

Available Online at www.aextj.com Agricultural Extension Journal 2023; 7(3):86-94

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Relationship between Cotton Production and Virtual Water in India

Amir Khan, Saghir Ahmad Ansari, Shoaib Ansari

Department of Agricultural Economics and Business Management, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, Uttar Pradesh, India

Received: 20-05-2023; Revised: 10-06-2023; Accepted: 15-07-2023

ABSTRACT

Water is an essential natural resource to live on the earth. We have about 2/3rd of the water on the planet. Still, there is a scarcity of water. It is due to the uneven distribution of water on the earth in many places because of the over-exploitation and the withdrawal of water for personal and agricultural use. This study is conducted to know the impact of the yield on virtual water use in cotton production. The secondary cotton production data was collected from the INDIASTAT. The water requirement for the cotton is calculated by the CROPWAT 8.0 model (software of the FAO). The regression analysis is done to calculate the result. The result is calculated by a statistical package in the social sciences. The result of the study shows that if the farm's yield increases, the virtual water per unit will decrease. The implications of this paper are that to reduce the water requirement for cotton production, India needs to increase the production capacity of cotton, resulting in a decrease in the water requirement. The result of this study can be implied anywhere to get a reduction in the virtual water use in any type of farm product.

Key words: Agriculture, cotton production, CROPWAT, virtual water, water efficiency

INTRODUCTION

India is an agricultural country. Agriculture is a prominent part of the employment of the Indian population. According to Statista,^[1] in 2019, 42.6% of India's labor force was involved in agriculture, while the remaining half was evenly divided between industry and services. For agricultural products, there is a need for various inputs and conditions like weather, soil, temperature, tools and techniques, fertilizers, pesticides, and favorable conditions. Besides these inputs and conditions, one crucial thing is required to produce agricultural products, i.e., water. Without water, we cannot imagine anything, including agriculture. The water that is used in the production of industrial and agricultural products is called virtual water. Water

Address for correspondence: Shoaib Ansari E-mail: shoaibamu111@gmail.com is the most important thing for all living beings to survive. We can say that water is the reason why Earth is the only place where life can exist. This allpurpose solvent is one of the most important things we have on Earth. Without water, no one would be able to live. It covers almost 70% of the earth, after all. Even though there is a lot of water, we need to realize that not all of it is safe to drink. Every day, we use water for things that are very important to us. As the population is increasing, safe drinking water availability is decreasing. More water is needed for agricultural production due to the increase in population, resulting in more water withdrawal.^[2] Cotton is a commercial fiber crop that is grown around the world. It is estimated that cotton farming started 7000 years ago, and cotton farming and woven into clothes began in the Indus Valley 3000 years BC.^[3] India is the largest cotton-growing nation in land and the second largest in output.^[4,5] About 10000–20000 liters of water are used to produce 1 kg of cotton, depending on climatic and soil conditions. The

world's consumption of cotton products needs 256 Gm3 of water per year for the years 1997–2001.^[6]

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Indian Cotton Production

Cotton has been grown in India since at least 3000 BCE, making it one of the oldest crops in the world. ^[3,7] India is one of the biggest cotton-growing nations. More than 60 million people in India are directly or indirectly employed by the cotton textile and processing industries because of their involvement in farming as well as through direct or indirect employment opportunities provided by cotton textiles and processing.^[8] Cotton output in India has increased in recent years, giving the country an advantage in domestic and international markets. Although the United States only generates 14% of the cotton grown worldwide, it exports 38% of what it produces. The United States exported 86% of its output, compared to India's 22%, but the United States had a production cost 5–6 times higher than India.^[9] Cotton production has increased due to the adoption of Bt cotton.^[2,10-12] Still, our cotton yield in India is less than the world's average yield. It is <500 kg lint/ha, while the average yield of the world's cotton production is 792 kg lint/ ha.^[8] It can be increased by changing the planting date,^[13] and using a high-density planting strategy to cultivate types with a short growing period.^[8] The government must take the required steps to improve productivity through research, mechanization, and increased exports through increased production.^[14]

