Sustainable Spray Technology: A Battery-Powered Shielded Sprayer for Chilly Crop for Drift Reduction

*\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_*

**ABSTRACT**

The study tackles low mechanization and pesticide drift in India’s small‐scale farming by designing, evaluating, and conducting a cost analysis of a battery‑powered, shielded inter‑row sprayer to improve pest control efficiency and minimize environmental impact. It was designed with a DC motor, Li-ion battery, nozzle-equipped adjustable boom, and shield to minimize drift. The sprayer uses interchangeable nozzles (hollow cone, flat fan) with a discharge rate of 900–1000 ml/min and a spray angle of 70–80. Powered by a 0.5 hp DC motor and guided by an Atmega16 controller, it includes rubber wheels and shielded nozzles for precise, drift-free spraying in chilly crop. Performance evaluation included laboratory tests per IS standards and field trials on 54 plots using different speeds, nozzle types, and heights. Spray parameters like droplet density, Volume Median Diameter (VMD), Number Median Diameter (NMD), Homogeneity Factor (HF), spray deposition, application rate, effective field capacity, field efficiency and ergonomic parameters like heart rate and comfort rating were analyzed for chilly crop. Field experiments indicated that droplet density decreased as with increase in spray height and increase in forward speed for changes nozzle type. Maximum droplet density was found at hollow cone nozzle, 0.4 m/s forward speed and 0.4 m height of nozzle (57.47 no./cm²) for chilly crop. Most uniform droplet size was found at hollow cone nozzle,0.7m/s forward speed and 0.4 height of nozzle as HF was closer to one (1.58), for chilly crop. The highest total deposition was observed in N1S2H2 (85.17%), while the lowest was found in N1S3H1 (82.44%). The maximum EFC was observed in N1S3H3 (0.328 ha/h), indicating higher speed improves field coverage efficiency, while the highest field efficiency was recorded in N2S1H1 (67.28%) and the lowest in N2S3H2 (51.34%). Heart rate increased with increased forward speeds, while the comfort rating was highest at low forward speed. Plant damage was highest (4.30%) in N1S2H1, with no damage in N1S1H3, showing that optimized sprayer settings reduce plant damage. The developed sprayer significantly reduced time, covering one hectare in only 4.40 hours compared to 11.62 hours with a battery-operated manual knapsack sprayer. This research provides compact design, effective field performance, and ergonomic operation make it ideal for improving weed and pest control in row crops like chilly.
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**1. INTRODUCTION**

 Agriculture remains vital to India's economy, supporting over 42% of the population and contributing significantly to GDP, despite facing challenges like small landholdings and declining farm sizes. Mechanization is increasingly essential due to labor shortages and the need for increased productivity and efficiency in farm operations. However, mechanization in India varies widely, with low adoption in some practices like plant protection and weeding.

 Farm mechanization, including the use of equipment for pesticide application, plays a vital role in improving agricultural productivity. Spraying pesticides, though essential for pest control, is a process fraught with risks. The widespread use of pesticides and herbicides in Indian agriculture is crucial for crop protection but is often inefficient, leading to environmental pollution and health hazards due to drift and misapplication. Uniform and targeted application, especially for herbicides, is necessary to improve effectiveness and minimize damage.

 Weed management is particularly critical as it can cause crop yield losses ranging from 10% to 100%. Traditional manual weeding is labor-intensive and expensive, making herbicides a preferred option. However, herbicide drift poses risks to surrounding crops and ecosystems. Shielded sprayers can mitigate this drift but are limited in availability and adoption, especially among small and marginal farmers who lack access to large machinery.

 Chilly (Capsicum frutescens L.) is a spices crop; the hallmark of Indian cuisine is the use of spices and chilies. Indians themselves consider chilies as an integral part of their food. Prior to the arrival of chilies, the two main ingredients used to spice up Indian food were the long pepper (grown in Bengal in East India) and black pepper (grown along the Western Coast, in particular Malabar in Kerala). In Gujarat, chili occupies 0.12 lakh ha area with a production of 0.23 lakh MT in 2020-21 (Directorate of Agriculture, 2021).

