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ABSTRACT
No-till practices play an important role in decreasing production costs, increasing soil organic
matter content, improving soil structure and removing unwanted environmental impacts. However,
due to a lack of access to proper machinery for direct seeding in unplowed lands, such practices
have failed to produce successful results since they are incapable of providing sufficient contact
between soil and seeds. Introducing a machine that can plant seeds and fertilizer at two different
depths in hard (unplowed) soils covered with last season’s crop residues can be the first step
towards pilot no-till initiatives. This step can finally lead to the promotion of this practice in the
potential areas. The total actual forces imposed to a furrow opener in practice is multiple times
larger than a design’s total. There are a number of factors contributing to this phenomenon
including unknown environmental factors in soil, existence of fine and coarse gravels, and also
different partial, unpredictable loads produced on impact with the soil. Empirically and practically,
as well as based on results from agricultural projects on no-till machinery in Iranian arid and semi-
arid regions, disk (rotary) coulters of a furrow opener set sustain heavy damages during no-till
farming. Therefore, the 4mm thickness of coulters on no-till machinery was increased to 6mm. On
the other hand, several parameters can influence the soil, as a result, the safety factor was also
increased to improve the furrow opener’s resistance against rocks, unknown soil factors, etc. In this
study, different components of a disk furrow opener were optimally designed in Solid Works
modelling software. ANSYS was used to analyze this furrow opener and its three main related
components. Finally, the coulter’s stress was determined using the von Mises criterion. The result
showed that the minimum coulter stress was 1985.5Pa throughout the plane and its maximum
belonged to the holes inside the hub with 1.0819x107Pa. The safety factor of the initial coulter was
17.85, while that of the optimally designed coulter was 25.
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Introduction
The term “combination” means blending and mixing, and it technically refers to a machine that performs multiple agricultural practices at the same time. Using functionality of different tools (e.g. moldboard plow, disk, leveler, seeder, roller, etc.) gathered together in a single set and in form of a machine leads to a device called combination (combined machine). This machine is capable of performing different tasks (including bed preparation, planting, leveling, and soil fixation) in just one pass on the field. The emergence of such a collection bring about accelerated work, timely practices, and also cost, time and energy efficiency. Moreover, reduction in tractor and machinery passes on the field can prevent the formation of hardpans. Recently, with regard to the mechanization sector’s demand, importing and manufacturing of combinations were increased, and they became more prevalent. These systems were used for planting seeds ranging between 2 and 10mm and for seed drilling. Two types of furrow opener are common in combination systems: disk furrow opener capable of performing in fields covered with plant residues (such as corn) and in high moisture content soils, as well as exactly adjusting the depth; and shoe furrow opener which has low wear (dry) and is suitable for properly loosened fields.

No-till machinery should be capable of cutting through unplowed soil and passing planting residues through furrow opener hitch links, and also providing a proper contact between soil and seeds (Graham and Ellis, 1980). Moreover, the type of residues, their density per area unit, and how well they are chopped are among the important factors effective in designing direct planting machinery. Research shows that the best arrangement for passing plant residues beneath a planter is when they are left upright on the ground. Chopped residues can, on the one hand, be accumulated in front of machinery hitch links and, on the other hand, disrupt the soil-seed contact (Hemmat and Taki, 2001). The maximum penetration in hard and dry soils can be provided using shovel type furrow openers. However, these can disrupt the surface soil layer and mix plant residues with this layer (Hofman, 1988). With worldwide increasing demand for no-till machinery, disk furrow openers became of great interest since they disrupt only a small portion of soil volume. This characteristic minimizes the germination of weed seeds and maintains soil moisture. Their other significant characteristics include their suitability for high-speed planting (i.e. low soil throwing) and their ability to pass over plant residues without accumulating them in front of the hitch links. Disk furrow openers are made and used in various forms. The main criteria in designing a direct planter with disk furrow openers are shape selection, their arrangement, and their combination with regard to soil conditions and planting pattern (Stephens and Johnson, 1993). Traveling speed is also another factor contributing to the performance of furrow openers. Generally, the wider the furrow opener, the more effective the traveling speed will be in its performance (Desbiolles, 1992). The amount of pressure on each opener is yet another important factor in designing direct planters with disk furrow
openers. The first difference between a planter used in conventional tillage practices and the one used in a no-till practice can be their weight. Since openers used in no-till conservative practices must cut through unplowed soils and plant residues, more pressure is required to drive them into soil. This lead to machinery overweight, especially in hard soils covered with wooden residues (Simmons, 1995). An effective approach to curbing machinery overweight is to use active furrow openers, which can facilitate cutting with their proper rotational movement along the traveling direction.