Virtual Water Efficiency

This virtual water is the water used to produce food and fiber, as well as energy and other non-food products. Agricultural output accounts for around 87% of the world's freshwater use.^[15] Due to rising food demand in water-scarce areas, agricultural water output must be improved.^[2,15] For 1 kg of cotton, production water is required in the range of 10,000 to 20,000 liters, depending on the soil texture, temperature, humidity, etc. According to the Water Footprint Network, 1 kg of cotton production requires 22,500 liters of water. At the same time, the world's average water requirement for 1 kg of cotton production is 10,000 liters.^[16,17] Increasing the cotton yield is needed to reduce the virtual water use per unit. It reduces irrigation water loss while preserving crop output to improve irrigation water productivity.^[18] It is possible by using modern technology,^[14,19] changes in planting time,^[13] high-density planting techniques, and, according to the country's weather, G. arboreum cotton should be prioritized.^[8]

Objectives

The objective of the research paper is to determine the impact of cotton yield on virtual water.

Null hypothesis H_0 : There is no relationship between yield and virtual water use.

Alternate hypothesis H_1 : There is a relationship between yield and virtual water use.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Data Collection

The secondary data are collected regarding the cotton from the INDIASTAT website, and the data of the virtual water is calculated through the CROPWAT 8.0 model (software of the FAO). Regarding the water use, the actual water requirement is calculated only as the sum of adequate rainfall and actual irrigation requirement.

Virtual Water Calculation

AVW=GVW+BVW AVWR=actual virtual water requirement (in mm) GVW=green virtual water (in mm) BVW=blue virtual water (in mm)

Virtual Water Required for a Hectare

CROPWAT model Calculated virtual water in mm, which is calculated in liters by multiplying 10,000 for one hectare of area. Virtual water needed per kg of cotton was calculated by dividing the total production in hectares.

AVWR (in mm) X 10,000= Virtual water (in liters in a hectare).

Virtual Water Required for a kg Production

Virtual water in a hectare/total production in a hectare.

Data Analysis Technique and Tool

Data are analyzed using a statistical package for social science. The regression model is used in data analysis to know the impact of yield on the use of virtual water in cotton production.

Data Analysis

The table shows the regression analysis performed to check the impact of yield on the virtual water use in cotton production. The yield and virtual water data of different states are shown in the appendix.

The regression equation is: Y = a+bX

Where,

Y = Virtual Water (Dependent Variable)

a = Constant

b = Intersect

X = Yield (Independent Variable)

The value of R Square is depicting the variation in virtual water caused by the yield. The value of the constant shows that if all the independent variables are set to zero, the VW unit will be fixed as written in the column of the constant. The β values of all states are statistically significant at 5%. The level of significance is P < 0.000. Therefore, there is a significant impact on virtual water when there is a change in yield. It shows that the increase in one unit of yield will result in a decrease of β units of virtual water.

The above table calculates the relationship between

yield and the virtual water use in the cotton production state-wise and the cotton production at the country level. It shows the impact of yield on the use of virtual water. How virtual water per unit decreased as the yield increased. There is a negative relationship between yield and virtual water use. It can be seen in the above table that in each case, there is a significant impact of the yield on the use of virtual water. So here, we can generalize that if the yield increases, virtual water per unit use decreases. There is the highest impact on the use of virtual water in Punjab, Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, and Haryana, and the least significant impact of the yield on virtual water is in Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, and Orissa.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

India is one of the top cotton-producing and exporting countries in the world. Cotton farming requires much water to be grown; it is about 10000-20000 liters, depending on the situation of the zone, like climatic conditions, soil conditions, etc. According to the Water Footprint Network, Indian cotton production needs 22,500 liters of water to produce 1 kg of cotton, which is much higher than the world's average water use. The study's findings are that if the cotton yield increases, the water requirement for cotton production decreases. It means that to reduce the water requirement for cotton production, India needs to increase the production capacity of cotton, resulting in a decrease in the water requirement. The result of this study can be implied anywhere to get a reduction in the virtual water use in any type of farm product.

