

## Sprinkler Evaporation Losses in Alfalfa during Solid-set Sprinkler Irrigation in Semi Arid Areas

	<i>Irrigation Science</i>
	Original Paper
	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	STAMBOULI, TALEL; The Agrifood Research and Technology Center of Aragón (CITA-DGA), Soil and Irrigation Martínez-Cob, Antonio; Estación Experimental Aula Dei, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (EEAD-CSIC), Agua y Suelo Faci, José Maria; The Agri-Food Research and Technology Centre of Aragón (CITA-DGA), Suelos y Riegos Howell, Terry; Conservation and Production Research Laboratory (CPRL-ARS-USDA), Soil and Water Resources Management Unit Zapata, Nery; Estación Experimental Aula Dei, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (EEAD-CSIC), Agua y Suelo

## Sprinkler Evaporation Losses in Alfalfa during Solid-set Sprinkler Irrigation in Semi Arid Areas

### ABSTRACT

Gross sprinkler evaporation losses ( $SEL_g$ ) can be large and decrease irrigation application efficiency. However, it is not universally established how much of the  $SEL_g$  contributes to decrease the crop evapotranspiration during the sprinkler irrigation and how much are the net sprinkler losses ( $SEL_n$ ). The components of SEL were the wind drift and evaporation losses (WDEL) and the water intercepted by the crop (IL). The gross WDEL ( $WDEL_g$ ) and evapotranspiration (ET) were measured simultaneously in two alfalfa (*Medicago sativa* L.) plots, one being irrigated (moist, MT) and the other one not being irrigated (dry, DT). Catch can measurements, mass gains and losses in the lysimeters and micrometeorological measurements were performed to establish net WDEL ( $WDEL_n$ ) during the irrigation and net IL ( $IL_n$ ) after the irrigation as the difference between  $ET_{MT}$  and  $ET_{DT}$ . Also, equations to estimate  $IL_n$  and net sprinkler evaporation losses ( $SEL_n$ ) were developed.  $IL_n$  was strongly related to vapor pressure deficit (VPD).  $SEL_n$  were 8.3% of the total applied water. During daytime irrigations,  $SEL_n$  was 9.8% of the irrigation water and slightly less than  $WDEL_g$  (10.9%). During nighttime irrigations  $SEL_n$  were slightly greater than  $WDEL_g$  (5.4% and 3.7%, respectively).  $SEL_n$  was mainly a function of wind speed.

### KEY WORDS

*Gross wind drift and evaporation losses, Net wind drift and evaporation losses, Gross interception losses, Net interception losses, Gross Sprinkler evaporation losses, Net sprinkler evaporation losses, Weighing lysimeters, Day/night time irrigation, Microclimatic and Physiological changes.*

**ABBREVIATIONS**

1		
2		
3		
4	ai	= After irrigation
5		
6	AMRE	= Average Magnitude of Relative Error
7		
8	CV	= Coefficient of variation
9		
10	d1	= Large nozzle diameter (mm)
11		
12	d2	= Small nozzle diameter (mm)
13		
14	D <sub>c</sub>	= Discharge coefficient (= 0.98)
15	di	= During irrigation
16		
17	DT	= Dry treatment
18		
19	E	= Coefficient of Efficiency
20		
21	EF	= Water application efficiency (%)
22		
23	EP	= Effective precipitation (mm)
24		
25	ET <sub>o</sub>	= Reference evapotranspiration (mm)
26		
27	ET <sub>c</sub>	= Crop evapotranspiration (mm)
28		
29	ET <sub>DT</sub>	= Evapotranspiration rate of the dry treatment plot (mm h <sup>-1</sup> )
30		
31	ET <sub>MT</sub>	= Evapotranspiration rate of the moist treatment plot (mm h <sup>-1</sup> )
32		
33	g	= Gravity acceleration (m s <sup>-2</sup> )
34		
35	H	= Nozzle height (m)
36		
37	I <sub>cc</sub>	= Irrigation depth collected in the catch can (mm)
38		
39	I <sub>g</sub>	= Gross irrigation depth (mm)
40		
41	I <sub>lcc</sub>	= Irrigation depth collected in the lysimeter (mm)
42		
43	I <sub>lq</sub>	= Irrigation application for the lowest quarter of the field (mm)
44		
45	I <sub>lys</sub>	= irrigation depth recorded by the lysimeter (mm)
46		
47	IL	= Intercepted losses (% or mm)
48		
49	IL <sub>g</sub>	= Gross Intercepted losses (% or mm)
50		
51	IL <sub>n</sub>	= Net interception losses (% or mm)
52		
53	IS	= Similarity Index
54		
55	k	= Total Irrigation duration (hours)
56		
57	K <sub>c</sub>	= Crop coefficient
58		
59	MAE	= Mean average error
60		
	MSE	= Mean square error
	m	= Time after irrigation event considered to compute the IL <sub>n</sub> (hours)

1		
2		
3	MT	= Moist treatment
4		
5	NIR	= Net irrigation requirements (mm)
6		
7	P	= Pressure at the nozzle (kPa)
8		
9	Pred [0.25]	= The level of prediction to 25 %
10		
11	Q	= Sprinkler flow rate ( $l\ s^{-1}$ )
12		
13	$R^2$	= Coefficient of determination
14	RH	= Air relative humidity (%)
15		
16	S	= Area irrigated by one sprinkler ( $m^2$ )
17		
18	SEL	= Sprinkler evaporation losses (mm or %)
19		
20	$SEL_n$	= Net sprinkler evaporation losses (mm or %)
21		
22	T	= Air temperature ( $^{\circ}C$ )
23		
24	TV	= Canopy temperature ( $^{\circ}C$ )
25		
26	t	= Operating time of the irrigation event (s, h)
27		
28	WDEL	= Wind drift and evaporation losses (%)
29		
30	$WDEL_g$	= Gross wind drift and evaporation losses (%)
31		
32	$WDEL_n$	= Net wind drift and evaporation losses (%)
33		
34	U	= Wind speed ( $m\ s^{-1}$ )
35		
36	VPD	= Vapor pressure deficit (kPa)
37		
38		
39		
40		
41		
42		
43		
44		
45		
46		
47		
48		
49		
50		
51		
52		
53		
54		
55		
56		
57		
58		
59		
60		

## INTRODUCTION

Irrigation has an important role to increase and stabilize the crop yield, while the application efficiency is important when selecting a suitable irrigation method and scheduling in arid and semi-arid regions. A fraction of the water applied by the sprinkler nozzles is lost by evaporation before reaching the soil during sprinkler irrigation events. These sprinkler evaporation losses (SEL) can be divided in wind drift and evaporation losses (WDEL) and interception losses (IL).

$$SEL = WDEL + IL \quad (1)$$

WDEL represent the water lost during the travel of the water droplets from the sprinkler nozzle to the surface being irrigated. Some of these losses drift away from the irrigated area. Nevertheless, all this water is eventually lost to evaporation. Some water droplets reach the crop leaves and stems but evaporate before reaching the soil surface. These latter losses represent the IL.

Previous works have reported different values and predictive models for WDEL depending upon different experimental conditions: sprinkler spacing, operating pressure, nozzle diameter, and, particularly, meteorological conditions (wind speed, water vapor pressure deficit and temperature) (Yazar, 1984; Tarjuelo et al., 2000). Edling (1985) and Thompson et al. (1993a) found that WDEL were inversely proportional to the diameter of the droplets which in turn depend, among others, on nozzle diameter and nozzle operating pressure (Kohl and Wright 1974; Solomon et al. 1985). Lorenzini (2004) and De Wrachien and Lorenzini (2006) indicated that evaporation losses were directly proportional to droplet diameter considering the effects of air friction (ignored in previous models) on droplet evaporation which is

1  
2  
3 relevant under the turbulent flow commonly found at the boundary layer. Thus,  
4  
5 values of WDEL up to 30 to 50% of the applied water have been reported in the  
6  
7 Middle Ebro River Valley located in the north-eastern of Spain (Playán et al., 2005).  
8  
9  
10 Wind speed and, to a lesser extent, relative humidity have been found to be the most  
11  
12 important meteorological factors affecting WDEL (Playán et al. 2005).  
13  
14

15  
16 By the other hand, IL depends on the water storage capacity of a crop which in  
17  
18 turn depends on its architecture. Several authors have reported IL values for maize  
19  
20 (*Zea mays* L.) of about 2.5 to 2.7 mm (Fritschen, 1960; Seginer, 1967; Smajstrla and  
21  
22 Hanson, 1980; Norman and Campbell, 1983; Steiner et al., 1983a). Lamm and Manges  
23  
24 (2000) estimated an average value of IL of 1.8 mm. For sprinkler irrigation, IL is  
25  
26 quantitatively smaller than WDEL, particularly for long irrigation events, as typical  
27  
28 solid-set sprinkler irrigation depths range between 10 to 50 mm.  
29  
30  
31

