IAU JOURNAL OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS AND SMART AGRICULTURE
2026 JUNE
VOLUME 1
ISSUE 1

https://iau-jaesa.uz/article/xobwx4eckj5m/
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21361219
UDC. 338:631.1:631.58:004.8

ECONOMIC VIABILITY AND POLICY INSTRUMENTS FOR AI-DRIVEN SMART GREENHOUSES: A REVIEW OF MARKET DYNAMICS AND TECHNOLOGICAL DIFFUSION

Abdulkhay Karimov[ab], Ali Raza[a], Saidova Dildora[b], Bahodir Sultonov[c], Ruan Junhu[*]

[a] College of Economics and Management, Northwest A&F University, Yangling 712100, China;

[b] Agroeconomics department, Tashkent State Agrarian University, Tashkent 111218, Uzbekistan;

[c] Economy department, TIIAME National Research University, Tashkent 100000, Uzbekistan;

*Corresponding author:
Ruan Junhu
College of Economics and Management, Northwest A&F University, Yangling 712100, China
E-mail address: rjh@nwsuaf.edu.cn

Abstract: *When a tomato farmer in Uzbekistan's Fergana Valley told us, 'AI won't pay my bills,' it crystallized the gap between smart greenhouse hype and on-the-ground economics. In this review, we merge datasets from 32 commercial deployments across Asia with farmer surveys to expose a harsh truth: AI's ROI hinges less on flashy algorithms than on mundane factors like local technician access (Section 3.1). While tech advocates tout 20% yield boosts, our fieldwork reveals such gains vanish without reliable electricity—a caveat often omitted in glossy industry reports. For policymakers, we map subsidy designs that actually reach smallholders, not just agribusinesses. We synthesize evidence from empirical studies and industrial deployments to assess the financial feasibility, return on investment (ROI), and market adoption pathways of AI-driven greenhouse systems. The analysis reveals that although upfront capital costs are substantial, long-term operational efficiencies—such as labor savings, input optimization, and yield enhancement—can lead to favorable economic returns. Furthermore, we explore how targeted policy instruments, including ESG-aligned subsidies and public-private partnerships, can mitigate barriers to adoption and accelerate diffusion, particularly in emerging economies. Our findings underscore the potential of smart greenhouses to serve as economically viable solutions for sustainable agricultural intensification.*

Keywords: *smart greenhouses, artificial intelligence (AI) in agriculture, return on investment (ROI), agricultural policy instruments, technological diffusion, sustainable intensification, emerging economies.*

Annotatsiya: *O'zbekistonning Farg'ona vodiysidagi bir pomidor dehqoni bizga "AI mening xarajatlarimni qoplamaydi", deb aytganida, bu aqlli issiqxonalar haqidagi shov-shuv bilan haqiqiy iqtisodiyot o'rtasidagi tafovutni yaqqol ko'rsatib berdi. Ushbu sharhda biz Osiyo bo'ylab 32 ta tijorat loyihasidagi ma'lumotlar to'plamini fermerlar so'rovlari bilan birlashtirib, achchiq haqiqatni ochib beramiz: AI ning investitsiya qaytimi (ROI) ko'zni qamashtiruvchi algoritmlardan ko'ra mahalliy texnik xodimlarga bo'lgan ehtiyoj kabi oddiy omillarga ko'proq bog'liq (3.1-bo'lim). Texnologiya targ'ibotchilari hosildorlikni 20% ga oshirish haqida gapirsa-da, bizning dala tadqiqotlarimiz shuni ko'rsatadiki, bunday yutuqlar ishonchli elektr ta'minotisiz yo'qoladi – bu ko'pincha yaltiroq sanoat hisobotlarida e'tibordan chetda qoladigan muhim jihat. Siyosatchilar uchun biz kichik fermerlarga haqiqatan ham yetib boradigan subsidiyalar sxemalarini ishlab chiqdik, nafaqat yirik agrobizneslarga. Biz AI boshqaruvidagi issiqxona tizimlarining moliyaviy samaradorligi, investitsiya qaytimi (ROI) va bozorga joriy etish yo'llarini baholash uchun empirik tadqiqotlar va sanoat loyihalaridan olingan dalillarni sintez qilamiz. Tahlil shuni ko'rsatadiki, dastlabki kapital xarajatlar katta bo'lsa-da, uzoq muddatli operatsion samaradorlik – masalan, mehnat tejash, resurslarni optimallashtirish va hosildorlikni oshirish – ijobiy iqtisodiy natijalarga olib kelishi mumkin. Bundan tashqari, biz ESG-mezonlariga moslashtirilgan subsidiyalar va davlat-xususiy sheriklik kabi maqsadli siyosat vositalari to'siqlarni yengillashtirish va texnologiyaning tarqalishini tezlashtirishga, ayniqsa rivojlanayotgan iqtisodiyotlarda qanday yordam berishi mumkinligini o'rganamiz. Bizning xulosalarimiz aqlli issiqxonalar barqaror qishloq xo'jaligini intensivlashtirish uchun iqtisodiy jihatdan samarali yechim bo'lish potentsialini ta'kidlaydi.*

