

**ESTIMATION AND MODELLING OF POTATO
WATER FOOTPRINT USING MACHINE LEARNING
APPROACH IN NILE DELTA, EGYPT**

By

AMAL MOHAMED ABD EL-HAMEED

B.Sc. Agric. Sci. (Agricultural Engineering), Fac. Agric., Cairo Univ., 2010

M.Sc. Agric. Sci. (Agricultural Engineering), Fac. Agric., Cairo Univ., 2016

THESIS

**Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of**

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In

**Agricultural Sciences
(Agricultural Engineering)**

**Department of Agricultural Engineering
Faculty of Agriculture
Cairo University
EGYPT**

2021

Format Reviewer

Vice Dean of Graduate Studies

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
1. Water situation in Egypt	5
2. Water management	7
3. Water footprint	7
a. Water footprint components	10
b. Water footprint for crops.....	11
c. Blue and green water footprint calculation	13
4. Machine learning approach	16
a. Application of Machine Learning Techniques.....	17
b. Types of Machine Learning	18
(1) Random Forest (RF)	21
(2) Support Vector Machines (SVM)	24
(3) Extreme Gradient Boost (XGB).....	26
(4) Artificial neural network (ANN).....	28
5. Potatoes crop	31
MATERIALS AND METHODS	33
1. Water footprint	33
a. The study area.....	33

CONTENTS (continued)

b. Data sources.....	35
c. Crop evapotranspiration.....	35
d. Water footprint calculations.....	37
e. Spatiotemporal analysis.....	38
f. Water footprint validation.....	39
(1) Field experiments.....	39
(2) Crop management and irrigation.....	40
2. Machine learning	41
a. location and datasets.....	41
b. Machine learning approaches.....	42
c. Support vector.....	43
d. Random forest (RF).....	44
e. Artificial Neural Network (ANN).....	45
f. Extreme gradient Boosting (XGBoost).....	47
g. Model performance.....	48
RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS	52
1. Water footprint analysis	52
a. The spatiotemporal changes of climate variables (1990–2016).....	52
b. Response of ET_C to climate parameters.....	56
c. Potato’s yield variations during the 1990–2016.....	57
d. Spatiotemporal distribution of the agriculture water footprint.....	58

CONTENTS (continued)

2. Water footprint validation.....	67
a. Crop evapotranspiration and yield.....	67
b. Blue and green water footprint.....	68
c. Total water footprint.....	69
3. Machine learning models.....	72
a. Evaluation of the machine learning models.....	72
b. The accuracy of the models.....	78
c. Comparison of the machine learning models.....	81
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	86
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	91
REFERENCES.....	92
ARABIC SUMMARY.....	110

LIST OF TABLES

No.	Title	Page
1.	Available water resources for Egypt (billion.m ⁻³)	6
2.	Average total water footprint (m ³ / ton) of Egyptian crops inside and outside the Nile Valley and Delta.....	12
3.	The study governorates areas and geographical coordinates.....	34
4.	The physical properties of the experimental soil.....	39
5.	Chemical analysis of the experimental site.....	39
6.	Summary combinations of blue water footprint for the developed models.....	43
7.	Nash–Sutcliffe efficiency coefficient (NSE) value.....	49
8.	The range of the scatter index SI.....	51
9.	Potatoes evapotranspiration during the two growing seasons.....	67
10.	Potatoes yield during the two growing seasons.....	68
11.	Performance metrics of the model applied for the blue water footprint.....	76

LIST OF FIGURES

No	Title	Page
.		
1.	Average total water footprint values (m ³ /ton) for different crops in Egypt (1995–2006)	13
2.	Machine Learning Supervise Process.....	20
3.	Random forest.....	21
4.	Support vector machine.....	25
5.	The typical Artificial Neural Network.....	29
6.	Artificial Neural Network architecture.....	30
7.	Study area location with meteorological stations.....	33
8.	The highest governorates in potato production during the period 1990-2016.....	41
9.	The temporal changes of a) effective precipitation, b) min. temperature, c) max. temperatures, d) wind speed, e) relative humidity and f) crop evapotranspiration.....	54
10.	The spatial distribution of a) effective precipitation, b) max. temperatures, c) min. temperature, d) wind speed, e) relative humidity and f) crop evapotranspiration.....	55
11.	Correlation matrix between max. temperatures, min. temperature, wind speed, relative humidity.....	57
12.	Time evolution of the potato's yield at the 10 governorates during the 1990–2016.....	59
13.	Spatial distribution of the agriculture water footprint (GWF and BWF) during the period from 1990-2016.....	60
14.	Agriculture water footprint (BWF and GWF) and its composition during the period from 1990-2016.....	62
15.	Composition of the agriculture water footprint during the period from 1990-2016.....	62

FIGURES (continued)

16. The relationship between yield and WF from 1990 to 2016.....	63
17. The average BWF, GWF, yield, ETc and P _{eff} for each governorates during 1990-2016.....	65
18. The time series of total water footprint, yield and ETc.....	66
19. Blue water footprint (m ³ /ton) for potato.....	69
20. Green water footprint (m ³ /ton) for potato.....	70
21. Total water footprint (m ³ /ton) for potato.....	71
22. Blue and green water footprint contribution of the total water footprint (m ³ /ton) for potato a) calculated data, and b) field data.....	72
23. Performance statistics of the applied ML models for the 6 different climate variable combination scenarios.....	74
24. Radar charts of the accuracy and mean absolute percentage error (MAPE) of the blue water footprint (BWF) for the applied ML models.....	79
25. Percentage error of the applied ML models during the test stage.....	81
26. Scatter plot of the applied models over the 6 scenarios for estimating the BWF	83
26. Boxplots showing the distribution of the estimation errors of the BWF in the test section for the best model-scenario.....	85