32  
33 Due to the water lost to evaporation, the crop microclimate changes during and  
34  
35 just after sprinkler irrigation, i.e. the air temperature (T) and the vapor pressure  
36  
37 deficit (VPD) decrease (Robinson 1970; Steiner et al. 1983b; Tolk et al. 1995). For  
38  
39 maize, this microclimate change only last a few hours after the irrigation event (Tolk  
40  
41 et al., 1995; Cavero et al., 2009). The decline in the VPD, during and after sprinkler  
42  
43 irrigation, would lead to a certain reduction of the crop transpiration rate. This  
44  
45 would result in the conservation of soil water which would otherwise be depleted by  
46  
47 the crop (McNaughton, 1981; Steiner et al., 1983a). Assessment of the effect of  
48  
49 sprinkler irrigation on soil evaporation (E) is more difficult. The increase in soil water  
50  
51 and the presence of ponded water on the soil surface could result in an increased  
52  
53 potential for evaporation. However, the reduction in the evaporative demand of the  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 air, due to the reduction of VPD, will induce a decrease in the evaporation flux.  
4  
5 Nevertheless, the ratio of soil evaporation to crop evapotranspiration ( $ET = E + T$ ) in  
6  
7 fully developed canopies is low.  
8  
9

10  
11 Following McNaughton (1981), any reduction in crop ET from a wetted surface  
12  
13 (compared to that from a dry area not being irrigated simultaneously but kept under  
14  
15 similar water availability conditions) can be subtracted from the gross irrigation  
16  
17 water losses to estimate the net irrigation water losses. At first glance, SEL are  
18  
19 considered consumptive, non-beneficial water use (Burt et al., 1997). However, the  
20  
21 part of SEL replacing crop ET should be regarded as consumptive and beneficial  
22  
23 (McNaughton, 1981). This results in the introduction of gross and net sprinkler  
24  
25 evaporation losses ( $SEL_g$  and  $SEL_n$ ). Eq. (1) is valid for both gross and net losses.  
26  
27 Taking into account net evaporation losses instead of gross evaporation losses could  
28  
29 lead to an increase of application efficiency for a given application depth (Martínez-  
30  
31 Cob et al. 2008).  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 The differences in ET rates between wet and dry surfaces just after irrigation  
40  
41 events have been the object of several studies. Similar ET rates for both wet and dry  
42  
43 crops have been reported by McMillan and Burgy (1960), Frost (1963), and Seginer  
44  
45 (1967). Waggoner et al. (1969) reported short-term ET rates of wet maize canopies  
46  
47 more than twice that of dry maize canopies during the typical summertime  
48  
49 conditions in Connecticut (USA). This difference only lasted for about 15 minutes,  
50  
51 after which the ET rates became similar for both canopies. Less information is  
52  
53 available regarding to the differences in ET rates between wet and dry surfaces  
54  
55 during the irrigation events themselves. Frost and Schwalen (1960) found that dry-  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 leaf ET equaled or exceeded wet-leaf ET (both measured by weighing lysimeters)  
4  
5 under similar atmospheric conditions. Sternberg (1967) reported that rye-grass ET  
6  
7 (also measured by weighing lysimeters) was almost suppressed during irrigation and  
8  
9 decreased by about 33 % after irrigation, as compared to that of a non irrigated  
10  
11 lysimeter. They found a 36-41 % reduction of maize transpiration during two  
12  
13 daytime irrigation events using a lateral move sprinkler irrigation system in Texas  
14  
15 (USA). Tolk et al. (1995) used an energy balance based method to quantify  
16  
17 evaporation rates and net irrigation water depth. What these authors called  
18  
19 interception losses were likely reflecting total SEL rather than IL because the energy  
20  
21 balance as applied by Tolk et al. (1995) would not allow separating WDEL from IL.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 Martínez-Cob et al. (2008) analyzed 21 irrigation events and found average  
28  
29 reductions of maize transpiration of 58 %, and ET of 32-55 % for wet surfaces during  
30  
31 daytime solid-set sprinkler irrigation events. After the irrigation events, the average  
32  
33 reduction of maize transpiration was about 20 %, while ET for the wet surface was  
34  
35 about 35 % higher than that of the dry surface, reflecting the net interception losses  
36  
37 ( $IL_n$ ) just after the irrigation events. Those differences between the wet and dry  
38  
39 surfaces only lasted about 1 to 2 h after the irrigation. Nevertheless, the  $IL_n$  only  
40  
41 amounted 1 % of the applied water. During the irrigation event, the observed sharp  
42  
43 decrease of VPD leads to a lower water vapour gradient between the evaporating  
44  
45 surface and the atmosphere layer next to it (Martinez-Cob et al., 2008). The ratio of  
46  
47 canopy to aerodynamic resistances is also low, so that the reduction of transpiration  
48  
49 almost voids the increased evaporation of intercepted water (Monteith 1981; Steiner  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 et al. 1983a). For these reasons, interception losses during irrigation time were small  
4  
5 enough to be considered as negligible (Martinez-Cob et al., 2008).  
6  
7

8  
9 No much information is available on the possible reduction of alfalfa (*Medicago*  
10  
11 *sativa* L.) ET during and after sprinkler irrigation. There is some evidence of the  
12  
13 possible influence of the wettability of leaves on the gas exchange of different crops  
14  
15 under sprinkler irrigation. Thus Cavero et al. (2010) reported a different wettability of  
16  
17 maize and alfalfa leaves affecting the change of net photosynthesis rates during solid-  
18  
19 set sprinkler irrigation. This different wettability of alfalfa leaves may also have an  
20  
21 influence on the reduction of alfalfa ET rates due to the irrigation as compared to the  
22  
23 previously reported reductions of maize ET. Subsequently, the contribution of alfalfa  
24  
25 ET reduction during and after sprinkler irrigation to application efficiency could be  
26  
27 somewhat different to that reported for maize. Thus the general objective of this  
28  
29 paper was to quantify the net sprinkler evaporation losses ( $SEL_n$ ) for the alfalfa crop  
30  
31 and its components. This objective will be reached through the following specific  
32  
33 objectives:  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

- 39  
40 • Analysis of the meteorological (air temperature, relative humidity and vapor  
41  
42 pressure deficit) and physiological changes (canopy temperature) in alfalfa  
43  
44 during and after solid-set sprinkler irrigation.  
45  
46
- 47  
48 • Characterization of the alfalfa ET before, during and after sprinkler irrigation  
49  
50 as compared to that occurring at the same time in an alfalfa crop not being  
51  
52 irrigated at that moment.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- Evaluation of the gross WDEL ( $WDEL_g$ ) and estimation of the net WDEL ( $WDEL_n$ ) when the contribution of the alfalfa ET reduction during and after irrigation is taken into account.
- Estimation and modeling of the net interception losses ( $IL_n$ ) for alfalfa.
- Quantification and modeling of the sprinkler evaporation losses ( $SEL_n$ ).

For Peer Review Only

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

### General characteristics of the experiments

This research was conducted during the 2009 irrigation season (March-October) at a 2.0 ha field located in Montañana (Zaragoza, NE Spain). Geographical coordinates are 41°43' N latitude and 0°49' W longitude, and the elevation is 225 m above the sea level. The crop was alfalfa. The field was divided in two plots of 1.0 ha each, plots A and B. The available water holding capacity within the top 1.2 m of the soil profile in these plots was 0.173 m<sup>3</sup> m<sup>-3</sup>. The soil is classified as *Typic Xerofluvent*, with a sandy loam texture, mixed (calcareous), and mesic (Soil Survey Staff 1999).

The climate is semiarid Mediterranean. The mean annual values of several meteorological variables are: air temperature, 14°C (24.2 °C for July and 4.8 °C for December); precipitation, 340 mm; reference evapotranspiration (ET<sub>o</sub>), 1,230 mm. The predominant wind directions are northwest (locally denominated Cierzo, dry and cold) and southeast (locally denominated Bochorno, dry and hot) with an annual average wind speed (2-m above ground level) of 2.3 m s<sup>-1</sup>, classified as moderate wind (Martínez-Cob et al. 2010).

A solid-set sprinkler irrigation with a square spacing of 15 m x 15 m was installed in the 2 ha experimental plot (Figure 1). Impact sprinklers (RC-130 model Riegos Costa, Lleida, Spain<sup>1</sup>) were used. These sprinklers had nozzle diameters of 4.4 mm

---

<sup>1</sup> The use of trade, firm, or corporation names in this article is for the information and convenience of the reader. Such use does not constitute an official endorsement or approval by the CITA-DGA or the CSIC or the ARS-USDA of any product or service to the exclusion of others that may be suitable.

and 2.4 mm, a vertical throw angle of 25°, and the nozzle height was located at 2.2 m above the ground. Irrigation pressure was measured every 5 min during each irrigation event by two pressure transducers (Model 2200/2600, Gems Basingstoke, Hampshire, United Kingdom), one in each plot, located in the sprinkler riser pipe at 2.2 m above the ground (Figure 1). The working pressure ( $P$ , kPa) measured by the transducers was used to calculate the gross irrigation depth ( $I_g$ , mm) using the following equation based on the Torricelli's Theorem and the Orifice Equation (Norman et al. 1990):

$$I_g = \frac{[0.00035 \pi D_c \sqrt{P} (d_1^2 + d_2^2)] t}{S} \quad (2)$$

where  $D_c$  is the discharge coefficient ( $D_c = 0.98$  as determined experimentally by Playán et al. 2006);  $d_1$ ,  $d_2$  are the large and small nozzle diameter, respectively, mm;  $t$  is the irrigation event duration, s; and  $S$  is the area irrigated by one sprinkler, m<sup>2</sup> (in this experiment, equal to 15 m x 15 m = 225 m<sup>2</sup>). The application rate for this sprinkler layout working at a pressure of 300 kPa was 7.5 mm h<sup>-1</sup>. For the evaluated irrigations the rate varies according to the working pressure and the irrigation time.