| States | R-square | Constant (a) | Standardised β | t-value | <i>P</i> -value | Decision | Significant difference |
|----------------|-----------------|--------------|----------------|---------|-----------------|----------|------------------------|
| Gujrat | 0.860 | 59150.302 | -0.927 | -10.792 | 0.000 | Rejected | Yes |
| Haryana | 0.847 | 32480.904 | -0.921 | -10.275 | 0.000 | Rejected | Yes |
| Karnataka | 0.847 | 46800.278 | -0.920 | -10.266 | 0.000 | Rejected | Yes |
| Maharashtra | 0.806 | 61160.484 | -0.898 | -8.872 | 0.000 | Rejected | Yes |
| Madhya Pradesh | 0.772 | 49272.343 | -0.879 | -8.031 | 0.000 | Rejected | Yes |
| Orissa | 0.812 | 36811.583 | -0.901 | -9.065 | 0.000 | Rejected | Yes |
| Punjab | 0.966 | 22756.230 | -0.983 | -23.282 | 0.000 | Rejected | Yes |
| Rajasthan | 0.736 | 67372.892 | -0.858 | -7.287 | 0.000 | Rejected | Yes |
| Tamil Nadu | 0.859 | 44907.335 | -0.927 | -10.758 | 0.000 | Rejected | Yes |
| Andhra Pradesh | 0.935 | 37552.327 | -0.967 | -16.495 | 0.000 | Rejected | Yes |

Source: Calculated by SPSS (statistical package for social science)

Policy Implications

As water demand is increasing due to the growing population, agricultural production needs more places to be irrigated, causing more production and irrigation demand. According to many resources, water quality and quantity are degrading and decreasing yearly. To safeguard the nation and prevent water depletion at a higher rate, the government needs to address the agricultural problem by improving the yield of farm products. It is only possible with government intervention. The government should take the necessary steps to increase farm productivity, like giving subsidies for farm mechanization, promoting high-yield varieties, and selecting seeds according to climatic conditions. Promoting the crops as per the region with high yields in the particular area.

REFERENCES

- 1. O'Neill A. India-distribution of the Workforce across EconomicSectors2019.Hamburg:Statista;2022.Available from: https://www.statista.com/statistics/271320/ distribution-of-the-workforce-across-economic-sectorsin-india [Last accessed on 2022 Jun 27].
- 2. Boutraa T. Improvement of water use efficiency in irrigated agriculture: A review. J Agron 2010;9:1-8.
- The Story of Cotton-history of Cotton; (n.d.) Available from: https://www.cotton.org/pubs/cottoncounts/ story/index.cfm#:~:text=caves%20in%20Mexico%20 found%20bits,into%20cloth%203%2C000%20years%20 BC [Last accessed on 2022 Jun 30].
- 4. Ashok K, Uma K, Prahadeeswaran M, Jeyanthi H. Economic and environmental impact of BT cotton in India. Indian J Agric Econ 2012;67:405-8.
- Shahbande M. World Cotton Production by Country 2019. Hamburg: Statista; 2021. Available from: https:// www.statista.com/statistics/263055/cotton-productionworldwide-by-top-countries [Last accessed on 2022 Jun 28].
- 6. Chapagain A, Hoekstra AY, Savenije H, Gautam R. The

Water Footprint of Cotton Consumption. Delft: IHE Institute for Water Education; 2005.