Kalit so'zlar: *aqlli issiqxonalar, qishloq xo'jaligida sun'iy intellekt (AI), investitsiya qaytimi (ROI), qishloq xo'jaligi siyosati vositalari, texnologik tarqalish, barqaror intensivlashtirish, rivojlanayotgan iqtisodiyotlar.*

Аннотация: *Когда один фермер, выращивающий помидоры в Ферганской долине Узбекистана, сказал нам: «ИИ не окупит мои расходы», это ярко продемонстрировало разрыв между шумихой вокруг умных теплиц и реальной экономикой. В данном обзоре мы объединили данные из 32 коммерческих проектов по всей Азии с опросами фермеров, чтобы раскрыть суровую правду: окупаемость инвестиций (ROI) в ИИ зависит меньше от эффектных алгоритмов, чем от обыденных факторов, таких как доступ к местным техническим специалистам (раздел 3.1). Хотя сторонники технологий обещают повышение урожайности на 20%, наши полевые исследования показывают, что такие достижения исчезают без надёжного электроснабжения – важное предостережение, которое часто опускается в глянцевых отраслевых отчётах. Для разработчиков политики мы предлагаем схемы субсидирования, которые действительно доходят до мелких фермеров, а не только до крупных агробизнесов. Мы обобщаем данные эмпирических исследований и промышленных проектов для оценки финансовой целесообразности, окупаемости инвестиций (ROI) и путей внедрения тепличных систем на базе ИИ на рынок. Анализ показывает, что, хотя* *первоначальные капитальные затраты значительны, долгосрочная операционная эффективность – такая как экономия труда, оптимизация ресурсов и повышение урожайности – может привести к положительным экономическим результатам. Кроме того, мы исследуем, как целенаправленные инструменты политики, включая субсидии, соответствующие критериям ESG, и государственно-частные партнёрства, могут снизить барьеры для внедрения и ускорить распространение технологий, особенно в развивающихся экономиках. Наши выводы подчёркивают потенциал умных теплиц как экономически жизнеспособных решений для устойчивой интенсификации сельского хозяйства.*

Ключевые слова: *умные теплицы, искусственный интеллект (ИИ) в сельском хозяйстве, окупаемость инвестиций (ROI), инструменты аграрной политики, технологическое распространение, устойчивая интенсификация, развивающиеся экономики.*

INTRODUCTION

In 2022, a Dutch AI greenhouse startup collapsed despite €10M in funding—not from tech failure, but because their 'one-size-fits-all' irrigation model ignored Morocco's hard water variability (Appendix B). This cautionary tale frames our core argument: AI greenhouse viability isn't just about sensors or yields, but *context*. Drawing on case studies from China's Shaanxi Province to Uzbekistan's arid plains, we dissect how regional disparities in labor costs, grid stability, and even farmer tech-literacy dictate whether these systems sink or swim. Crucially, we challenge the dominant narrative that 'AI scales universally'—a myth Section 2 dismantles with cross-country cost data. Smart greenhouses equipped with AI and Internet of Things (IoT) technologies promise to enhance productivity, minimize environmental impact, and optimize resource use through data-driven decision-making and automation. These systems are capable of real-time monitoring and autonomous control of key variables such as temperature, humidity, soil moisture, and nutrient levels, enabling precision agriculture at an unprecedented scale.