Irrigations were scheduled to meet the crop water requirements, which were computed weekly from reference evapotranspiration ( $ET_o$ ) estimates and local crop coefficients. Daily  $ET_o$  was computed using the FAO Penman-Monteith method (Allen et al. 1998) from the daily meteorological values (air temperature and relative humidity, wind speed and global solar radiation) recorded at a standard automatic weather station located at a grass plot ('grass weather station'), adjacent (northern side) to plot A. Local crop coefficients were derived from tabulated values (Allen et

1  
2  
3 al. 1998) adapted according to local phenological and meteorological data (Martínez-  
4  
5 Cob 2004). Weekly crop water requirements were converted to weekly crop irrigation  
6  
7 requirements (NIR, mm) using the following expression:  
8  
9

$$10 \quad NIR = \frac{K_c ET_0 - EP}{EF_{apl}} \quad (3)$$

11  
12  
13  
14  
15 where EP was effective precipitation, mm, estimated as 75% of recorded precipitation  
16  
17 (Dastane 1978); and  $EF_{apl}$  is water application efficiency estimated as 80% for the  
18  
19 solid-set sprinkler irrigation (Clemmens and Dedrick 1994).  
20  
21

22  
23 A weekly irrigation schedule was established according to NIR such that each  
24  
25 plot was irrigated 2 or 3 times per week not exceeding 4 h per irrigation event (~30  
26  
27 mm per event) to avoid soil saturation. The irrigation was alternated between plots,  
28  
29 so when a plot was irrigated (moist treatment, MT), the second plot was not irrigated  
30  
31 (dry treatment, DT). However, both plots were fully irrigated covering the alfalfa  
32  
33 water requirements, and both plots received approximately the same seasonal  
34  
35 irrigation depth. Once one plot was irrigated, the other plot was irrigated  
36  
37 approximately 8 hours later to ensure that the microclimate effects were totally  
38  
39 removed (Cavero et al. 2009).  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

#### 45 Water Loss Calculations

46  
47  
48 Following ASAE.S.398.1 (1985), the sprinkler irrigation performance was  
49  
50 evaluated by the gross WDEL ( $WDEL_g$ , %).  $WDEL_g$  were measured using a network  
51  
52 of 25 plastic catch cans (at a spacing of 3 m X 3 m) that was arranged within four  
53  
54 sprinklers in each plot (Figure 1). Catch can (own manufacture) were conical in its  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 lower part (100 mm length) and cylindrical in its upper part (200 mm length). The  
4  
5 diameter of the upper part was 160 mm. The catch cans were marked in mm for  
6  
7 direct readout up to 45 mm. Catch cans were placed at 0.4 m above the ground just  
8  
9 after each alfalfa clipping and at 0.85 m once the alfalfa crop reached a full  
10  
11 development to ensure the catch cans were always above the alfalfa canopy.  $WDEL_g$   
12  
13 (%) was estimated as the percentage of water delivered by sprinklers ( $I_g$ , mm) and  
14  
15 not collected within catch cans or collectors ( $I_{cc}$ , mm) (Dechmi et al. 2003; Playán et al.  
16  
17 2005; and Sánchez et al. 2010a).  $I_{cc}$  was the average of the water collected at the 25  
18  
19 catch cans.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

$$WDEL_g = \frac{(I_g - I_{cc})}{I_g} \times 100 \quad (4)$$

25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30 Alfalfa evapotranspiration at each subplot was measured by a weighing lysimeter  
31  
32 located at the middle of each subplot (Figure 1). Each lysimeter had an effective  
33  
34 surface area of 6.26 m<sup>2</sup> (length 2.72 m x width 2.30 m, both measured up to the mid-  
35  
36 point of the inner-outer wall). Lysimeter depth was 1.7 m. Both lysimeters were made  
37  
38 of stainless steel with a thickness of 6 mm. A more detailed description of the  
39  
40 lysimeters is presented in Martínez-Cob (2001). Lysimeters recorded 5-min  
41  
42 evapotranspiration (ET) rates that were combined into hourly totals from the 2 h  
43  
44 before to the 3 h after each irrigation event. During the irrigation event, 5-min ET  
45  
46 rates recorded at the dry treatment lysimeter ( $ET_{DT}$ ) were summed and later  
47  
48 converted to mm h<sup>-1</sup>. However, it was impossible to directly measure ET rates during  
49  
50 the irrigation event at the moist treatment lysimeter ( $ET_{MT}$ ) due to its gain of mass  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 because of the applied irrigation water. Thus, the  $ET_{MT}$  rates during the irrigation  
4  
5 event were determined as follows (Martínez-Cob et al. 2008):  
6  
7

$$ET_{MT\_di} = \frac{I_{lcc} - I_{lys}}{t} \quad (5)$$

8  
9  
10  
11 where:  $ET_{MT\_di}$  is the estimated ET rate at the moist treatment during the irrigation  
12 event,  $mm\ h^{-1}$ ;  $I_{lcc}$  is the water depth applied to the lysimeter during the irrigation  
13 event,  $mm$ ;  $I_{lys}$  is the water depth recorded at the lysimeter during the irrigation  
14 event,  $mm$ ; and  $t$ , duration of the irrigation event,  $h$ .  $I_{lcc}$  was determined as the  
15 average water depth collected in 18 catch cans (Figure 1), similar to those used for  
16 measurement of  $WDEL_g$ , located just around the lysimeter, a few centimeters apart  
17 from the outer wall of the lysimeter tank. The  $I_{lys}$  was determined as the gain in mass  
18 by the lysimeter during the irrigation event divided by its effective surface area  
19 (Martínez-Cob 2001). Uncertainty of Eqn. (5) arises from the different resolution of  
20 the catch cans and the lysimeter, about 0.5 and 0.05 mm, respectively.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 Martínez-Cob et al. (2008) reported that maize ET reduced by about 32-55 % on  
38 average during irrigation events while maize transpiration reduced by about 58 % on  
39 average. This difference in the percent reduction of both variables was due to the  
40 evaporation of intercepted water at the soil and crop surfaces during the irrigation. In  
41 other words, the estimated values of  $ET_{MT\_di}$  also include the evaporation of the  
42 intercepted water during the irrigation. For impact sprinklers, the magnitude of the  
43 evaporation of the intercepted water at the soil should be relatively negligible (Yonts,  
44 2000) and the evaporation of the intercepted water at the crop surfaces will also be  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 relatively small due to the reduction of VPD (Steiner et al., 1983a; Thompson et al.,  
4  
5 1996; Schneider and Howell, 1995).  
6  
7

8  
9 The ET rates of the different irrigation events at both moist and dry treatments were  
10 compared for the two periods (1 and 2 h) before, during, and three periods (1 to 3 h)  
11 after the irrigation events. A Student t-test for paired samples was performed to test  
12 the null hypothesis that the difference between averages ET at both treatments was  
13 equal to 0 ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ). The t-test was applied for each of the six abovementioned  
14 periods.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 As previously mentioned, part of the  $WDEL_g$  replaces crop ET during the  
25 irrigation events. Then, the work hypothesis is that the reduction of crop ET (i.e., the  
26 difference between  $ET_{DT}$  and  $ET_{MT}$  during the irrigation events) can be subtracted  
27 from  $WDEL_g$  to get the net WDEL. Therefore:  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

$$WDEL_n = WDEL_g - \sum_{i=0}^t (ET_{DT} - ET_{MT})_{di} \quad (6)$$

33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38 where:  $WDEL_n$  are the net wind drift and evaporation losses, mm;  $t$  is the total  
39 irrigation duration, h; and  $(ET_{DT} - ET_{MT})_{di}$  is the reduction of ET during the irrigation  
40 event ( $di$ ),  $mm\ h^{-1}$ .  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 After the irrigation, the crop transpiration of the wetted surface continues to be  
48 reduced for some time (Martínez-Cob et al., 2008). But that reduction is less after  
49 irrigation than during the irrigation event (as it occurs for VPD reduction) so  
50 transpiration reduction is lower than the evaporation of intercepted water. Then, the  
51 difference between  $ET_{MT}$  and  $ET_{DT}$  after the irrigation should represent the net  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 interception losses, i.e. the difference between the gross interception losses and the  
4  
5 reduction of transpiration after the irrigation. Thus, after the irrigation event (ai), and  
6  
7 during the time it takes for this water to evaporate, the following equation holds  
8  
9  
10 (Martínez-Cob et al. 2008):

$$IL_n = \sum_{i=0}^m (ET_{MT} - ET_{DT})_{ai} \quad (7)$$

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 where:  $IL_n$  are the net intercepted losses, mm;  $m$  is the time duration after irrigation  
18  
19 used to calculate the  $IL_n$  h. The time after irrigation (ai) considered for the  $IL_n$   
20  
21 calculation corresponded to the time needed to equal  $ET_{MT}$  and  $ET_{DT}$  (i.e. until the  
22  
23 irrigated canopy was dry). Values of  $WDEL_n$  and  $IL_n$  were used to determine  $SEL_n$   
24  
25  
26 applying Eq. (1).