In arid and semi-arid areas of Iran, the high evaporation between harvesting and next planting stages and also the lack of organic matters at soil’s surface layer can harden the area’s structureless soil to the extent that, unless the plow practice is performed, furrow openers of grain drills and even the tough arms of deep drills will fail to penetrate. Against this background, most research efforts on no-till systems have used grain drills that had opener penetration issues or had to impose high pressure on machinery arms which, in turn, produced a plowed surface layer. Therefore, mixed results are reported in these studies, making it hard to draw a single conclusion.

The current study builds on the results from research efforts on no-till machinery in arid and semi-arid areas. These studies have frequently reported penetration issues which have led to crushing and bending of machinery due to impose high pressures on the opener unit and its collision with rocks and gravels. Therefore, with regards to the observed disfigurations and damages to furrow openers, Solid Works and ANSYS were employed to optimally design and analyze the components of a furrow opener. At the first design stage, a general view of the furrow opener unit of no-till machinery was required, which was provided a visual examination. It was essential to prepare separate drawings for its components. To this effect, drawing on the inverse engineering concept, all components were dismantled and analyzed.

2. Materials and Methods
The optimal design of the furrow opener was performed by building on the soil properties from fields of arid and semi-arid areas and also the results from studies on no-till machineries working on such fields. The ASAE standard table was the reference for design calculations. Then, Solid Works was used for the simulation process. ANSYS and the finite element method were employed for analyzing the furrow opener components.

2.1. Modeling of furrow opener set
A 3D model of the furrow opener set in a Bertini no-till machine was designed and modelled in Solid Works (Figure 1). The technical specifications are presented in Tale 1.
Figure 1: 3D model of the furrow opener

Table 1: Technical specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total width</td>
<td>430cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work width</td>
<td>300cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spacing and the number of units in line planting</td>
<td>17.5cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spacing and the number of units in row planting</td>
<td>35cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of planting</td>
<td>1-7cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine’s weight</td>
<td>3400kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required force</td>
<td>67kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opener’s diameter</td>
<td>40cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opener’s hitch linklength</td>
<td>90cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.1. Optimal design and modeling of opener’s components

The furrow opener set of a no-till machine includes a number of opener units. Each unit consisted of a disk coulter, hub, bushing , hitch link, secondary chassis, main chassis, and safety spring. The main components are depicted in Figures 2 to 5.
ASTM-A37 steel was selected for these components with regards to the imposed loads. The mechanical properties of this steel are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2:** The mechanical properties of materials used for each unit’s components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Density ( \left( \frac{kg}{m^3} \right) )</th>
<th>Final strength</th>
<th>Yield strength</th>
<th>Young’s modulus (Pa)</th>
<th>Thermal expansion coefficient ( (Jkg^{-1}10^{-1}) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steel (ASTM-A37)</td>
<td>7850</td>
<td>4.6x10⁸</td>
<td>2.5x10⁸</td>
<td>2x10⁹</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2. Forces imposed on the opener unit