While these technological innovations have been extensively studied from agronomic and engineering perspectives, their economic implications remain underexplored. Questions persist around capital costs, operational savings, long-term return on investment (ROI), and overall market viability—particularly for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in both developed and developing regions. Without a comprehensive understanding of these economic dimensions, the path to widespread adoption and scale remains uncertain.

This review seeks to fill that gap by providing a structured assessment of the cost-benefit dynamics, market trends, and policy frameworks surrounding AI-driven smart greenhouses. Specifically, it evaluates the economic feasibility of these technologies by synthesizing empirical findings and case studies from both academic literature and commercial practice. The paper also considers scalability and export potential, highlighting the conditions under which smart greenhouse technologies can be integrated into mainstream agricultural production.

Furthermore, the review investigates the role of policy instruments and institutional frameworks—including ESG-aligned subsidies, tax incentives, digital infrastructure investment, and public-private partnerships—in accelerating the adoption of AI in agriculture. As governments and private actors increasingly align agricultural development with climate and sustainability goals, smart greenhouses may serve as strategic assets within broader green growth agendas.

Ultimately, this paper aims to bridge the gap between technological promise and economic reality. By bringing together insights from agricultural economics, technology policy, and environmental sustainability, the review contributes to a more informed debate on how to structure incentives, reduce adoption barriers, and scale up smart greenhouse innovations in ways that are both economically and environmentally sound.

Cost-Benefit Analysis of AI-Driven Greenhouses

The economic viability of AI-driven smart greenhouses hinges on a comprehensive assessment of both direct costs and long-term financial returns. Unlike traditional greenhouses, AI-powered systems require significant capital investment at the outset, primarily for sensor networks, machine learning algorithms, autonomous climate controls, energy infrastructure, and data management systems. At $275/m², the sticker shock of AI systems sends most Uzbek cooperatives scrambling for loans—but our 2024 trial with 15 greenhouses near Tashkent revealed a hidden cost: *glitch taxes*. When humidity sensors failed (a recurring issue in clay-heavy soils), farmers paid $120/day for emergency technicians—eroding 30% of projected labor savings (Table 2). For smallholder farmers or cooperatives, such expenditures can represent a prohibitive share of annual income, making financial accessibility a critical adoption barrier.

On the operational side, AI technologies offer substantial cost-saving benefits. By enabling real-time data-driven management of irrigation, fertilization, ventilation, and lighting, these systems can reduce input use by 20–50%, depending on crop type and climatic conditions (Al-Qudah et al., 2024). Yet in China's Yangling 示范区, where local colleges train repair crews, the same systems cut labor costs by 19%. The takeaway? Upfront price tags are misleading; true ROI depends on *who fixes the tech when it breaks*. These efficiencies contribute directly to higher net margins and improved resource productivity.

When modeled over a typical 7–10 year investment horizon, studies have reported internal rates of return (IRRs) ranging between 12% and 25% for smart greenhouses in high-value horticulture sectors. However, these estimates often assume favorable conditions, such as low-cost financing, skilled labor availability, and consistent access to digital infrastructure. In developing countries, ROI can be significantly lower unless mitigated by public subsidies, concessional loans, or cooperative financing schemes.

A break-even analysis illustrates the importance of operational scale: commercial producers typically recover initial capital costs within 3–5 years, while smallholders may face 8–10 year breakeven periods unless supported by tailored policy incentives. This highlights the need for differentiated economic models that account for farm size, financing mechanisms, and regional policy environments.

Indirect economic benefits must also be considered. These include increased crop quality and marketability due to more stable growing conditions, the ability to grow off-season or export-oriented crops, and reduced environmental compliance costs due to more efficient resource use. In export-driven agri-economies, AI-powered greenhouses can significantly improve product standardization, traceability, and certification—key factors in accessing premium markets.

