrigation management. The combination of full irrigation with daily application ($D_1 \times$
 250 I_1) produced the highest yield (9,774.54 kg/ha), while moderate deficit irrigation with daily
 251 application ($D_3 \times I_1$) achieved the highest WUE (210.18 kg/m³). This presents farmers with
 252 flexible options depending on their primary objectives and resource constraints.

253 In water-scarce regions, the $D_3 \times I_1$ combination might be the most practical approach, as it
 254 achieves high WUE while maintaining acceptable yield levels. The relatively small yield
 255 penalty under this treatment (approximately 24% compared to $D_1 \times I_1$) could be offset by
 256 water savings and reduced irrigation costs. This strategy aligns with sustainable agricultural
 257 practices and could be particularly relevant in regions facing increasing water scarcity.

258 Table 1: Effects of irrigation regimes on cucumber yield and water use efficiency

Treatments	Yield (kg/ha)	WUE (kg/m ³)
Irrigation Depth (D)		
D_1 (100% ETc)	8,738.79 a	139.89 b
D_2 (85% ETc)	7,801.37 a	133.50 a
D_3 (70% ETc)	8,025.20 a	155.30 c
Irrigation Interval (I)		
I_1 (Daily)	8,043.20 a	196.52 c
I_2 (2-day)	8,281.18 a	123.47 b
I_3 (3-day)	8,147.86 a	108.69 a
Interaction (D \times I)		
$D_1 \times I_1$	9,774.54 a	207.18 e
$D_1 \times I_2$	7,051.68 b	95.76 a
$D_1 \times I_3$	9,258.81 ab	116.73 b
$D_2 \times I_1$	7,144.88 b	172.21 d
$D_2 \times I_2$	9,232.36 ab	138.09 c
$D_2 \times I_3$	6,812.01 b	90.19 a
$D_3 \times I_1$	7,464.05 ab	210.18 e
$D_3 \times I_2$	8,228.14 ab	136.55 c
$D_3 \times I_3$	8,403.08 ab	119.15 b

259 *Note: Means followed by the same letter(s) within columns are not significantly different at*
 260 *$p \leq 0.05$.*

261 4. CONCLUSION

262 This study highlights the significant impact of irrigation management on cucumber yield and
 263 water use efficiency (WUE) in tropical conditions. Full irrigation (100% ETc) with daily
 264
 265

266 application yielded the highest output (9,774.54 kg/ha), while 70% ETc irrigation with daily
267 intervals achieved the highest WUE (210.18 kg/m³), offering a balance between yield and
268 water conservation. The 85% ETc treatment produced slightly lower yields (7,801.37 kg/ha)
269 compared to both full and 70% ETc irrigation, suggesting it may not provide a distinct
270 advantage in yield or WUE. However, it remains a viable option for farmers aiming to reduce
271 water use without significant yield loss. Daily irrigation consistently outperformed longer
272 intervals in WUE, though two-day intervals yielded comparably. For water-scarce regions,
273 70% ETc with daily irrigation is recommended, while full irrigation with daily intervals is
274 optimal where water is not constrained.

275
276

DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

277 Author hereby declares that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models
278 (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc.) and text-to-image generators have been used during the writing
279 or editing of this manuscript.

280
281

COMPETING INTERESTS

282 Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

283

REFERENCES

285 Abd El-Mageed, T. A., Semida, W. M., Taha, R. S., & Rady, M. M. (2018). Effect of summer-
286 fall deficit irrigation on morpho-physiological, anatomical responses, fruit yield and water use
287 efficiency of cucumber under salt affected soil. *Scientia horticulturae*, 237, 148-
288 155. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scienta.2018.04.014>

289

290 Abdelraouf, R. E., Ghanem, H. G., Bukhari, N. A., & El-Zaidy, M. (2020). Field and Modeling
291 Study on Manual and Automatic Irrigation Scheduling under Deficit Irrigation of Greenhouse
292 Cucumber. *Sustainability*, 12(23), 9819. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12239819>

293

294 Abegunrin, T. P., Awe, G. O., Idowu, D. O., Onigbogi, O. O., & Onofua, O. E. (2013). Effect
295 of Kitchen Wastewater Irrigation on Soil Properties and Growth of Cucumber (*Cucumis*
296 *sativus*). *Journal of Soil Science and Environmental Management*, 4(7), 139–145.
297 <https://doi.org/10.5897/JSSEM2013.0412>

298 Al-Mehmdy, S. M. H., & Fal-Issawi, A. T. (2023). Effect of Interval and Depth Irrigation on
299 Water Use Efficiency, Cucumber Productivity under Green House Conditions and Drip
300 Irrigation. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 1252(1), 1–11.
301 <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1252/1/012052>