2.2.1. Forces on the rotary coulter (disk-type furrow opener)

The free body diagram of a rotary coulter is as follows:
According to Figure 6, the equivalent force imposed by soil on the $\hat{CD}$ arc due to the forward movement of the coulter is supposed as $K_n$. This force is acting at the middle of the $\hat{CD}$ arc. It can be determined using the following equation:

$$K_n = K_0 L = K_0 (R \alpha)$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

Where, $K_n$ is the force acting on the coulter from soil (N), $K_0$ denotes the soil rigidity coefficient (N/m), $L$ is the length of the $\hat{CD}$ arc (m), $R$ is the radius of the coulter (m), and $\alpha$ is the central angle of the $\hat{CD}$ arc in degrees. Moreover, $\beta$ is the angle between the coulter’s hitch link and the horizontal line. On the other hand, the total force, $\vec{K}$, can be obtained from the summation of the equivalent vector force, $\vec{K}_n$, and the tangent force between the coulter and soil, $\vec{T}$, as follows:

$$\vec{K} = \vec{K}_n + \vec{T}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

The total force, $\vec{K}$, is determined using Equation 3:

$$K = \frac{K_n}{\cos \phi}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

Where, $\phi$ is the angle between $\vec{K}$ and $\vec{K}_n$, which, according to standards in Table 3, is the friction between soil and the coulter’s steel. In order to determine the tangent force of the coulter, the following equations are used (Shafiy, 2005):

$$T = K_n \tan \phi$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

Furthermore, $\alpha$ is determined as follows:
\[
\alpha = \cos^{-1} \left( \frac{R - a}{R} \right)
\]  
(5)

As a result, \( \alpha \) is equal to 70.51 degrees. The total force (\( K \)) was resolved into its vertical and horizontal components. In order to determine the tension on the coulter, Equation 6 was employed:

\[
D = F_i[A + B(S) + C(S)^2]WT
\]  
(6)

Where, \( D = K_x \) is the force imposed on instruments (N); \( F \) is determined using the standard table for designing a furrow opener (3) in Appendix, and it shows the soil texture type; according to Table 3, \( I \) is specific soil parameters, in which -1 is used for light texture soils, -2 for medium texture soils, and -3 is for heavy texture soils. \( A, B \) and \( C \) are implement-specific parameters in Table 3. Moreover, \( S \) is the forward speed (km/h), \( w \) is the machine width with the number of rows or planting units, \( T \) denotes the tillage depth which, for main tillage implements, is in centimeter (cm) and, for planter cutters, is a dimensionless quantity and equal to 1. The parameters associated with draft and preferred draft range (for tillage and planting implements) are estimated using Table 3. With regards to machine specifications, the coulter row under Seeding Implements and Grain Drill No-Till topics was selected and the related quantities were used for the following equation:

\[
D = 1 \times [720 + 0 + 0] \times 1 \times 1 = 720 N
\]  
(7)

Note that the coulter is capable of bearing up to 972N with a 4mm thickness:

\[
D_{Final} = 720 + (0.35 \times 720) = 972 \quad N
\]  
(8)

The maximum force for the 4mm coulter was 972N. The unknown parameters of the above equations were calculated using Table 3. Then, the design was proceeded for a 6mm coulter, and its related \( K_x \) and \( K_y \) during a tillage operation were determined. Its results were compared to those from the 4mm coulter.

\[
K_x = k \sin \left( \frac{\alpha}{2} + \varphi \right) \rightarrow k = 981N
\]

\[
K_y = k \cos \left( \frac{\alpha}{2} + \varphi \right) \rightarrow K_y = 119.87 + 734.6 = 854.471N
\]  
(9)

Therefore, compressive stresses on the coulter’s section (\( \hat{C}D \)) can be obtained from Equation 10:

\[
\sigma = \frac{K_y}{A}
\]  
(10)