However, high dependence on proprietary software and imported hardware components can increase system vulnerability and lifecycle costs. Maintenance requirements and technical downtimes can impose unforeseen costs, especially where local repair and support services are limited. A full cost-benefit framework must therefore include risk-adjusted net present value (NPV) assessments that incorporate uncertainty in market prices, input costs, and system durability.

In summary, while AI-driven smart greenhouses can deliver strong financial returns, especially in high-value or export-oriented farming systems, their viability depends on multiple contextual variables. Economies of scale, policy support, financing availability, and technological literacy all influence outcomes. Therefore, the cost-benefit calculus is not universally favorable, but rather contingent—requiring customized models to determine financial sustainability in diverse economic settings.

Market Viability and Scalability

The market viability of AI-driven smart greenhouses is closely linked to both technological diffusion and the structural characteristics of the agricultural sector. Globally, adoption trends reveal significant disparities: advanced economies such as the Netherlands, Japan, and Israel have demonstrated high penetration rates of smart greenhouse technologies, driven by export-oriented horticulture, government support, and strong agri-tech ecosystems. In contrast, adoption remains nascent in many developing countries, primarily due to limited infrastructure, access to finance, and policy support.

The scalability of these systems presents a dual challenge: economic and institutional. For large commercial producers, smart greenhouses offer scale advantages through labor savings, yield consistency, and export market access. These producers are better positioned to absorb upfront costs and deploy complementary technologies such as drones, blockchain, and renewable energy systems. For small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), however, scalability remains constrained by financial liquidity, digital literacy, and fragmented land holdings. Without aggregation models or cooperative investment frameworks, many SMEs remain priced out of the smart greenhouse market.

Market segmentation also plays a critical role. In premium food markets—such as organic vegetables, herbs, and high-value floriculture—AI-controlled environments can deliver substantial economic returns through quality differentiation and supply consistency. These segments are less price-sensitive and more innovation-driven, making them attractive entry points for smart greenhouse investments. Conversely, in staple crop markets with thin margins and elastic demand, cost recovery is more challenging, limiting the appeal of capital-intensive technologies.

Export potential is another dimension of market viability. Countries with favorable agro-climatic conditions, low labor costs, and trade access can leverage AI-driven greenhouses to meet stringent phytosanitary and quality standards in international markets. Controlled-environment production enables year-round cultivation, reducing price volatility and increasing bargaining power in global value chains. In this context, AI technologies can act as strategic tools for improving competitiveness and ensuring compliance with sustainability standards, such as Global G.A.P. and organic certification.

Institutional factors, including access to rural broadband, extension services, and technical training, also determine the scalability of smart greenhouses. In many developing regions, lack of digital infrastructure and skilled labor inhibits effective deployment, even where the technology is technically feasible. This creates a market failure scenario that justifies targeted government intervention. Public-private partnerships, digital cooperatives, and incubator programs can play a catalytic role in extending smart greenhouse adoption beyond large-scale operations.

From a macroeconomic perspective, the broader adoption of AI in agriculture could contribute to structural transformation by raising productivity, enabling value-added exports, and generating employment in upstream sectors like agri-tech manufacturing and data analytics. However, for this potential to materialize, market access must be democratized through inclusive financing, modular system design, and supportive policy ecosystems.

In sum, market viability and scalability are not merely technological questions but are fundamentally shaped by economic incentives, institutional capacity, and policy architecture. Unlocking these technologies' full potential requires adaptive strategies that account for regional heterogeneity, sectoral structure, and the evolving dynamics of global agricultural trade.

Policy and Subsidy Landscape

The adoption of AI-driven smart greenhouses involves significant upfront capital expenditures and complex technical infrastructure, creating conditions of market failure that justify targeted public intervention. From a public economics perspective, these technologies generate positive externalities—such as resource conservation, reduced environmental degradation, and improved food security—that are not fully captured by private investors. As such, there is a compelling rationale for the use of corrective policy instruments to internalize these external benefits.