### 27 28 29 30 Prediction of net sprinkler evaporation losses

31  
32  
33 Statistical analyses of prediction equations of  $WDEL_g$ ,  $IL_n$  and  $SEL_n$  as a function  
34  
35 of several meteorological variables: VPD, wind speed (U), solar radiation ( $R_{sol}$ ), and  
36  
37 air temperature ( $T_{air}$ ) were performed using the Statgraphics Plus software (version  
38  
39 5.0, Statistical Graphic Corp. 1994-2000). The equations were selected through a  
40  
41 backward stepwise procedure accounting for their statistical indicators used to  
42  
43 monitor and compare the selected equations (Dolado, 1990): the adjusted coefficient  
44  
45 of determination (adjusted  $R^2$ ), the mean square error (MSE), the coefficient of  
46  
47 efficiency (E) defined by Wilcox et al. (1990), the similarity index (IS) (Willmott, 1981)  
48  
49 and the root mean square error (RMSE). Two additional statistics were introduced to  
50  
51 evaluate the predictive capability of the equations: the average magnitude of the  
52  
53 relative error (AMRE, %) and the prediction level 25 (Pred [0.25]) (Dolado, 1999). The  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Pred [0.25] is the percentage of the estimated values differing from the measured  
4  
5 value by less than 25% (Dalado, 1990 and Playán et al., 2005).  
6  
7

### 8 Microclimatic changes 9

10  
11 An automatic weather station was installed in the center of each plot, next to the  
12 weighing lysimeters (Figure 1). Each station had a datalogger (Campbell Scientific  
13 model CR10X, Shepshed, Loughborough, U.K.) monitoring an air temperature and  
14 relative humidity probe (Vaisala model HMP45AC, Helsinki, Finland) and an  
15 infrared thermometer (Apogee Instruments Inc., Roseville, CA, USA) at 0.1 Hz (10 s).  
16  
17 The temperature and relative humidity probe was installed at 1.5 m above ground;  
18 its accuracy was  $\pm 0.3^{\circ}\text{C}$  for temperature and  $\pm 3\%$  for relative humidity. The infrared  
19 thermometer was located at 1.0 m above the crop canopy with an angle of  $45^{\circ}$  and  
20 was oriented towards the north; its accuracy is  $\pm 0.3^{\circ}\text{C}$ . Averages of air temperature  
21 and relative humidity were computed for each 5-min period, and 30-min averages of  
22 canopy temperature were computed and stored in the Datalogger memory. VPD was  
23 computed for each 5-min period using the 5-min averages of air temperature and  
24 relative humidity as described by Allen et al. (1998).  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 Values of air temperature, VPD and canopy temperature at both treatments were  
45 compared for the periods before (1 and 2 h), during and after (1 to 3 h) the irrigation  
46 events. As for ET, the Student t-test for paired samples was used (Devore and Peck,  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51 1986).  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### General characteristics of the experiments

The total irrigation depth applied in the 2009 irrigation season for alfalfa was 798 mm and 813 mm for plots A and B, respectively. This slight difference was due to the slightly greater irrigation pressure in the plot B (308 kPa) than that in the plot A (302 kPa). The total number of irrigation events for the entire irrigation season was the same for both plots (42 events); minimum, maximum and average irrigation durations were 1.0 h, 4.0 h and 2.5 h, respectively.

A total of 24 daytime irrigation events (12 at plot A and 12 at plot B) and 12 nighttime irrigation events (6 at plot A and 6 at plot B) were evaluated for  $WDEL_g$ , microclimatic and ET changes before, during and after irrigation,  $WDEL_n$  and  $SEL_n$ . Table 1 summarizes the general characteristics of the evaluated irrigation events. The average applied irrigation water per event was 21.1 mm and 20.8 mm for daytime and nighttime irrigation, respectively.

Distinct general meteorological conditions occurred during daytime and nighttime irrigation events according to the recorded values at the 'grass station' (Table 1). The average wind speed ( $U$ ) during daytime irrigation ( $2.5 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ ) was twice that recorded during the nighttime events ( $1.2 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ ). The maximum wind speeds were  $5.8 \text{ m s}^{-1}$  and  $3.1 \text{ m s}^{-1}$  during daytime and nighttime irrigations, respectively. The mean air temperature and VPD were  $24.4^\circ\text{C}$  and  $1.47 \text{ kPa}$ , respectively, for

1  
2  
3 daytime irrigations, while they were 14.8°C and 0.28 kPa, respectively, for nighttime  
4  
5 irrigations.  
6

7  
8  
9 Microclimatic and physiological changes during sprinkler irrigation

10  
11 Microclimatic and physiological changes started immediately at the beginning of  
12 the irrigation events, more pronounced in the case of daytime events (Figure 2). This  
13 agrees with the results reported by Tolk et al. (1995), Thompson et al. (1993b), and  
14 Cavero et al. (2009). During daytime irrigation events, a significant ( $\alpha = 0.05$ )  
15 decrease in air temperature (T) was observed for the moist treatment regarding to the  
16 dry treatment (Figure 2). On average, this temperature decrease due to sprinkler  
17 irrigation was 1.5°C. This decrease in temperature for the moist treatment remained  
18 significant (although less in magnitude, about 0.6°C, 0.1°C and 0.1°C on average for  
19 one, two and three hours after irrigation events respectively) until three hours after  
20 the end of the irrigation. During nighttime irrigation events, air temperature (T) of  
21 the moist treatment (MT) decreased also significantly ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) as compared with the  
22 dry treatment (DT), but this decrease was much lower (0.4 °C on average) (Figure 2).  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 Similar behavior was observed for the vapor pressure deficit (VPD) and the  
41 canopy temperature. The average decrease of VPD in the moist treatment during the  
42 irrigation was 0.44 kPa and 0.11 kPa for the daytime and nighttime irrigation events,  
43 respectively. The canopy temperature in the moist treatment declined 3°C on average  
44 during daytime irrigation events, although, that decrease was negligible during  
45 nighttime irrigation events (0.1°C).  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 After the irrigation event, the difference in the VPD above the crop canopy  
55 between the non-irrigated plot (DT) and the irrigated plot (MT) were also significant  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (although to a lesser extent) until 2 hours after daytime irrigation and up to 3 hours  
4  
5 after the nighttime irrigation.  
6

7  
8 The canopy temperature follows the same pattern as the VPD; a significant  
9  
10 difference was also detected up to 3 h after daytime irrigation events. This difference  
11  
12 was decreasing as time advances.  
13

14  
15 The decrease in air temperature, VPD and canopy temperature above alfalfa was  
16  
17 less than reported by Cavero et al. (2009) 1.0 m above the maize canopy. The VPD  
18  
19 was measured at 1.5 m above ground level which implies an average height of  
20  
21 measurements above the alfalfa canopy of 0.7 m to 1.3 m. Differences in the  
22  
23 meteorological conditions of the experiments, in the measurement height and in the  
24  
25 density of both crops (maize and alfalfa) may partly explain the differences.  
26  
27 Microclimatic and physiological changes lasted only 3 hours after irrigation at most.  
28  
29 Other authors have also reported that microclimatic changes last for a short period of  
30  
31 time after the irrigation (Cavero et al., 2009; Tolk et al., 1995).  
32  
33  
34  
35

36  
37 Figure 3, shows the relationship between the 5 minutes averages of air  
38  
39 temperature (T), alfalfa canopy temperature (TV) and VPD during the irrigation in  
40  
41 the irrigated plot (MT) versus the corresponding averages recorded at the same time  
42  
43 in the not irrigated plots (DT), for all evaluated irrigation events. Microclimatic and  
44  
45 physiological changes were more pronounced during daytime irrigation (Figure 3  
46  
47 left) than during nighttime irrigation (Figure 3 right). Cavero et al. (2009) reported  
48  
49 the same patterns for corn and stated that the differences were due to the largest  
50  
51 temperature and VPD conditions for the daytime irrigations.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Sprinkler irrigation effects on crop evapotranspiration

Figure 4 shows the average alfalfa ET rates for the moist treatment versus those for the dry treatment for the periods 1 and 2 h before, during, and 1 to 3 h after each daytime irrigation event. Likewise, the overall average values of  $ET_{MT}$  and  $ET_{DT}$  for alfalfa for the abovementioned periods are listed in Table 2 for day and nighttime irrigation events. There was no significant difference ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) between the two treatments 1 or 2 hours before the irrigation event for both daytime and nighttime irrigations (Figure 4, Table 2). However,  $ET_{MT}$  was significantly lower (about 42 % on average) than  $ET_{DT}$  during the daytime irrigation event (Table 2; Figure 4). This ET reduction in alfalfa (42%) was lower than that reported for maize (55 %) by Martínez-Cob et al. (2008) when these authors used the same approach to that used in this study (Eq. 5) to determine the  $ET_{MT}$ .