Where, \( \sigma \) is the compressive stress (N/m), and the involved section of the coulter is in m².
2.2.2. Forces acting on hitch link
In order to design a coulter, it is first necessary to calculate the draft imposed on its components when it engages the soil. Therefore, using Table 3, the draft was estimated. The following free body diagram presents the forces acting on a coulter’s hitch link in no-till implements:

![Free body diagram of forces acting on the hitch link](image)

**Figure 7:** Free body diagram of forces acting on the hitch link

Equation 9 can be used to determine the draft on a coulter’s hitch link in no-till implements. The force, $F_s$, can be obtained using the following relation:

\[
\sum M_O = 0 \\
F_s S \sin \beta - F_x L \cos \alpha - F_y L \sin \alpha = 0
\]  

(11)

2.2.3. Forces acting on coulter’s hub
The numerical calculations of the forces on the hub along the x and y axes were performed using Equation 9.

![Forces acting on the coulter’s hub](image)

**Figure 8:** Forces acting on the coulter’s hub

Equation 9 was also used to determine the equivalent force of the hub along the x and y axes. Therefore, the resultant vector from the addition of the said forces, the equivalent force, $K$, of 981 N was obtained.

2.2.4. Forces acting on coulter’s bushing
Equation 9 was also used to determine the bushing’s forces along the x and y axes. The equivalent force, $K$, was 981 N. This amount was divided into two at both ends of the bushing.

2.3. Safety Factor
The von Mises theory was used for this purpose. According to the theory, the maximum stress on an object can be determined using the following relation:

\[
\sigma_{\text{max}} = \left( \frac{(\sigma_1 - \sigma_2)^2 + (\sigma_2 - \sigma_3)^2 + (\sigma_1 - \sigma_3)^2}{2} \right)^{1/2}
\]

\[(12)\]

Where, \(\sigma_1\), \(\sigma_2\) and \(\sigma_3\) are the main stresses acting on an object along three coordinate axes. In order to ensure the performance of mechanical materials and to prevent failure, the applied stresses on an object should be smaller than its yield stress. According to this principle, the safety factor of an object can be determined as follows:

\[
F.S = \frac{\sigma_y}{\sigma_{\text{max}}}
\]

\[(13)\]

All parameters in the above relation are in Newton.

Once the design calculations of the coulter was checked with table 3, it was found that the actual forces are multiple times larger than in the theory. Empirically and practically, coulters sustain heavy damages during operation. Due to unknown environmental factors in soil, existence of fine and coarse gravels, and also different partial, unpredictable loads produced on impact with the soil, it was concluded that the coulter’s thickness must be increased. On the other hand, there are numerous factors acting on soil; therefore, the safety factor was also increased. To design these four components, \(K_x = 981N\) and \(K_Y = 854.47N\) were obtained.

2.4. Meshing and Loading for Main Components of the Coulter

In the optimal designing of a coulter and its main involved components, the static loading approach was used. Element type was triangular. The finer the meshing, the more accurate the analysis. Figures 9 to 15 show the meshing and loading processes of the main coulter components; where A, B and C specify the backrest, displacement and the applied force.

Figure 9: Triangular meshing of the disk-type furrow opener
**Figure 10:** A) force applied to furrow opener; B) backrest displacement

**Coulter Loading**

**Figure 11:** Triangular meshing of the coulter’s hub

**Hub Meshing**

**Figure 12:** Furrow opener’s hub loading and backrest

**Hub Loading and Backrest**

**Figure 13:** Triangular meshing of the coulter’s hitch link

**Hitch Link Meshing**

**Figure 14:** Furrow opener’s hitch link loading and backrest

**Hitch Link Loading**

**Figure 15:** Triangular meshing of the coulter’s bushing

**Bushing Meshing**
3. Results and Discussions

The maximum force that can be borne by the coulter of the no-till implement with a 4mm diameter was 972 N. Given $\varphi = 47.726$, the value of $K_y$ was 854.471 N. Moreover, $K_x$ was 981 N. The maximum tension that the optimal coulter can hold along the horizontal axis was 981 N.