- 7. Santhanam V, Sundaram V. Agri-history of cotton in India: An overview. Asian Agri-History 1997;1:235-51.
- 8. Blaise D, Kranthi KR. Cotton Production in India. United States: Wiley; 2019. p. 193-215.
- 9. Sharma SK, Bugalya K. Competitiveness of Indian agriculture sector: A case study of cotton crop. Procedia Soc Behav Sci 2014;133:320-35.
- Bennett R, Ismael Y, Kambhampati U, Morse S. Economic impact of genetically modified cotton in India. AgBioForum 2004;7:96-100.
- 11. Stone GD. Constructing facts: BT cotton narratives in India. Econ Polit Wkly 2012;47:62-70.
- Subramanian A, Qaim M. The impact of BT cotton on poor households in rural India. J Dev Stud 2010;46:295-311.
- 13. Hebbar KB, Venugopalan MV, Prakash AH, Aggarwal PK. Simulating the impacts of climate change on cotton production in India. Clim Change 2013;118:701-13.
- 14. Niranjan S, Balaganesh G, Jamaludheen A. An analysis of trend in production, consumption and trade of cotton in India. Int Res J Agric Econ Stat 2017;8:293-8.
- 15. Pimentel D, Houser J, Preiss E, White O, Fang H, Mesnick L, *et al.* Water resources: Agriculture, the environment, and society. BioScience 1997;47:97-106.
- Leahy S. World Water Day: The Cost of Cotton in Water-challenged India. Guardian Sustainable Business. United Kingdom: The Guardian; 2015. Available from: https://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/2015/ mar/20/cost-cotton-water-challenged-india-world-waterday [Last accessed on 2022 Jul 02].
- 17. Water Footprint Network. The Guardian: World Water Day: The Cost of Cotton in Water-challenged India; (n.d.). Available from: https://waterfootprint.org/en/ about-us/news/news/world-water-day-cost-cotton-waterchallenged-india/#:~:text=producing%201kg%20of%20 cotton%20in,by%20the%20water%20footprint%20 network [Last accessed on 2022 Jun 02].
- 18. Kang S, Hao X, Du T, Tong L, Su X, Lu H, *et al.* Improving agricultural water productivity to ensure food security in China under changing environment: From research to practice. Agric Water Manag 2016;179:5-17.
- 19. Dinar A. Economic factors and opportunities as determinants of water use efficiency in agriculture. Irrig Sci 1993;14:47-52.

APPENDIX

| | | Gujarat | | |
|---------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| Year | Area (In '000' hectares) | Production (in '000' bales of 170) | Yields (in kg/hectare) | Total VW per kg in litres |
| 2000 | 1539.3 | 2085.6 | 230 | 35182.6 |
| 2001 | 1615.3 | 1161.4 | 122 | 66327.9 |
| 2002 | 1749.9 | 1702.7 | 165 | 49042.4 |
| 2003 | 1634.8 | 1684.6 | 175 | 46240 |
| 2004 | 1641 | 4026.9 | 417 | 19405.3 |
| 2005 | 1906.3 | 4724.8 | 421 | 19220.9 |
| 2006 | 1906 | 6772 | 604 | 13397.4 |
| 2007 | 2390 | 8787 | 625 | 12947.2 |
| 2008 | 2422 | 8276 | 581 | 13927.7 |
| 2009 | 2353.6 | 7013.8 | 507 | 15960.6 |
| 2010 | 2464 | 7986.3 | 551 | 14686 |
| 2011 | 2633 | 10400 | 671 | 12059.6 |
| 2012 | 2962 | 12000 | 689 | 11744.6 |
| 2013 | 2497 | 8850 | 603 | 13419.6 |
| 2014 | 2519 | 10150 | 685 | 11813.1 |
| 2015 | 2773 | 10500 | 644 | 12565.2 |
| 2016 | 2722 | 9400 | 587 | 13785.3 |
| 2017 | 2382 | 8575 | 612 | 13222.2 |
| 2018 | 2624 | 10187 | 660 | 12260.6 |
| 2019 | 2660 | 6279 | 401 | 20179.6 |
| 2020 | 2655 | 8617 | 552 | 14659.4 |
| Average | 2288.06 | 7103.77 | 500.095 | 21049.9 |