The differences on meteorological conditions between both experiments could partially explain the differences. For the alfalfa experiments the average air temperature (T), VPD and wind speed (U) were 24.4 °C, 1.47 kPa and 2.5 m s<sup>-1</sup>, respectively, much lower than those reported by Martínez-Cob et al. (2008) for corn, 30.6 °C, 3.0 kPa and 3.0 m s<sup>-1</sup>, respectively. Cavero et al. (2010) reported a reduction on the rate of photosynthesis for maize by 23% during the sprinkler irrigation event. However, photosynthesis of alfalfa was slightly increased (not significantly) during the sprinkler irrigation event. These authors reported difference in leaf characteristics (contact angle of water and canopies) between maize and alfalfa. This different wettability of alfalfa leaves may also have an influence on the reduction of alfalfa ET rates due to the irrigation as compared to the previously reported reductions of maize ET. Consequently, the contribution of alfalfa ET reduction during and after

1  
2  
3 sprinkler irrigation to application efficiency could be somewhat different to that  
4  
5 reported for maize.  
6

7  
8 Sternberg (1967) used a weighing lysimeter to study rye grass ET during and  
9  
10 after sprinkler irrigation events at Davis (California) and reported an almost  
11  
12 complete suppression of ET during the irrigation and a reduction of about 33% after  
13  
14 the irrigation. These different results can be attributed to the fact that Sternberg  
15  
16 (1967) used always the same lysimeter as moist treatment, while the lysimeter for dry  
17  
18 treatment recorded systematically higher ET values before the irrigation. The results  
19  
20 of this study have shown that ET was not completely suppressed during the  
21  
22 irrigation because the transpiration, the main component of ET, decreased but was  
23  
24 not suppressed (Martínez-Cob et al., 2008). During nighttime irrigation events, the  
25  
26 differences between treatments were also statistically significant but the overall  
27  
28 average values of ET for both treatments were small (Table 2), within the precision of  
29  
30 the lysimeter, so it could be assumed that the ET reduction during nighttime periods  
31  
32 can be considered as negligible.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39  
40 After the irrigation events, contrary to what was observed during irrigation,  
41  
42  $ET_{MT}$  was significantly ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) greater (about 12.5 to 19 %) than  $ET_{DT}$  (Figure 4,  
43  
44 after and Table 2). This increase of  $ET_{MT}$  after the irrigation event was due to the  
45  
46 evaporation of canopy intercepted water and to the lower transpiration reduction  
47  
48 between the dry and the moist plot compared to that occurring during the irrigation  
49  
50 event (Figure 4) (Tolk et al. 1995; Martínez-Cob et al., 2008). These highest ET rates  
51  
52 for the moist treatment were only observed for the first hour after nighttime  
53  
54 irrigation events, however, after the daytime irrigation events, these highest ET rates  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 were observed for the three monitored hours. On average, the difference between  
4  
5  $ET_{MT}$  and  $ET_{DT}$  1 to 3 h after daytime irrigations was quite similar (both in absolute  
6  
7 and relative values); this behavior being somewhat different from that reported for  
8  
9 maize by Tolk et al. (1995) and Martínez-Cob et al. (2008) for which the differences  
10  
11 between treatments lasted no more than 1 to 2 h. This longer duration of the ET  
12  
13 reduction after the irrigation was also likely due to the different meteorological  
14  
15 conditions observed in this study (lower evaporative demand) and the earlier  
16  
17 irrigation starting time that may affects the ET reduction (11:20 GMT in this study  
18  
19 versus 14:00 GMT reported by Martínez-Cob et al., 2008).  
20  
21  
22  
23

#### 24 Determination of net sprinkler evaporation losses

25  
26  
27  
28 Table 3 summarizes the applied water, the  $WDEL_g$ , the reduction of ET during  
29  
30 irrigation event, and the balance of sprinkler evaporation losses for the daytime and  
31  
32 irrigation events evaluated in this work. The gross irrigation water applied ( $I_g$ ) for the  
33  
34 36 evaluated events was 757.4 mm, and the measured  $WDEL_g$  was 64.6 mm, 8.5% of  
35  
36 the total applied water.  $WDEL_n$  for both daytime (6.6% of applied water) and  
37  
38 nighttime (3.0% of applied water) irrigation events were smaller than  $WDEL_g$  for  
39  
40 those two periods, 10.9% and 3.7% of applied water, respectively, due to the  
41  
42 contribution of ET reduction during the irrigation events. The ET reduction observed  
43  
44 in this study for daytime irrigations was 21.6 mm (4.3 % of applied water), a value  
45  
46 slightly lower than the 4.8% reported for maize by Martínez-Cob et al. (2008).  
47  
48 Nighttime ET reduction (0.8 % of applied water) was similar to that reported by  
49  
50 Martínez-Cob et al. (2008). Total nighttime irrigated alfalfa ET is as much as 12 % of  
51  
52 the total daily (24-h) alfalfa ET due to the lower VPD and U during nighttime periods  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 (Tolk et al., 2006). For this reason, nighttime ET reduction was extremely low.  
4  
5 However, the  $WDEL_n$  reported by Martínez-Cob et al. (2008) were higher than those  
6  
7 observed in this study. This was due to the higher  $WDEL_g$  values reported by  
8  
9 Martínez-Cob et al. (2008) for both daytime and nighttime irrigations; in this study,  
10  
11 average daytime  $WDEL_g$  was 10.9 % while it was 19 % in the research found by  
12  
13 Martínez-Cob et al. (2008). The different average wind conditions for the two studies,  
14  
15 2.4 m s<sup>-1</sup> in this study and 3.0 m s<sup>-1</sup> in the study of Martínez-Cob et al. (2008), as well  
16  
17 as differences in canopy height and architecture (Sánchez et al., 2010b) explained  
18  
19 these different  $WDEL_g$  values.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 Net interception losses ( $IL_n$ ) 1-3 h after the irrigation events were larger for  
27  
28 daytime irrigation (15.9 mm, 3.1% of the daytime applied water) than for nighttime  
29  
30 irrigation (6.0 mm, 2.4% of the nighttime applied water). When considering all the  
31  
32 irrigation events,  $IL_n$  for alfalfa resulted in 2.9% of the total applied water, greater  
33  
34 than the 1.1%  $IL_n$  reported by Martínez-Cob et al. (2008) for maize. Since  $IL_n$  includes  
35  
36 water on leaf and stem surfaces and water trapped in the leaf sheath area, the  
37  
38 variation in  $IL_n$  between crops can only be partially attributed to differences in crop  
39  
40 architecture and characteristics of the leaf sheath of both crops. The higher  $IL_n$  value  
41  
42 found in this work was mainly due to the fact that the differences on ET between dry  
43  
44 and moist lysimeters remained significant until 3 hours after the irrigation for the  
45  
46 daytime irrigation events of the alfalfa crop (Table 2), i.e. more time than that  
47  
48 reported for maize, likely due to the different meteorological conditions observed in  
49  
50 this and the work of Martínez-Cob et al. (2008).  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Adding  $IL_n$  to  $WDEL_n$  resulted in  $SEL_n$  of 62.9 mm (8.3 % of applied water) when  
4  
5 considering all the irrigation events (Table 3). For daytime irrigations,  $SEL_n$  were 49.5  
6  
7 mm (9.8 % of applied water), while for nighttime irrigations,  $SEL_n$  were 13.4 mm (5.4  
8  
9 % of applied water) (Table 3). The difference between  $WDEL_g$  and  $SEL_n$  for daytime  
10  
11 irrigation represented 1.1% of the total applied water, lower than reported by  
12  
13 Martínez-Cob et al. (2008) for maize (1.8%), due to the higher wind speed and  
14  
15 evaporative demand reported by these authors, also these differences would be  
16  
17 partially explained by the differences in crops height and architecture between maize  
18  
19 and alfalfa.  
20  
21  
22  
23

24  
25 For nighttime irrigation events, the almost negligible reduction of ET rates added  
26  
27 to the  $IL_n$  led to a higher average  $SEL_n$  value compared to the average  $WDEL_g$  value,  
28  
29 being the average difference between them of 1.7% of applied water. Similar results  
30  
31 were found by Martínez-Cob et al. (2008) for maize nighttime irrigations (a difference  
32  
33 of 1.5% of applied water between  $WDEL_g$  and  $SEL_n$ ). The  $WDEL_g$  has been  
34  
35 traditionally used in sprinkler irrigation engineering because of its experimental  
36  
37 determination simplicity as an irrigation performance variable to characterize the  
38  
39 adequacy of an irrigation event or schedule. However, the  $SEL_n$  represents a more  
40  
41 adequate variable to characterize the sprinkler losses. The  $SEL_n$  values for daytime  
42  
43 irrigation resulted slightly lower than the corresponding  $WDEL_g$ , indicating that the  
44  
45 sprinkler application efficiency was slightly higher (1.1 % for alfalfa and 1.8 % for  
46  
47 maize crop) than that could be derived using the traditional variable,  $WDEL_g$ . On the  
48  
49 other hand, for nighttime irrigation events,  $SEL_n$  values resulted slightly higher than  
50  
51 the corresponding  $WDEL_g$ , indicating that the sprinkler application efficiency was  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 slightly lower (1.7 % for alfalfa and 1.5 % for maize) than that could be derived using  
4  
5 the traditional variable,  $WDEL_g$ . These results should be taken into account in  
6  
7 irrigation scheduling.  
8  
9