3.1. Stress Analysis of the 4mm Coulter (von Mises Theory)

According to the stress analysis of the coulter shown in Figure 17, the minimum stress of the coulter was 2124.7 Pa at most points on the plane, while its maximum occurred at both its impact point with soil and a part of its backrest with $1.4133 \times 10^7$ Pa.

3.1.1. Stress analysis of the optimal coulter with a 6mm diameter

According to the stress analysis of the coulter shown in Figure 18 (based on the von Mises criterion), the minimum stress of the coulter throughout the plane was 1985.5 Pa, while its maximum was occurred at holes used for connecting to the hub with $1.0829 \times 10^7$. 
3.2. Results from Deflection Analysis of the 4mm Coulter

As shown in Figure 19, the applied forces during the implement’s forward movement cause deflection in the coulter, as its maximum \((5.628 \times 10^{-6} \text{ m})\) occurred at the edge engaged with soil. However, no deflection was observed at the central areas of the plate.

3.3.1. Deflection analysis in the 6mm optimal coulter

According to Figure 20, the applied forces during the implement’s forward movement cause deflection in the optimal coulter, as its maximum \((3.128 \times 10^{-6} \text{ m})\) occurred at the edge engaged with soil. However, no deflection was observed at the central areas of the plate.
3.4. Results from Stress Analysis of Hub

Using the von Mises criterion, the stress analysis of the hub shown in Figure 21 indicated that the minimum stress of the hub was 4228.1 Pa throughout the plane except around the holes, while its maximum was inside the hub’s holes with $5.7744 \times 10^6$ Pa.

![Figure 21: Stress analysis of the coulter’s hub](image)

3.4.1. Results from deflection analysis of the hub

As shown in Figure 22, the maximum deflection of the coulter’s hub ($5.4784 \times 10^{-7}$ m) occurred when forces acted on the hub’s center along the implement’s movement direction. This is while its minimum (zero) was observed around the bolt holes.

![Figure 22: Deflection analysis of the coulter’s hub](image)

3.5. Results from Stress Analysis of Hitch Link

Using the von Mises criterion, the stress analysis of the hitch link shown in Figure 23 indicated that the minimum stress of the hitch link was 3151.3 Pa at its both ends, while its maximum was at the middle of the hitch link and along the instrument traveling direction with $2.4719 \times 10^7$ Pa.
3.5.1. Results from deflection analysis of hitch link

As shown in Figure 24, the maximum deflection of the hitch link ($5.3903 \times 10^{-5}$ m) occurred at its point of connection to the coulter due to forces along the implement’s movement direction. This is while its minimum was observed at the backrest and its close vicinity with $1.0168 \times 10^{-7}$ m).

3.6. Results from Stress Analysis of Frames Pivot Bushing

According to Figure 25, the stress analysis for the frame’s joint bushing indicated that the minimum stress in this component was at its middle with 32.806 Pa and the maximum stress was observed at its both ends with $9.618 \times 10^5$ Pa.

Figure 23: Stress in the coulter’s hitch link

Figure 24: Deflection in the coulter’s hitch link

Figure 25: Stress in the coulter’s bushing
3.6.1. **Deflection in the frame’s joint bushing**

As shown in Figure 26, forces applied to the implement along its movement direction produced deformations in the frame’s joint bushing. The maximum deflection was $1.4211 \times 10^{-8}$ m at the point where the force was applied, and the minimum was around zero at other parts of the bushing.