 With the dominance of small-scale farmers in India, affordable and efficient solutions like battery-operated shielded sprayers are essential. These sprayers not only reduce labor and energy costs but are also more environmentally friendly. Therefore, the study aims with below objectives to develop and evaluate a battery-powered shielded sprayer for herbicide and pesticide application for effective and sustainable crop protection.

1. To standardize operational parameters of shielded spraying for chilly crop.
2. To evaluate the techno-economic feasibility of shielded sprayer.

**2. MATERIALS AND METHOD**

**2.1 Study Site and Crops**

**Location:** Development and lab work at CAET, AAU Godhra; field trials at the college’s instructional farm in Kankanpur (22°56′ N, 72°53′ E).

**Crops:** Chilly (Capsicum frutescens L., var. VNR 332), selected for 500–600 mm row spacing. Crop parameters (age, canopy dimensions, inter-plant/row spacing) were measured to inform machine design.

**2.2 Design & Fabrication of Battery-Operated Shielded Sprayer**

 The sprayer was developed as per shown Fig.2.1 with objectives an easy in-row operation, low cost, locally maintainable, time/labor saving, drift-reducing shield. The developed sprayer includes an adjustable MS frame with dimensions ranging from 1000–1400 mm in length and 460–1350 mm in width, weighing 60 kg when loaded. It features a 40-liter PVC tank, a 12V diaphragm pump, and lithium-ion batteries (12V, 25Ah & 15Ah). The sprayer uses interchangeable nozzles (hollow cone, flat fan) with a discharge rate of 800–1000 ml/min and a spray angle of 70–80°. Powered by a 0.5 hp DC motor and guided by an Atmega16 controller, it includes rubber wheels and shielded nozzles for precise, drift-free spraying in row crops.



**Fig. 2.1 Schematic views of developed sprayer**

**2.3 Laboratory study**

 The tests were conducted to assess the nozzle parameter selection different parameters such as spray angle and width, nozzle discharge and spray pattern. The optimum values of those are important to ascertain the working of sprayer in the field condition. Measured spray angle and width, discharge (l/min), and distribution uniformity using a 41-channel patternator at 1–2.5 kg/cm², heights 400–600 mm of ranging.

**2.4 Field performance study**

The field studies were conducted to assess the performance of the developed shielded sprayer in real agricultural conditions, focusing on factors like; nozzle type (hollow cone, flat fan), forward speed (0.40, 0.55, 0.70 m/s), nozzle height (0.40, 0.50, 0.60 m). It was conducted on chilly crop. Factorial RBD with 3 parameters like; nozzle type (hollow cone, flat fan), forward speed (0.40, 0.55, 0.70 m/s), nozzle height (0.40, 0.50, 0.60 m) in 18 treatments × 3 replications = 54 plots (3168 m²) in 2025. The evaluation of developed sprayer performance involved analyzing Spray and field parameters like droplet density, Volume Median Diameter (VMD), Number Median Diameter (NMD), Homogeneity Factor (HF), spray deposition, application rate, effective field capacity, field efficiency and ergonomical parameters like heart rate and comfort rating were analyzed for chilly crop are as follows:

**2.4.1 Spray parameter (Droplet size analysis)**

 Droplet size analysis included finding of droplet density, NMD, VMD, HF and deposition. For which (strips of known spread factor 1.16) glossy paper strip was put on upper and lower side of the leaf at top and middle of the plant and one strip was put on ground in rows. The open-source ImageJ software was used for further analysis of the strip.

**Droplet Density:** Number of droplets deposited per cm².

$$Droplet density(droplets/cm^{2})=\frac{Total number of droplets in selected image area }{Selected Image area}$$

**Number Median Diameter (NMD):** Diameter dividing droplets into two equal parts by number.

**Volume Median Diameter (VMD):** Mid-way droplet size when accumulated volume of smaller droplets accounts for 50% of sprayed liquid.