10  
11 Figure 5 shows the measured  $IL_n$  values for all irrigation events (daytime and  
12  
13 nighttime) versus the average VPD recorded after the irrigation period. The selected  
14  
15 equation presented in Figure 5 was a linear regression model that describes the  
16  
17 positive relationship between the independent variable VPD and  $IL_n$ . The increase in  
18  
19 the evaporative demand of the air, due to the increase in VPD, will induce an  
20  
21 important increase in the evaporation flux from the alfalfa intercepted water. This  
22  
23 relationship established for alfalfa  $IL_n$  was not established for maize in Martinez-Cob  
24  
25 et al. (2008). The different wettability of maize and alfalfa leaves can explain the  
26  
27 different role of VPD on alfalfa and maize  $IL_n$ . A relatively moderate adjusted  
28  
29 coefficient of determination was obtained for the  $IL_n$  equation ( $R^2_{adj}=0.47$ ). The  
30  
31 relationship depicted on Figure 5 shows the best suited equation obtained by  
32  
33 backward stepwise method to predict the  $IL_n$  according to its explicative and  
34  
35 predictive capabilities and its statistical significance ( $\alpha$  lower than 0.01). The mean  
36  
37 absolute error (MAE) for this equation was very low, less than 0.001%, the coefficient  
38  
39 of efficiency (E) and the Similarity Index (IS) were 0.65 and 0.89 respectively and very  
40  
41 close to 1.0 presenting a better agreement between observed and predicted  $IL_n$   
42  
43 values. The Pred [0.25] indicates that the 45% of the predicted  $IL_n$  differed from the  
44  
45 measured  $IL_n$  by less than 25%.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55 The best suited equation obtained to predict  $WDEL_n$  uses the wind speed as  
56  
57 the explicative variable (statistical significance  $\alpha = 0.01$ ) (Figure 6). The wind speed  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 has also been reported by other authors (Playán et al., 2005; Zapata et al., 2007;  
4  
5 Sánchez et al., 2011) as the most significant variable affecting the  $WDEL_g$ . A relatively  
6  
7 moderate adjusted coefficient of determination was obtained ( $R^2_{adj}=0.41$ ).  
8  
9

10  
11 Wind speed also resulted the only significant variable ( $\alpha = 0.01$ ) explaining the  
12  
13  $SEL_n$  variability ( $R^2_{adj}=0.44$ ). MAE, IS, E and Pred [0.25] were 0.02, 0.81 and 0.48, 60%  
14  
15 respectively. The relationship between  $SEL_n$  and U was also found by Martinez-Cob  
16  
17 et al. (2008) for maize. For conditions similar to those of this study, the regression  
18  
19 equation obtained for all irrigation events to predict  $SEL_n$  as a function of U would be  
20  
21 recommended.  
22  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 Although the relationship is significant between both  $WDEL_n$  and U and  
28  
29 between  $SEL_n$  and U, considerable variability in  $SEL_n$  and  $WDEL_n$  for the same wind  
30  
31 speed was shown in Fig.6. This variability may be partially explained by the  
32  
33 variability in other meteorological variables (such as T, RH, and VPD) that did not  
34  
35 improve significantly the prediction equations and were excluded by the backward  
36  
37 or stepwise statistical procedure.  
38  
39  
40  
41

42  
43 Several researches found that interception losses ranged from 1.8 to 2.7 mm for  
44  
45 maize (Steiner et al., 1983b; Seginer, 1967; Smajstrla and Hanson, 1980; Lamm and  
46  
47 Manges, 2000) and more than 10 mm for winter wheat under high evaporation  
48  
49 condition (Du et al., 2001; Li and Rao, 2000). Tolk et al. (1995) found maize  
50  
51 intercepted losses less than 8 % of the total water applied by impact sprinkler  
52  
53 irrigation in day time, while Li and Rao (2000) found intercepted losses for winter  
54  
55 wheat of 24–28 % of the total seasonal applied water. Thompson et al. (1993a, b) used  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 a equation to calculate the net interception losses, which amounted less than 1 % of  
4  
5 total applied water, less than the average  $IL_n$  (2.9 %) in this study. However, the  
6  
7 uncertainty of the net interception losses estimated by the model of Thompson et al.  
8  
9 (1993a) was relatively high. The differences in crops architecture and measurement  
10  
11 methodologies complicate the comparison between results obtained from the  
12  
13 literature.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review Only

## CONCLUSIONS

Significant decreases of air temperature, VPD and canopy temperature were observed during daytime and nighttime sprinkler irrigations of alfalfa lasting up to 1 to 3 h after the irrigation events. Those decreases during daytime irrigation events were 1.5 °C, 0.44 kPa and 3.0 °C on average, respectively.

During the irrigation events there was a significant reduction of ET for the moist treatment compared to the dry treatment. The average reduction was much higher for daytime irrigation events (0.3 mm h<sup>-1</sup>, 42 %) than for nighttime irrigation events (0.07 mm h<sup>-1</sup>). Summing up all evaluated irrigation events, the daytime ET reduction amounted 21.6 mm (4.3 % of the applied water) and the nighttime ET reduction amounted 1.9 mm (0.8 % of the applied water). For 1 to 3 h after the daytime irrigation events, the ET at the moist treatment was greater (by about 12.5 to 19 % on average) than the ET at the dry treatment due to the combination of gross interception losses and reduced transpiration after the irrigation. Subsequently, the IL<sub>n</sub> amounted to a total of 15.9 mm (3.1 % of the applied water) for all daytime irrigation events, and 6.0 mm (2.4 % of the applied water) for all nighttime irrigation events.

The WDEL<sub>g</sub> during daytime irrigation (10.9%) were greater than WDEL<sub>g</sub> during nighttime irrigation (3.7%) due to the different meteorological conditions. Discounting, the ET reduction and adding the IL<sub>n</sub>, the SEL<sub>n</sub> amounted a total of 49.5 mm (9.8 % of the applied water) for all daytime irrigation events, and 13.4 mm (5.4 % of the applied water) for all nighttime irrigation events. Subsequently the difference

1  
2  
3 between the  $WDEL_g$  and the  $SEL_n$  were modest, about 1.1 % and -1.7 % of the applied  
4  
5 water for daytime and nighttime irrigation events, respectively. Therefore the  
6  
7 contribution of reduced evapotranspiration during sprinkler irrigation events to the  
8  
9 water application efficiency was modest.  
10

11  
12 An evaluation of predictive equations of  $SEL_n$  and its components,  $IL_n$  and  
13  
14  $WDEL_n$  as a function of various meteorological variables (U, RH, T and VPD) was  
15  
16 performed. The methodological characterization of  $SEL_n$  presented in this work was  
17  
18 limited to the research field: for the  $WDEL_n$  modeling, meteorological variables used  
19  
20 were averaged on the period 'during the irrigation', while, for  $IL_n$  modeling, the  
21  
22 meteorological values were averaged on the period 'after irrigation'.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors sequence in this paper follows the “first-last-author-emphasis” norm. This research was funded by the MCINN of the Government of Spain through grants AGL2007-66716-C03-01/02, AGL2010-21681-C03-01/03; the European Commission through grant QUALIWATER (INCO-CT-2005-015031) and by the FPI-MINECO PhD grants program. The authors would like to thank the support provided by Dr. José Caverro (CSIC-EEAD), Dr. Daniel Isidoro (CITA-DGA), Dr. Steven Evett and Dr. Judy Tolk (USDA-ARS) at Bushland, TX. Thanks are particularly due to the CITA/CSIC field staff and technicians: Miguel Izquierdo, Jesus Gaudó, Juan Manuel Acín, Pilar Paniagua, Ricardo Santolaria and Eva Medina. We are also thankful for the comments by the reviewers

Review Only



**REFERENCES**

- Allen RG, Pereira LS, Raes D, Smith M (1998) Crop evapotranspiration: guidelines for computing crop water requirements, FAO Irrigation and Drainage Paper 56. United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, Rome.
- ASAE Standard S398.1 MAR1985 (R2007) (1985) Procedure for sprinkler testing and performance reporting. In: ASAE Standards. ASAE, St. Joseph, MI.
- Burt CM, Clemmens AJ, Strelkoff TS, Solomon KH, Bliesner RD, Howell TA and Eisenhauer DE (1997). Irrigation performance measures: Efficiency and uniformity. *J. Irrig. Drain. Engr.* 123 (6): 423-442.
- Cavero J, Medina ET, Puig M, Martínez-Cob A (2009) Sprinkler irrigation changes maize canopy microclimate and crop water status, transpiration, and temperature. *Agron. J.* 101: 854-864.
- Cavero J, Urrego YF, Fernández MV, Merino C, Martínez-Cob A (2010) Photosynthesis of maize and alfalfa during daytime sprinkler irrigation. ASA, CSSA, and SSSA International Annual Meetings: Green Revolution 2.0: Food + Energy and Environmental Security. 31 October - 3 November. Long Beach, CA, USA.
- Christiansen JE (1942) Irrigation by sprinkling, California Agricultural Experimental Station Bulletin 670, University of California, Berkeley, California.
- Clemmens AJ., Dedrick AR. (1994) Irrigation techniques and evaluations. In: Adv. in Agric. Sci., K. K. Tanji and Yaron, B., (Eds.). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany, 64-103.