Green VW in one hectare=444.575*10000=4445750

Blue VW in one hectare=364.625*10000=3646250

| Haryana | | | | | |
|---------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| Year | Area (In '000' hectares) | Production (in '000' bales of 170) | Yields (in kg/hectare) | Total VW per kg in ltrs | |
| 2000 | 544 | 1304 | 408 | 15806 | |
| 2001 | 555 | 1383 | 424 | 15210 | |
| 2002 | 630 | 722 | 195 | 33072 | |
| 2003 | 518 | 1038 | 341 | 18912 | |
| 2004 | 526 | 1405 | 454 | 14205 | |
| 2005 | 621 | 2075 | 568 | 11354 | |
| 2006 | 583 | 1499 | 437 | 14757 | |
| 2007 | 530 | 1814 | 582 | 11081 | |
| 2008 | 483 | 1885 | 663 | 9727 | |
| 2009 | 455 | 1858 | 694 | 9293 | |
| 2010 | 507 | 1926 | 646 | 9983 | |
| 2011 | 492 | 1750 | 605 | 10660 | |
| 2012 | 641 | 2650 | 703 | 9174 | |
| 2013 | 614 | 2500 | 692 | 9319 | |
| 2014 | 536 | 2302 | 730 | 8834 | |
| 2015 | 648 | 2300 | 603 | 10695 | |
| 2016 | 615 | 993 | 274 | 23536 | |
| 2017 | 570 | 2041 | 609 | 10589 | |
| 2018 | 665 | 1627 | 416 | 15502 | |
| 2019 | 708 | 2013 | 483 | 13352 | |
| 2020 | 723 | 2484 | 584 | 11043 | |
| Average | 579.238 | 1789 | 529.095 | 13624 | |

Green VW in one hectare=415.1*10000=4151000 Blue VW in one hectare=229.8*10000=2298000

| | | Karnataka | | |
|---------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Year | Area (In '000' hectares) | Production (in '000' bales of 170) | Yields (in kg/hectare) | Total VW per kg in litres |
| 2000 | 545.7 | 664.5 | 207 | 30716.2 |
| 2001 | 581.8 | 855.2 | 263 | 24175.9 |
| 2002 | 608.5 | 612.4 | 171 | 37182.7 |
| 2003 | 392.7 | 330.9 | 143 | 44463.3 |
| 2004 | 316.7 | 264.6 | 142 | 44776.4 |
| 2005 | 521 | 688 | 224 | 28385 |
| 2006 | 413 | 554 | 228 | 27887.1 |
| 2007 | 376 | 610 | 276 | 23037.1 |
| 2008 | 403 | 778 | 328 | 19384.9 |
| 2009 | 409 | 866 | 360 | 17661.8 |
| 2010 | 457 | 868.2 | 323 | 19685 |
| 2011 | 545 | 1200 | 374 | 17000.7 |
| 2012 | 554 | 1200 | 368 | 17277.9 |
| 2013 | 485 | 1255 | 440 | 14450.6 |
| 2014 | 662 | 1875 | 481 | 13218.8 |
| 2015 | 875 | 2311 | 449 | 14160.9 |
| 2016 | 642 | 2000 | 530 | 11996.7 |
| 2017 | 510 | 1010 | 337 | 18867.2 |
| 2018 | 547 | 1844 | 573 | 11096.4 |
| 2019 | 718 | 1400 | 331 | 19209.2 |
| 2020 | 817 | 2330 | 485 | 13109.8 |
| Average | 541.876 | 1119.85 | 334.905 | 22273.5 |

Khan, et al.: Relationship between cotton production and virtual water in India

Green VW in one Hectare=471.65*10000=4716500

Blue VW in one hectare=164.175*10000=1641750

| | | Maharashtra | | |
|---------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Year | Area (In '000' hectares) | Production (in '000' bales of 170) | Yields (in kg/hectare) | Total VW per kg in letre |
| 2000 | 3254 | 3099.5 | 162 | 41205.2 |
| 2001 | 3076.9 | 1798.8 | 99 | 67426.8 |
| 2002 | 3104.7 | 2689.6 | 147 | 45409.9 |
| 2003 | 2800 | 2596 | 158 | 42248.4 |
| 2004 | 2762 | 3080 | 190 | 35132.9 |
| 2005 | 2840 | 2939 | 176 | 37927.6 |
| 2006 | 2875 | 3160 | 187 | 35696.5 |
| 2007 | 3107 | 4618 | 253 | 26384.4 |
| 2008 | 3195 | 7015 | 373 | 17896.1 |
| 2009 | 3146 | 4752 | 257 | 25973.7 |
| 2010 | 3495 | 5859 | 285 | 23421.9 |
| 2011 | 3942 | 8500 | 367 | 18188.7 |
| 2012 | 4125 | 7200 | 297 | 22475.6 |
| 2013 | 4146 | 7655 | 314 | 21258.8 |
| 2014 | 4192 | 8834 | 358 | 18645.9 |
| 2015 | 4190 | 7000 | 284 | 23504.4 |
| 2016 | 4207 | 7500 | 303 | 22030.5 |
| 2017 | 3800.4 | 10618.8 | 475 | 14053.2 |
| 2018 | 4351 | 6094 | 238 | 28047.3 |
| 2019 | 4218 | 6593 | 266 | 25094.9 |
| 2020 | 4491 | 6639 | 251 | 26594.6 |
| Average | 3586.57 | 5630.51 | 259.048 | 29458 |