**Homogeneity Factor (HF):** Ratio of VMD to NMD, indicating droplet formation homogeneity.

**Deposition:** The droplet deposition is the volume deposited per cm2 area or percentage. It was calculated by following equation.

$$Deposition (μl/cm^{2})=\frac{Total volume of all droplets on the selected area of strip }{selected  area of strip }$$

**2.4.2 Field evaluation and ergonomical parameters**

 Field evaluation parameters comprised theoretical field capacity (TFC), effective field capacity (EFC), field efficiency (FE), application rate & ergonomical parameters like heart rate, comfort rating was found by using standard formulas.

**2.4.3 Experimental procedures**

 The shielded sprayer specific calibration followed the same procedures as the laboratory experiment. A methylene blue dye solution was prepared and filled into the sprayer tank. Glossy paper strips were then installed at various positions on the plants to capture spray data. The experimental procedure involved developed sprayer over the marked plot according to the designated treatment combinations. The time taken to cover the length and area was recorded, and the volume of liquid sprayed/consumed was measured. The strips were removed for analysis after each pass and placed new for subsequent trials. Each treatment was replicated thrice within a single day to ensure data reliability.

**2.4.4 Statistical Analysis**

Data obtained from experiments was also assessed through RBD statistical analysis was used to correlate response variations with independent variables. Optimum process conditions are required to significantly enhance the performance of battery operated sprayer with shield. Numerical optimization has been conducted to evaluate the different nozzles, optimum forward speed and height of spray nozzle for chilly and cabbage were used for the design of experiments to study the effects.

**2.5 Techno-economical Evaluation**

 The parameters like operational Cost (fixed and variable costs) were taken into consideration to estimate the cost of operations by using IS: 9164-1979 test code, payback period and B:C ratio was calculated by using standard method and formulas.

**2.5.1 Fixed Costs**

***Depreciation***

$D=\frac{P-S}{L}$

Where, D= Average annual depreciation, ₹/year; P= Purchase price of machine, ₹; S= Residual value of machine (5% of purchase price), ₹; L= Life of machine, years

***Interest on investment***

$$I=\frac{P+S}{2}×\frac{i}{100}$$

Where, I= Interest on investment, ₹/year; P= Purchase price, ₹; S= Residual value, ₹, i = Rate of interest %

***Insurance and Taxes***

Actual amount paid or to be paid annually for insurance and annual taxes, if any should be charged. If the information is not available, it may be calculated on the basis of 2 percent of the average purchase price of the machine.

***Housing***

It should be calculated on the basis of 1 percent of the average purchase price of the machine.

**2.5.2 Variable Cost**

The variable costs as the name suggests vary with its use and they are expressed as costs per unit area worked or hour of operation. They are divided into maintenance and repair costs, Electricity charges Labour charges.

Fixed and variable costs give the overall costs of operation of a machine. Labour charges must be added depending on labour requirements of particular operation.

**2.5.3 Payback period**

The payback period of developed sprayer on hour and hectare basis had worked out based on relationship of annual use of working hours, total benefits and total manufacturing cost and net benefits suggested by (Rahman et al.,2013). The payback period is expressed by the relation given below:

 Payback period = (Initial investment)/(Average net benefit)

Where,

Average net benefit (₹) = (Custom hiring rate, ₹/h-Total operating cost Rs/h)