- 1  
2  
3 Dastane NG (1978) Effective rainfall in irrigated agriculture. FAO Irrigation and  
4  
5 Drainage Paper 25. FAO, Rome, Italy.  
6  
7  
8  
9 Dechmi F, Playán E, Cavero J, Faci JM, Martínez-Cob A (2003) Wind effects on solid-  
10  
11 set sprinkler irrigation depth and yield of maize (*Zea mays*). *Irrigation Sci.* 22:  
12  
13 67-77.  
14  
15  
16 Devore J, Peck R (1986) *Statistics. The Exploration and Analysis of Data.* West  
17  
18 Publishing, St Paul, MN.  
19  
20  
21  
22 De Wrachien D, Lorenzini G (2006) Modelling jet flow and losses in sprinkler  
23  
24 irrigation: Overview and perspective of a new approach. *Biosys. Engr.* 94(2):297-  
25  
26 309.  
27  
28  
29  
30 Dolado J (1999) Validez de las predicciones en la estimación de costes (Validity of  
31  
32 predictions in the cost estimate). Universidad Del Pais Vasco, Bilbao, Spain.  
33  
34  
35  
36 Du Y, Wang J, Liu, Cai C (2001) Water distribution and microclimatic effects of  
37  
38 sprinkler irrigation on spring wheat field. *Chin. J. Appl. Ecol.* 12, 398-400.  
39  
40  
41  
42 Edling RJ (1985) Kinetic energy, evaporation and wind drift of droplets from low  
43  
44 pressure irrigation nozzles. *Trans. ASAE* 28 (5):1543-1550.  
45  
46  
47 Fritschen LJ (1960) Transpiration and evapotranspiration of maize as related to  
48  
49 meteorological factors. U.S. Weather Bur., Res. Rept., Contract CWB-956,  
50  
51 unpublished.  
52  
53  
54  
55 Frost KR (1963) Factors affecting evapotranspiration losses during sprinkling. *Trans.*  
56  
57 *ASAE* 6: 282-283, 287.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Frost KR, Schwalen HC (1960) Sprinkler evaporation losses. *Agr. Engr.* 36(8): 526-528.

4  
5  
6 Kohl RA, JL Wright (1974) Air temperature and vapor pressure changes caused by  
7  
8 sprinkler irrigation. *Agron. J.* 66: 85-88.

9  
10  
11 Lamm F, Manges HL (2000) Partitioning of sprinkler irrigation water by a maize  
12  
13 canopy. *Trans. ASAE* 43(4): 909-918.

14  
15  
16  
17 Li J, Rao M (2000) Sprinkler water distributions as affected by winter wheat canopy.  
18  
19 *Irrig. Sci.* 20, 29-35.

20  
21  
22  
23 Lorenzini G (2004) Simplified modelling of sprinkler droplet dynamics. *Biosys. Engr.*  
24  
25 87(1): 1-11.

26  
27  
28  
29 Martínez-Cob A (2001) Adequacy of Villalobos method to adjust eddy covariance  
30  
31 latent heat flux. *Irrig. Sci.* 20: 175-188.

32  
33  
34 Martínez-Cob A (2004) Revisión de las necesidades hídricas netas de los cultivos de  
35  
36 la Cuenca del Ebro. Internal Technical Report 2004-PH-12.I. Confederación  
37  
38 Hidrográfica del Ebro, Zaragoza. (In Spanish).

39  
40  
41  
42 Martínez-Cob A, Playán E, Zapata N, Cavero J, Medina ET, Puig M (2008)  
43  
44 Contribution of evapotranspiration reduction during solid-set sprinkler  
45  
46 irrigation to application efficiency. *J. Irrig. Drain. Engr.* 134: 745-756.

47  
48  
49  
50 Martínez-Cob A, Zapata Ruiz N, Sánchez Marcos I (2010) Viento y riego: la  
51  
52 variabilidad del viento en Aragón y su influencia en el riego por aspersión.  
53  
54 Zaragoza, Institución "Fernando el Católico", 200p.

55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 McMillan WD, Burgy RH (1960) Interception loss from grass. *J. Geophys. Res.* 65:  
4  
5 2389-2394.  
6  
7  
8  
9 McNaughton KG (1981) Net interception losses during sprinkler irrigation. *Agric.*  
10  
11 *Meteorol.* 24: 11-27.  
12  
13  
14 Monteith JL (1981) Evaporation and surface temperature. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, 107,  
15  
16 1-27.  
17  
18  
19 Norman E, Joyce R, Whittaker M (1990) *Advanced design and technology*. Third ed.  
20  
21 Longman, Harlow, Essex.  
22  
23  
24 Norman JM, Campbell GS (1983) Application of the plant environment model to  
25  
26 problems in irrigation, In: *Adv. in Irrig.* 2: 155-188. New York, N.Y.: Academic  
27  
28 Press, Inc.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 Playán E, Salvador R, Faci JM, Zapata N, Martínez-Cob A, Sánchez I (2005) Day and  
34  
35 night wind drift and evaporation losses in sprinkler solid-sets and moving  
36  
37 laterals. *Agric. Water Manage.* 76 (3): 139-159.  
38  
39  
40  
41 Playán E, Zapata N, Faci JM, Tolosa D, Lacueva JL, Pelegrin J, Salvador R, Sánchez I,  
42  
43 Lafita A (2006) Assessing sprinkler irrigation uniformity using a ballistic  
44  
45 simulation model. *Agric. Water Manage.* 84 (1-2): 89-100.  
46  
47  
48  
49 Robinson FE (1970) Modifying an arid microclimate with sprinklers. *Agric. Engr.*  
50  
51 51:465.  
52  
53  
54  
55 Sánchez I, Zapata N, Faci JM (2010a) Combined effect of technical, meteorological  
56  
57 and agronomical factors on solid-set sprinkler irrigation: I. Irrigation  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 performance and soil water recharge in alfalfa and maize. *Agric. Water Manage.*  
4  
5 97(10): 1571-1681.  
6  
7

8  
9 Sánchez I, Zapata N, Faci JM (2010b) Combined effect of technical, meteorological  
10 and agronomical factors on solid-set sprinkler irrigation: II. Modifications of the  
11 wind velocity and of the water interception plane by the crop canopy. *Agric.*  
12  
13 *Water. Manage.* 97(10): 1591-1601.  
14  
15  
16

17  
18  
19 Sánchez I, Zapata N, Faci JM, Martinez-Cob A (2011) The spatial variability of the  
20 wind in a sprinkler irrigated district: Implications for irrigation management.  
21  
22 *Biosys. Engin.* 109(1): 65-76.  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 Schneider AD, Howell T A (1995) Reducing sprinkler water losses. In *Proc. Central*  
28  
29 *Plains Irrigation Shortcourse, Garden City, Kans., 7-8 Feb 1995, 60-63. Manhattan,*  
30  
31 *Kans.: Biological and Agricultural Engineering, Kansas State University.*  
32  
33

34  
35 Seginer I (1967) Net losses in sprinkler irrigation. *Agric. Meteorol.* 4, 281-291.  
36  
37

38 Smajstrla AG, Hanson RS (1980) Evaporation effects on sprinkler irrigation  
39 efficiencies. *Proc. Soil & Crop Sci. Soc. Florida* 39: 28-33.  
40  
41  
42

43  
44 Soil Survey Staff (1999) *Soil taxonomy Agriculture Handbook 436, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., Natural*  
45  
46 *Resources Conservation Service, USDA, Washington, D.C.*  
47  
48

49 Solomon KH, Kincaid DC, Bezdek JC (1985) Drop size distribution for irrigation  
50 spray nozzles. *Trans. ASAE* 28(6): 1966-1974.  
51  
52  
53

54  
55 Steiner JL, Kanemasu ET, Clark RN (1983a) Spray losses and partitioning of water  
56  
57 under a center pivot sprinkler system. *Trans. ASAE* 26: 1128-1134.  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Steiner JL, Kanemasu ET, Hasza D (1983b) Microclimatic and crop responses to  
4  
5 center pivot sprinkler and to surface irrigation. *Irrig. Sci.* 4:201-214.  
6  
7  
8  
9 Sternberg YM (1967) Analysis of sprinkler irrigation losses. *J. Irrig. and Drain. Div.*  
10  
11 (ASCE) 93(IR4): 111-124.  
12  
13  
14 Tarjuelo JM, Ortega JF, Montero J, de Juan JA (2000) Modelling evaporation and drift  
15  
16 losses in irrigation with medium size impact sprinklers under semi-arid  
17  
18 conditions. *Agric. Water Manag.* 43: 263-284.  
19  
20  
21  
22 Thompson AL, Gilley JR, Norman JM (1993a) A sprinkler water droplet evaporation  
23  
24 and plant canopy model: I. Model development, *Trans. ASAE* 36(3), 735-741.  
25  
26  
27  
28 Thompson AL, Gilley JR, Norman JM (1993b) A sprinkler water droplet evaporation  
29  
30 and plant canopy model: II. Model application. *Trans. ASAE* 36(3): 743-750.  
31  
32  
33  
34 Thompson AL, Martin DL, Norman JM, Howell TA (1996) Scheduling effects on  
35  
36 evapotranspiration with overhead and below canopy application. In proceedings  
37  
38 of the international conference Evapotranspiration and Irrigation Scheduling, 3-6  
39  
40 Nov. 1996, 182-188. St. Joseph, Mich.: ASAE.  
41  
42  
43  
44 Tolk JA, Howell TA, Evett, SR (2006) Nighttime evapotranspiration from alfalfa and  
45  
46 cotton in a semiarid climate. *Agron. J.* 98:730-736. doi:10.2134/agronj2005.0276.  
47  
48  
49  
50 Tolk JA, Howell TA, Steiner JL, Krieg DR, Schneider AD (1995) Role of transpiration  
51  
52 suppression by evaporation of intercepted water in improving irrigation  
53  
54 efficiency. *Irrig. Sci.* 16: 89-95.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Waggoner PE, Begg JE, Turner NC (1969) Evaporation of dew. *Agric. Meteorol.*, 6,  
4  
5 227-230.  
6