![Deflection analysis of the coulter’s bushing](image)

**Figure 26**: Deflection analysis of the coulter’s bushing

4. **Conclusion**

With regards to Table 3 in the Appendix, the maximum tension that can be borne by the coulter was 720 N. Given a 35% correction factor in Table 3 for designing, the coulter’s maximum tension can be increased to 972 N. However, in practice, the applied forces are multiple times larger than in theory. Empirically and practically, coulters sustain heavy damages during operation. The coulter’s stress can be reduced and its strength and safety factor can be boosted by optimally designing the components of a furrow opener. Note that the alloy used for the share was regular iron ($2.5 \times 10^8$) and the share’s thickness was increased. The maximum stress of the optimal 6mm coulter was $1.0829 \times 10^7$ Pa. The maximum bearable stress by the 4mm coulter was $1.4133 \times 10^7$ Pa. The maximum deflection of the optimal 6mm coulter was $3.128 \times 10^{-6}$ m which was smaller than the deflection in the 4mm coulter ($5.628 \times 10^{-6}$ m). The safety factor of the 4mm coulter was 17.85 while it was increased to 25 in the 6mm coulter. Finally, the results showed that the optimal furrow opener is durable and will not face deformation under applied forces. It is also more cost-effective. Under loading conditions, the maximum stress along the implement forward movement occurred in the hub’s holes with $5.7744 \times 10^6$ Pa.

By optimally designing the coulter’s hitch link, the stress concentration area is widened. The maximum stress concentration was also occurred in the drawbar’s bolt holes. From an economical point of view, the 10mm bolts in the hitch link were replaced by 12mm bolts. Note that the maximum stress at the front side of the hitch link and along the instrument movement direction was $2.4719 \times 10^7$ Pa. In the optimally designed frame’s joint bushing, the strength was boosted while
stress and deflection were mitigated. The maximum stress were recorded at both ends of the bushing with $9.618 \times 10^5$ Pa, while the minimum amount with 32.806 Pa occurred at its middle point when applied forces were along the instrument movement direction.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: ASAE Standard Parameters for Designing Furrow Openers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implement</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Machine Parameters</th>
<th>Soil Parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>units</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAJOR TILLAGE TOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sideways/Manure Injector</td>
<td>narrow point</td>
<td>tools</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 cm (1 ft) deep point</td>
<td>tools</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldboard Plow</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisel Plow</td>
<td>5 cm (2.0 in) straight</td>
<td>tools</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 cm (3.0 in) sweep</td>
<td>tools</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 cm (4.0 in) wedge</td>
<td>tools</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sweep Pipe</strong></td>
<td>primary slurry</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary slurry</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disk Harrow, Tandem</strong></td>
<td>primary slurry</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary slurry</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disk Harrow, Offset</td>
<td>primary slurry</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary slurry</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disk Plow, Single row</td>
<td>primary slurry</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary slurry</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultivator</strong></td>
<td>smooth or rippled</td>
<td>tools</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>box or fluted</td>
<td>tools</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Cultivator</td>
<td>primary slurry</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary slurry</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Row Crop Cultivator</strong></td>
<td>5-shot</td>
<td>rows</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-shot</td>
<td>rows</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-till</td>
<td>rows</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Red Wedge</strong></td>
<td>rows</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disk-Blender</td>
<td>rows</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MINOR TILLAGE TOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Hoe</td>
<td>rows</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coil 3/4 in. Harrow</td>
<td>rows</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spike Tooth Harrow</td>
<td>rows</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Tooth Harrow</td>
<td>rows</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reel Packer</td>
<td>rows</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avocado Hoe</td>
<td>rows</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Plane</td>
<td>rows</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEEDING IMPLEMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Crop Planter, prepared seedbed</td>
<td>rows</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drawn</td>
<td>rows</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seed, fertilizer, herbicides</td>
<td>rows</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Crop Planter, 8- to 8-in. seed, fertilizer, herbicides</td>
<td>rows</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grass Drill with 12-in. wheels</td>
<td>rows</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 to 3.7 in. drill width</td>
<td>rows</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 3.7 in. drill width</td>
<td>rows</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain Drill, no-till</td>
<td>rows</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hoe Drill</strong></td>
<td>primary slurry</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>6,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary slurry</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pneumatic Drill</strong></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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