Custom hiring rate, ₹/h = (Cost of operation of applicator per hour + 25 %

 Overhead Charge) + 25 % profit over new cost

**3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**3.1 Effect of independent variables on droplet density**

An experiment was conducted to know the effect of type of nozzle(N), forward speed(S) and height of nozzle(H) on the droplet density. The ANOVA given in Table 3.1 and Fig.3.1 shows that the effect of type of nozzle(N), forward speed(S), km/h and height of nozzle(H), m and their NS & SH interactions on the droplet density was found of significant at 5% level of significance.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.1: Analysis of variance for Droplet density (chilly)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source of Variation**  | **DF** | **S S** | **M S** | **F-Cal.** | **S Em** | **Test** |
| **N** | 1 | 4.785 | 4.785 | 49.78 | 0.060  | \* |
| **S** | 2 | 1008.9 | 504.4 | 5248.3 | 0.073 | \* |
| **N \* S** | 2 | 0.740 | 0.370 | 3.85 | 0.103 | \* |
| **H** | 2 | 70.935 | 35.468 | 368.97 | 0.073 | \* |
| **N \* H** | 2 | 0.544 | 0.272 | 2.83 | 0.103 | NS |
| **S \* H** |  4 |  6.556 | 1.639 | 17.05 | 0.127 | \* |
| **N \*S\*H** | 4 | 0.241 | 0.060 | 0.63 | 0.179 | NS |
| **Error** | 34 | 3.268 | 0.096 |  |  |  |
| **Total** | **53** | **1096.54** |  | **C V %: 0.62** |  |

*(N: Type of Nozzles, S: Forward speed, H: Height of Nozzle \*= P<0.05)* | **Fig. 3.1Effect of nozzle type (N), forward speed(S) and height of nozzle(H) on droplet density** |

**3.2 Effect of independent variables on Homogeneity Factor**

The experiment was conducted to know the effect of independent variables i.e., type of nozzle(N), forward speed(S) and height of nozzle(H) on the HF at chilly crop. The homogeneity factor (HF) is the ratio of the VMD to NMD. The ANOVA given in Table 3.2 and Fig.3.2 shows that effect of types of nozzles, forward speed(S) and height of nozzle (H) and their interaction on the HF was found significant at 5% level of significance.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.2: Analysis of variance for HF (Chilly)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source of Variation**  | **DF** | **S S** | **M S** | **F-Cal.** | **S Em** | **Test** |
| **N** | 1 | 0.301 | 0.301 | 165.90 | 0.008  | \* |
| **S** | 2 | 0.015 | 0.007 | 4.09 | 0.010 | \* |
| **N \* S** | 2 | 0.085 | 0.043 | 23.49 | 0.014 | \* |
| **H** | 2 | 0.119 | 0.060 | 32.84 | 0.010 | \* |
| **N \* H** | 2 | 0.223 | 0.111 | 61.40 | 0.014 | \* |
| **S \* H** |  4 |  0.056 | 0.014 | 7.70 | 0.017 | \* |
| **N \*S\*H** | 4 | 0.069 | 0.017 | 9.47 | 0.025 | \* |
| **Error** | 34 | 0.062 | 0.002 |  |  |  |
| **Total** | **53** | **0.929** |  | **C V %: 2.38** |  |

*(N: Type of Nozzles, S: Forward speed, H: Height of Nozzle \*= P<0.05)* | **Fig. 4.4 Effect of nozzle type (N), forward speed(S) and height of nozzle(H) on HF** |

**3.3 Effect of independent variables on Deposition**

 An experiment was conducted to know the effect of type of nozzle(N), forward speed(S) and nozzle height(H) on the deposition of chilly crop. The ANOVA given in Table 3.3 and Fig.3.3 indicates the percentage of other losses, which is the spray that does not reach the target and deposition losses away. Comparing the heights of nozzle, H2 generally exhibits the highest deposition percentages at various locations, while H1 & H3 tends to have the lowest deposition percentages for chilly crop.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.3 Average deposition for individual variables**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **Deposition, %** |
| **H1** | **H2** | **H3** |
| **Top Upper** | 38.15 | 38.84 | 37.29 |
| **Top Lower** | 5.23 | 4.73 | 4.38 |
| **Middle Upper** | 15.01 | 20.17 | 23.67 |
| **Middle Lower** | 5.20 | 5.20 | 4.35 |
| **Bottom** | 19.12 | 19.12 | 13.75 |
| **Total on plants** | 82.71 | 85.01 | 83.44 |
| **Other losses** | 17.29 | 14.99 | 16.56 |

 | **Fig. 3.3 Effect of nozzle type (N), forward speed(S) and height of nozzle(H) on deposition** |