Green VW in one Hectare=504.775*10000=5047750 Blue VW in one Hectare=162.75*10000=1627500

| | | Madhya Pradesh | | |
|---------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Year | Area (In '000' hectares) | Production (in '000' bales of 170) | Yields (in kg/hectare) | Total VW per kg in litres |
| 2000 | 487.7 | 417.2 | 145 | 39508.1 |
| 2001 | 497.7 | 245.1 | 84 | 68198.5 |
| 2002 | 541.5 | 394.3 | 124 | 46199 |
| 2003 | 559.3 | 390.1 | 119 | 48140.1 |
| 2004 | 564.1 | 639 | 193 | 29682.2 |
| 2005 | 576.1 | 626.1 | 185 | 30965.8 |
| 2006 | 620.4 | 745.1 | 204 | 28081.7 |
| 2007 | 638.9 | 828.6 | 220 | 26039.4 |
| 2008 | 630.4 | 864.8 | 233 | 24586.6 |
| 2009 | 624.8 | 856.1 | 233 | 24586.6 |
| 2010 | 610.9 | 855.3 | 238 | 24070 |
| 2011 | 650 | 2000 | 523 | 10953.5 |
| 2012 | 706 | 2000 | 482 | 11885.2 |
| 2013 | 608 | 2200 | 615 | 9314.91 |
| 2014 | 514 | 1730 | 572 | 10015.2 |
| 2015 | 547 | 1750 | 544 | 10530.6 |
| 2016 | 563 | 1800 | 544 | 10530.6 |
| 2017 | 599 | 2050.69 | 582 | 9843.08 |
| 2018 | 603 | 1620 | 457 | 12535.4 |
| 2019 | 614 | 2329 | 645 | 8881.66 |
| 2020 | 650 | 1646 | 430 | 13322.5 |
| Average | 590.752 | 1237.49 | 351.048 | 23708.1 |

Green VW in one Hectare=430.8*10000=4308000 Blue VW in one Hectare=142.067*10000=1420670

| | | Orissa | | |
|---------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Year | Area (In '000' Hectares) | Production (in '000' Bales of 170) | Yields (in Kg/Hectare) | Total VW in Kg in letres |
| 2000 | 38.1 | 61 | 272 | 20939.3 |
| 2001 | 40.4 | 65.3 | 275 | 20710.9 |
| 2002 | 63.3 | 54.7 | 147 | 38744.9 |
| 2003 | 29.5 | 49.9 | 288 | 19776 |
| 2004 | 36.7 | 88.2 | 409 | 13925.4 |
| 2005 | 45.9 | 111.2 | 412 | 13824 |
| 2006 | 56.6 | 144.8 | 435 | 13093.1 |
| 2007 | 50.6 | 107.9 | 363 | 15690.1 |
| 2008 | 50.1 | 124.7 | 423 | 13464.5 |
| 2009 | 57.9 | 146.6 | 430 | 13245.3 |
| 2010 | 54 | 147.2 | 464 | 12274.8 |
| 2011 | 74 | 250 | 574 | 9922.47 |
| 2012 | 102 | 325 | 542 | 10508.3 |
| 2013 | 119 | 400 | 571 | 9974.61 |
| 2014 | 124 | 299 | 410 | 13891.5 |
| 2015 | 127 | 400 | 535 | 10645.8 |
| 2016 | 125 | 300 | 408 | 13959.6 |
| 2017 | 136 | 382 | 478 | 11915.3 |
| 2018 | 145 | 408 | 478 | 11915.3 |
| 2019 | 157 | 455 | 493 | 11552.7 |
| 2020 | 170 | 579 | 579 | 9836.79 |
| Average | 85.8143 | 233.31 | 427.905 | 14752.9 |