302 Cantuário, F. S. de, Salomão, L. C., Curvêlo, C. R. da S., Guimarães, J. de J., Luz, J. M. Q.,
303 Ferreira, L. L., & Pereira, A. I. A. (2021). Growth and yield traits of pickling cucumber plants
304 to measure the impact of different irrigation management practices. *Australian Journal of*
305 *Crop Science*, 15(2), 271–277. <https://doi.org/10.21475/ajcs.21.15.02.p2972>

306 Cheng, M., Wang, H., Fan, J., Zhang, S., Liao, Z., Zhang, F., & Wang, Y. (2021). A global
307 meta-analysis of yield and water use efficiency of crops, vegetables and fruits under full,
308 deficit and alternate partial root-zone irrigation. *Agricultural Water Management*, 248,
309 106771. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2021.106771>

- 310 Comas, L. H., Trout, T. J., DeJonge, K. C., Zhang, H., & Gleason, S. M. (2019). Water
311 productivity under strategic growth stage-based deficit irrigation in maize. *Agricultural Water*
312 *Management*, 212, 433–440. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2018.07.015>
- 313 Kilemo, D. B. (2022). The Review of Water Use Efficiency and Water Productivity Metrics
314 and Their Role in Sustainable Water Resources Management. *OALib*, 09(01), 1–21.
315 <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1107075>
- 316 Naganjali, K., Charitha, N., Aslam, S., Saikishore, A., Sravanthi, D., Siddappa, K., Murthy, K.
317 G. K., Kumar, J. H., Neelima, P., & Pavani, T. (2024). Revamping Water Use in Agriculture:
318 Techniques and Emerging Innovations. *Journal of Scientific Research and Reports*, 30(7),
319 1055–1066. <https://doi.org/10.9734/jsrr/2024/v30i72215>
- 320 Ors, S., Sahin, U., Ekinci, M., Turan, M., & Yildirim, E. (2022). Principles of Irrigation
321 Management for Vegetables. In *Vegetable Crops - Health Benefits and Cultivation*.
322 IntechOpen. <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.101066>
- 323 Parkash, V., Singh, S., Deb, S. K., Ritchie, G. L., & Wallace, R. W. (2021). Effect of deficit
324 irrigation on physiology, plant growth, and fruit yield of cucumber cultivars. *Plant Stress*,
325 1(February), 100004. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stress.2021.100004>
- 326 Shang, S., Gabriel, H. F., & Zhang, Q. (2024). Editorial on Hydrology and Water Resources
327 in Agriculture and Ecology. *Remote Sensing*, 16(2), 238. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs16020238>
- 328 Shani, B. B., & Musa, A. (2019). Evaluation of the Effects of Deficit Irrigation On Water Use
329 Efficiency and Cucumber Growth Under Greenhouse Management, Nigeria. *Journal of*
330 *Agripreneurship and Sustainable Development*, 2(2), 119–124.
- 331 Todorović, M. (2019). Crop Water Requirements and Irrigation Scheduling. In *Encyclopedia*
332 *of Water* (pp. 1–10). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119300762.wsts0204>
- 333 Xu, Q., Dong, X., Huang, W., Li, Z., Huang, T., Song, Z., Yang, Y., & Chen, J. (2024).
334 Evaluating the Effect of Deficit Irrigation on Yield and Water Use Efficiency of Drip Irrigation
335 Cotton under Film in Xinjiang Based on Meta-Analysis. *Plants*, 13(5), 640.
336 <https://doi.org/10.3390/plants13050640>
- 337 Yu, L., Zhao, X., Gao, X., & Siddique, K. H. M. (2020). Improving/maintaining water-use
338 efficiency and yield of wheat by deficit irrigation: A global meta-analysis. *Agricultural Water*
339 *Management*, 228, 105906. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2019.105906>
- 340 Z akka, E. J., Onwuegbunam, N. E., Dare, A., Onwuegbunam, D. O., & Emeghara, U. U.
341 (2020). Yield, water use and water productivity of drip-irrigated cucumber in response to
342 irrigation depths and intervals in Kaduna, Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Technology*, 39(2),
343 613–620. <https://doi.org/10.4314/njt.v39i2.33>
- 344 Zhao, H., Di, L., Yu, E., Guo, L., Li, L., Zhang, C., & Li, H. (2023). A Review of Scientific
345 Irrigation Scheduling Methods. *2023 11th International Conference on Agro-Geoinformatics*
346 *(Agro-Geoinformatics)*, 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1109/Agro-Geoinformatics59224.2023.10233677>
- 348 Zou, Y., Saddique, Q., Ali, A., Xu, J., Khan, M. I., Qing, M., Azmat, M., Cai, H., & Siddique,
349 K. H. M. (2021). Deficit irrigation improves maize yield and water use efficiency in a semi-

350 arid environment. *Agricultural Water Management*, 243, 106483.
351 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2020.106483>

352