**3.4 Effect of independent variables on EFC**

 An experiment was conducted to know the effect of type of nozzle(N), forward speed(S) and nozzle height, on the Effective field capacity (EFC) of chilly crop. The ANOVA given in Table 3.4 and Fig.3.4 indicates the effect of height of nozzle(H) and forward speed(S) & interaction of NH found significant at 5% level of significance whereas their interaction on the EFC and effect of types of nozzles was found non-significant and the interaction of height of nozzle(H) and forward speed(S) was also found non-significant.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  **Table 3.4: Analysis of variance for EFC (Chilly)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source of Variation**  | **DF** | **S S** | **M S** | **F-Cal.** | **S Em** | **Test** |
| **N** | 1 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.04 | 0.001  | NS |
| **S** | 2 | 0.076 | 0.038 | 1230.17 | 0.001 | \* |
| **N \* S** | 2 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.19 | 0.002 | \* |
| **H** | 2 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 3.81 | 0.001 | \* |
| **N \* H** | 2 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 4.33 | 0.002 | \* |
| **S \* H** |  4 |  0.000 | 0.000 | 2.44 | 0.002 | NS |
| **N \*S\*H** | 4 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 2.49 | 0.003 | NS |
| **Error** | 34 | 0.001 | 0.000 |  |  |  |
| **Total** | **53** | **0.079** |  | **C V %: 2.07** |  |

*(N: Type of Nozzles, S: Forward speed, H: Height of Nozzle \*= P<0.05)* | **Fig. 3.4 Effect of nozzle type (N), forward speed(S) and height of nozzle(H) on EFC**  |

**3.5 Effect of independent variables on Plant damage**

An experiment was conducted to know the effect of type of nozzle (N), forward speed(S) and height of nozzle (H) on the plant damage. The ANOVA given in Table 3.5 and Fig.3.5 indicates that the effect of type of nozzle(N), forward speed(S), km/h and height of nozzle(H), m on the plant damage was found of significant at 5% level of significance and their interactions was found of non-significant due to crop parameters may be affect.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.5: Analysis of variance for Plant damage (Chilly)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source of Variation**  | **DF** | **S S** | **M S** | **F-Cal.** | **S Em** | **Test** |
| **N** | 1 | 0.685 | 0.685 | 0.25 | 0.029 | \* |
| **S** | 2 | 7.852 | 3.926 | 1.44 | 0.036 | \* |
| **N \* S** | 2 | 2.507 | 1.253 | 0.46 | 0.051 | NS |
| **H** | 2 | 12.720 | 6.360 | 2.33 | 0.036 | \* |
| **N \* H** | 2 | 3.014 | 1.507 | 0.55 | 0.051 | NS |
| **S \* H** |  4 |  9.480 | 2.370 | 0.87 | 0.062 | \* |
| **N \*S\*H** | 4 | 14.447 | 3.612 | 1.32 | 0.088 | NS |
| **Error** | 34 | 92.805 | 2.730 |  |  |  |
| **Total** | **53** | **146.446** | **C V %: 104.17** |  |

*(N: Type of Nozzles, S: Forward speed, H: Height of Nozzle \*= P<0.05)* | **Fig.3.5 Effect of nozzle type (N), forward speed(S) and height of nozzle(H) on plant damage** |

**3.6 Effect of independent variables on Heart rate (HR)**

 An experiment was conducted to know the effect of type of nozzle(N), forward speed(S) and height of nozzle(H) on the heart rate (HR). The ANOVA given in Table 3.6 and Fig.3.6 indicates the effect of type of nozzle (N), forward speed(S) and height of nozzle (H) and their interactions on the heart rate was found of significant at 5% level of significance.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.6: Analysis of variance for HR (Chilly)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source of Variation**  | **DF** | **S S** | **M S** | **S Em** | **Test** |
| **N** | 1 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000  | \* |
| **S** | 2 | 729.333 | 364.667 | 0.000 | \* |
| **N \* S** | 2 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | \* |
| **H** | 2 | 49.333 | 24.667 | 0.000 | \* |
| **N \* H** | 2 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | \* |
| **S \* H** |  4 | 22.667 | 5.667 | 0.000 | \* |
| **N \*S\*H** | 4 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | \* |
| **Error** | 34 | 0.000 | 0.000 |  |  |
| **Total** | **53** | **945.333** | **C V %: 0.00** |  |