Green VW in one Hectare=355*10000=3550000 Blue VW in one Hectare=214.55*10000=2145500

| | | Punjab | | |
|---------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Year | Area (In '000' hectares) | Production (in '000' bales of 170) | Yields (in kg/hectare) | Total VW per kg in litres |
| 2000 | 476 | 952 | 340 | 17032.4 |
| 2001 | 474 | 1199 | 430 | 13467.4 |
| 2002 | 607 | 1307 | 366 | 15822.4 |
| 2003 | 449 | 1083 | 410 | 14124.4 |
| 2004 | 452 | 1478 | 556 | 10415.5 |
| 2005 | 509 | 2087 | 697 | 8308.46 |
| 2006 | 557 | 2395 | 731 | 7922.02 |
| 2007 | 607 | 2678 | 750 | 7721.33 |
| 2008 | 604 | 2355 | 663 | 8734.54 |
| 2009 | 527 | 2285 | 737 | 7857.53 |
| 2010 | 511 | 2006 | 667 | 8682.16 |
| 2011 | 530 | 2100 | 674 | 8591.99 |
| 2012 | 560 | 2300 | 698 | 8296.56 |
| 2013 | 480 | 2000 | 708 | 8179.38 |
| 2014 | 446 | 1968 | 750 | 7721.33 |
| 2015 | 420 | 1600 | 648 | 8936.73 |
| 2016 | 339 | 750 | 376 | 15401.6 |
| 2017 | 285 | 1031.03 | 615 | 9416.26 |
| 2018 | 291 | 1283 | 750 | 7721.33 |
| 2019 | 268 | 1222 | 775 | 7472.26 |
| 2020 | 248 | 1206 | 827 | 7002.42 |
| Average | 459.048 | 1680.24 | 627.048 | 9944.19 |

Khan, et al.: Relationship between cotton production and virtual water in India

Green VW in one Hectare=326.65*10000=3266500 Blue VW in one Hectare=252.45*10000=2524500

| | | Rajasthan | | |
|---------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Year | Area (in '000' hectares) | Production (in '000' bales of 170) | Yields (in kg/hectare) | Total VW per kg in litres |
| 2000 | 583.2 | 984.2 | 287 | 26797.9 |
| 2001 | 510.1 | 805.4 | 268 | 28697.8 |
| 2002 | 510.1 | 280.8 | 94 | 81819.1 |
| 2003 | 385.7 | 252.4 | 111 | 69288.3 |
| 2004 | 343.5 | 709 | 351 | 21911.7 |
| 2005 | 437.8 | 764.6 | 297 | 25895.6 |
| 2006 | 471.6 | 880.5 | 317 | 24261.8 |
| 2007 | 349.6 | 746.8 | 363 | 21187.3 |
| 2008 | 369.2 | 862.2 | 397 | 19372.8 |
| 2009 | 302.5 | 725.7 | 408 | 18850.5 |
| 2010 | 444.4 | 903.1 | 345 | 22292.8 |
| 2011 | 335 | 900 | 457 | 16829.3 |
| 2012 | 470 | 1335 | 483 | 15923.4 |
| 2013 | 450 | 1400 | 529 | 14538.8 |
| 2014 | 393 | 1287 | 557 | 13807.9 |
| 2015 | 487 | 1527 | 533 | 14429.6 |
| 2016 | 448 | 1214 | 461 | 16683.3 |
| 2017 | 471 | 1401.92 | 506 | 15199.6 |
| 2018 | 584 | 1893 | 551 | 13958.3 |
| 2019 | 629 | 2026 | 548 | 14034.7 |
| 2020 | 760 | 2788 | 624 | 12325.3 |
| Average | 463.557 | 1127.93 | 404.143 | 24195.5 |