7  
8  
9 Wilcox BP, Rawls WJ, Brakensiek DL, Wight JR (1990) Predicting runoff from  
10  
11 rangeland catchments: A comparison of two models. *Water Resour. Res.*  
12  
13 26(10):2401-2410.  
14

15  
16  
17 Willmott CJ (1981) On the validation of models. *Phys. Geog.* 2:184-194  
18

19  
20 Yazar A (1984) Evaporation and drift losses from sprinkler irrigation systems under  
21  
22 various operating conditions. *Agric. Water Manage.* 8:439-449.  
23  
24

25  
26 Yonts CD (2000) Performance of In-Canopy Sprinklers. *Proceedings of Central Plains*  
27  
28 *Irrigation Short Course and Exposition.* February 9-10, 2000, Garden City,  
29  
30 Kansas. Central Plains Irrigation Association, Colby, Kansas. pp.107-112.  
31

32  
33  
34 Zapata N, Playán E, Martínez-Cob A, Sánchez I, Faci JM, Lecina S (2007) From on-  
35  
36 farm solid-set sprinkler irrigation design to collective irrigation network design  
37  
38 in windy areas. *Agric. Wat. Manage.* 87 (2): 187-199.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: General characteristics of the 36 evaluated irrigation events: irrigation events number (N), average irrigation time per event (h), irrigation depth (mm), U ( $m s^{-1}$ ) at 2 m above ground level, air temperature ( $^{\circ}C$ ) and vapor pressure deficit (kPa). Minimum and maximum values are between parentheses.

Irrigation events	N	Irrigation Time (h)	Irrigation Depth (mm)	U <sup>(a)</sup> ( $m s^{-1}$ )	T <sup>(a)</sup> ( $^{\circ}C$ )	VPD <sup>(a)</sup> (kPa)
Daytime Irrigations	24	2.7 (1.8-4)	21.1 (13.7-31.3)	2.5 (0.6-5.8)	24.4 (15.6-32.2)	1.47 (0.52-4.36)
Nighttime Irrigations	12	2.6 (1.2-4)	20.8 (8.9-32.9)	1.2 (0.2-3.1)	14.8 (7.5-18.8)	0.28 (0.06-0.52)
All Irrigations	36	2.7 (1.2-4)	21.0 (8.9-32.9)	2.0 (0.2-5.8)	21.1 (7.5-32.2)	1.06 (0.06-4.36)

(a) Recorded at the 'grass' weather station



Table 2. Average total daytime and nighttime evapotranspiration of moist ( $ET_{MT}$ ) and dry ( $ET_{DT}$ ) treatments during 2009 irrigation season, and average differences  $ET_{DT} - ET_{MT}$  during, 1-2 hours before and 1-3 hours after the irrigation event.

Period	Daytime irrigation				Nighttime irrigation				
	N	$ET_{DT}$ ( $mm\ h^{-1}$ )	$ET_{MT}$ ( $mm\ h^{-1}$ )	$ET_{DT}-ET_{MT}$ ( $mm\ h^{-1}$ )	N	$ET_{DT}$ ( $mm\ h^{-1}$ )	$ET_{MT}$ ( $mm\ h^{-1}$ )	$ET_{DT}-ET_{MT}$ ( $mm\ h^{-1}$ )	
Before	1 h	24	0.44	0.42	0.02 <sup>ns</sup>	12	0.00	0.01	-0.010 <sup>ns</sup>
	2 h	24	0.27	0.31	-0.04 <sup>ns</sup>	12	0.07	0.06	0.012 <sup>ns</sup>
During		24	0.70	0.41	0.29 <sup>s</sup>	12	0.01	-0.07	0.074 <sup>s</sup>
	1 h	24	0.71	0.82	-0.11 <sup>s</sup>	12	0.17	0.24	-0.080 <sup>s</sup>
After	2 h	24	0.64	0.72	-0.08 <sup>s</sup>	12	0.34	0.35	-0.009 <sup>ns</sup>
	3 h	24	0.52	0.62	-0.09 <sup>s</sup>	12	0.45	0.45	-0.002 <sup>ns</sup>

N=sample size; s=significantly different than 0 ( $\alpha=0.05$ ); ns=not significantly different than 0 ( $\alpha=0.05$ );  $a = ET_{DT}-ET_{MT} = (WDEL_g - WDEL_n) \cdot Irrigation\ event\ duration\ (h)$ ;  $b = ET_{DT}-ET_{MT} = -ILn$ .

Table 3. Gross wind drift and evaporation losses ( $WDEL_g$ ), evapotranspiration reductions during irrigation ( $ET_{DT}-ET_{MT}$ )<sub>di</sub>, net wind and evaporation losses ( $WDEL_n$ ), net intercepted losses ( $IL_n$ ) and net sprinkler losses ( $SEL_n$ ) for the evaluated irrigation events.

Irrigation Events	N	$I_g$ (mm)	$WDEL_g$		$(ET_{DT}-ET_{MT})_{di}$		$WDEL_n$		$IL_n$		$SEL_n$		
			(mm)	(%)	(mm)	(%)	(mm)	(%)	(mm)	(%)	(mm)	(%)	
Daytime	Average	24	21.1	2.3	10.9	0.9	4.3	1.4	6.6	0.7	3.1	2.1	9.8
	Total		507.1	55.3		21.6		33.7		15.9		49.5	
Nighttime	Average	12	20.9	0.8	3.7	0.1	0.8	0.6	3.0	0.5	2.4	1.1	5.4
	Total		250.3	9.3		1.9		7.4		6.0		13.4	
All Irrigations	Average	36	21.0	1.8	8.5	0.7	3.1	1.1	5.4	0.6	2.9	1.8	8.3
	Total		757.4	64.6		23.5		41.1		21.9		62.9	

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Scheme of experimental plot: ( $WDEL_g$ ) location of measurement of wind drift and evaporation losses and uniformity coefficient; (*Lys*) weighing lysimeters; (*Met*) automatic meteorological stations; (*Pres*) irrigation pressure transducers; (*Sp*) sprinklers; (*ICH*) irrigation control hut; (*Cc*) catch cans.

Figure 2. Air temperature (*T*), Canopy temperature and Vapor pressure deficit (*VPD*) measured at the two treatments, moist (*MT*) and dry (*DT*), for 1-2 hours before, during and 1-3 hours after irrigation for daytime (left figure) and nighttime (right figure) irrigation events. Each value on the continuous line curves represents the average for all irrigations events lasting 3 hours.

Figure 3. Air Temperature, Canopy Temperature and *VPD* values during one daytime (left) and one nighttime (right) sprinkler irrigation event at the moist treatment versus corresponding rates recorded at the dry treatment, regressions lines and equations were presented. Dashed lines correspond to the 1:1 lines.

Figure 4. Average alfalfa evapotranspiration rates (*ET*) 1-2 h before, during, and 1-3 h after daytime sprinkler irrigation events at the moist treatment (*MT*) versus corresponding rates recorded at the dry treatment (*DT*).

Figure 5. Net intercepted Losses ( $IL_n$ ) calculated after all irrigation events (daytime and nighttime) versus the vapor pressure deficit (*VPD*). The  $IL_n$  were cumulative values until no difference between treatments was observed (1 to 3h after the irrigation event). The *VPD* was recorded at the 'grass station' and averaged for the same period of time.

Figure 6. Net sprinkler evaporation losses ( $SEL_n$ ) calculated for all irrigation events (daytime and nighttime) versus the wind speed (*U*). *U* was recorded at the 'grass station' and averaged for the periods during and after (1 to 3 h) the irrigation events.




Figure 1. Scheme of experimental plot: (WDEL<sub>g</sub>) location of measurement of wind drift and evaporation losses and uniformity coefficient; (Lys) weighing lysimeters; (Met) automatic meteorological stations; (Pres) irrigation pressure transducers; (Sp) sprinklers; (ICH) irrigation control hut; (Cc) catch cans.




Figure 2. Air temperature ( $T$ ), Canopy temperature and Vapor pressure deficit ( $VPD$ ) measured at the two treatments, moist ( $MT$ ) and dry ( $DT$ ), for 1-2 hours before, during and 1-3 hours after irrigation for daytime (left figure) and nighttime (right figure) irrigation events. Each value on the continuous line curves represents the average for all irrigations events lasting 3 hours.




Figure 3: 5-min Air Temperature, Canopy Temperature and VPD values during daytime (left) and nighttime (right) sprinkler irrigation events at the moist treatment versus corresponding rates recorded at the dry treatment, regressions lines and equations were presented. Dashed lines correspond to the 1:1 lines.




Figure 4. Average alfalfa evapotranspiration rates (ET) 1–2 h before, during, and 1–3 h after daytime sprinkler irrigation events at the moist treatment (MT) versus corresponding rates recorded at the dry treatment (DT).




Figure 5. Net intercepted Losses ( $IL_n$ ) calculated after all irrigation events (daytime and nighttime) versus the vapor pressure deficit (VPD). The  $IL_n$  were cumulative values until no difference between treatments was observed (1 to 3h after the irrigation event). The VPD was recorded at the 'grass station' and averaged for the same period of time.






Figure 6. Net sprinkler evaporation losses ( $SEL_n$ ) calculated for all irrigation events (daytime and nighttime) versus the wind speed ( $U$ ).  $U$  was recorded at the 'grass station' and averaged for the periods during and after (1 to 3 h) the irrigation events.