*(N: Type of Nozzles, S: Forward speed, H: Height of Nozzle \*= P<0.05)* | **Fig. 3.6 Effect of nozzle type (N), forward speed(S) and height of nozzle(H) on HR**  |

**3.7 Effect of independent variables on Comfort rating (CR)**

An experiment was conducted to know the effect of type of nozzle(N), forward speed(S) and height of nozzle(H) on the comfort rating (CR). The ANOVA given in Table 3.7 and Fig.3.7 shows that the effect of type of nozzle (N) and forward speed(S) was found of significant at 5% level of significance and height of nozzle (H) and all interactions on the CR was found of non-significant.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3.7: Analysis of variance for CR (Chilly)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source of Variation**  | **DF** | **S S** | **M S** | **F-Cal.** | **S Em** | **Test** |
| **N** | 1 | 0.667 | 0.667 | 6.88 | 0.060  | \* |
| **S** | 2 | 34.037 | 17.019 | 175.54 | 0.073 | \* |
| **N \* S** | 2 | 0.111 | 0.056 | 0.57 | 0.104 | NS |
| **H** | 2 | 0.481 | 0.241 | 2.48 | 0.073 | NS |
| **N \* H** | 2 | 0.111 | 0.056 | 0.57 | 0.104 | NS |
| **S \* H** |  4 | 0.519 | 0.130 | 1.34 | 0.127 | NS |
| **N \*S\*H** | 4 | 0.444 | 0.111 | 1.15 | 0.180 | NS |
| **Error** | 34 | 3.296 | 0.097 |  |  |  |
| **Total** | **53** | **39.704** | **C V %: 7.64** |

*(N: Type of Nozzles, S: Forward speed, H: Height of Nozzle \*= P<0.05)* | **Fig. 3.6 Effect of nozzle type (N), forward speed(S) and height of nozzle(H) on CR**  |

**4. CONCLUSIONS**

From the study, following conclusions were drawn.

 The developed sprayer obtained superior performance in terms of spray quality, operational efficiency, and economic viability. Optimal droplet density (57.47 no./cm²) and uniformity (HF = 1.58) were achieved using a hollow cone nozzle at 0.4 m/s speed and 0.4 m height. Maximum field capacity (0.328 ha/h) and efficiency (67.28%) highlight operational effectiveness, while deposition remained consistent (82–85%). Speed influenced operator heart rate (103–114 bpm) and comfort (rating 3–5). Minimal plant damage (0%) occurred under optimized settings, support its safety. The sprayer operates at 329 ₹/ha (74.65 ₹/h), with a benefit:cost ratio of 3.13, offering a net gain of 53.87 ₹/h and quick payback (232.36 ha). Compared to traditional knapsack sprayers, it is nearly twice as cost-efficient and 2.5 times faster, making it highly suitable for small and marginal farmers.

The developed battery-operated shielded sprayer proved to be technically efficient (uniform droplet size, low drift), ergonomically safe (lower heart rate, higher comfort), economically viable (low cost, fast payback), and environmentally friendly (battery-powered, low emissions). A battery-operated shielded sprayer, offering a valuable contribution to sustainable agriculture, particularly for small-scale farming operations. By integrating battery power and shielded spraying, the design significantly reduces chemical drift and emissions, addressing both economic and environmental concerns. This innovation supports precision agriculture practices, promotes safer pesticide use, and lowers the dependency on fossil fuels. It is especially suited for small and marginal farmers, supporting precision agriculture, timely field operations, and sustainable mechanization.
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