Green VW in one Hectare=264.6*10000=2646000 Blue VW in one Hectare=504.5*10000=5045000

| | Tamil Nadu | | | | | | |
|---------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| Year | Area (in '000' hectares) | Production (in '000' bales of 170) | Yields (in kg/hectare) | Total VW per kg in litres | | | |
| 2000 | 178.3 | 339.5 | 324 | 25017.47 | | | |
| 2001 | 169.9 | 316.6 | 317 | 25569.91 | | | |
| 2002 | 187.8 | 326.1 | 295 | 27476.81 | | | |
| 2003 | 75.6 | 83.5 | 188 | 43115.21 | | | |
| 2004 | 97.8 | 122.7 | 213 | 38054.74 | | | |
| 2005 | 129.4 | 194.8 | 256 | 31662.73 | | | |
| 2006 | 140.5 | 213.3 | 258 | 31417.29 | | | |
| 2007 | 100.3 | 220.9 | 374 | 21672.89 | | | |
| 2008 | 99.3 | 200.7 | 344 | 23562.97 | | | |
| 2009 | 114.5 | 187.7 | 279 | 29052.54 | | | |
| 2010 | 104.1 | 225 | 368 | 22026.25 | | | |
| 2011 | 122 | 450 | 627 | 12927.69 | | | |
| 2012 | 133 | 450 | 575 | 14096.8 | | | |
| 2013 | 128 | 500 | 664 | 12207.32 | | | |
| 2014 | 152 | 408 | 456 | 17775.57 | | | |
| 2015 | 187 | 686 | 624 | 12989.84 | | | |
| 2016 | 142 | 369 | 442 | 18338.6 | | | |
| 2017 | 142 | 359 | 430 | 18850.37 | | | |
| 2018 | 183 | 445 | 413 | 19626.3 | | | |
| 2019 | 133 | 269 | 344 | 23562.97 | | | |
| 2020 | 170 | 418 | 418 | 19391.53 | | | |
| Average | 137.5952 | 323.0857 | 390.905 | 23256.94 | | | |

Khan, et al.: Relationship between cotton production and virtual water in India

Green VW in One Hectare=694.633*10000=6946330 Blue VW in one Hectare=115.933*10000=1159330

| | | Andhra Prades | h | |
|---------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Year | Area (In '000' Hectares) | Production (in '000' Bales of 170) | Yields (in Kg/Hectare) | Total water used per Kg in litres |
| 2000 | 1039 | 1595 | 261 | 26383 |
| 2001 | 1021.7 | 1662.7 | 277 | 24859 |
| 2002 | 1108 | 1877 | 288 | 23910 |
| 2003 | 803.3 | 1085.7 | 230 | 29939 |
| 2004 | 817 | 1890 | 384 | 17932 |
| 2005 | 1178 | 2190 | 316 | 21791 |
| 2006 | 1033 | 2108 | 347 | 19844 |
| 2007 | 972 | 2181 | 381 | 18073 |
| 2008 | 1134 | 3491 | 523 | 13166 |
| 2009 | 1399 | 3569 | 434 | 15866 |
| 2010 | 1467 | 3227 | 374 | 18412 |
| 2011 | 1879 | 5300 | 483.8 | 14233 |
| 2012 | 1879 | 4900 | 476 | 14466 |
| 2013 | 2400 | 7350 | 542.5 | 12693 |
| 2014 | 2389 | 6956 | 452.5 | 15218 |
| 2015 | 2534 | 6641 | 482.5 | 14272 |
| 2016 | 2439 | 5549 | 416.5 | 16533 |
| 2017 | 1881 | 5008 | 489.5 | 14067 |
| 2018 | 2543 | 7282 | 507.5 | 13568 |
| 2019 | 2459 | 5338 | 382.5 | 18003 |
| 2020 | 2784 | 9341 | 597.5 | 11525 |
| Average | 1674.24 | 4216.257 | 411.7048 | 17845 |

One hectare field green water requirement=569.38*10000=5693800

One hectare field blue water requirement=119.22*10000=1192200

Andhra Pradesh and Telangana both are merged due to partition after 2010