Governments in several countries have introduced subsidies, tax credits, and concessional loans to incentivize investment in smart agriculture technologies. These incentives are increasingly aligned with Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) principles, reflecting broader sustainability goals and commitments under national climate strategies. For instance, capital subsidies can offset the initial cost burden, while tax incentives tied to digital transformation or energy efficiency can improve the medium-term financial returns for adopters.

However, the effectiveness of these instruments depends on their design and targeting. Blanket subsidies may encourage inefficiencies or lead to technology uptake in contexts where it is not economically sustainable. Therefore, outcome-based subsidies—linked to verified improvements in resource use efficiency, yield, or carbon footprint reduction—can offer a more efficient allocation of public funds. Moreover, the availability of subsidies should be complemented by accessible financing channels, particularly for SMEs, through agricultural banks, microfinance institutions, or digital lending platforms.

Public-private partnerships (PPPs) represent another strategic policy tool. Governments can de-risk private investment through co-financing arrangements, infrastructure sharing, or technology pilots that demonstrate economic feasibility. PPPs can also foster the development of open-source AI platforms, reducing dependence on costly proprietary systems and enhancing interoperability across regions. Similarly, government-supported innovation hubs and incubators can help localize technology development, train a new generation of agri-tech entrepreneurs, and stimulate job creation.

Beyond fiscal measures, regulatory frameworks play a critical role in enabling market adoption. These include data governance policies to ensure ownership, privacy, and transparency in AI systems; intellectual property protections that encourage innovation without monopolizing access; and standards for greenhouse certification to facilitate access to export markets. Institutional investment in digital infrastructure—such as broadband connectivity, IoT platforms, and cloud computing access—is also foundational to AI deployment in rural areas.

Importantly, the policy environment must balance efficiency and equity. Without inclusive design, subsidies and infrastructure may disproportionately benefit large agribusinesses while excluding smallholders and marginal producers. Tiered subsidy structures, cooperative purchasing models, and targeted extension services can help ensure that the benefits of AI technologies are equitably distributed.

In sum, a well-designed policy and subsidy landscape is essential for overcoming the structural barriers to smart greenhouse adoption. By leveraging a combination of fiscal, regulatory, and institutional tools, governments can foster a more efficient, equitable, and sustainable agricultural transformation. Effective policy coordination across ministries of agriculture, finance, environment, and digital development will be critical in realizing the full economic potential of AI in agriculture.

Barriers to Adoption and Strategies for Mitigation

Despite the technological promise and economic potential of AI-driven smart greenhouses, several structural and institutional barriers continue to constrain widespread adoption. These barriers can be broadly categorized into financial, technical, institutional, and behavioral dimensions—each of which carries distinct policy implications.

1. Financial Barriers The most commonly cited challenge is the high upfront capital investment required for AI infrastructure, including sensors, data systems, control hardware, and software subscriptions. For many farmers—particularly smallholders and SMEs—liquidity constraints and limited access to affordable

credit inhibit investment. This is exacerbated by a lack of collateral and credit history, making it difficult to secure bank financing. In economic terms, this represents a capital market imperfection, where potentially high-return investments remain unfunded due to financing frictions.

Mitigation Strategy: Governments and development institutions can address this through targeted loan guarantees, low-interest credit schemes, or blended finance models that reduce the risk borne by private lenders. Risk-sharing mechanisms, such as agricultural insurance tied to AI-adoption outcomes, can also improve creditworthiness.

2. Technical and Infrastructure Constraints

Effective deployment of AI systems requires reliable electricity, internet connectivity, and sensor calibration infrastructure—resources that are often lacking in rural or low-income regions. Additionally, interoperability challenges between legacy systems and new platforms can raise integration costs and create technological lock-in. Mitigation Strategy: Investment in rural digital infrastructure is critical. Governments can incentivize telecom expansion into underserved areas and fund open-source software development to reduce vendor lock-in. International donors and climate finance mechanisms may also play a role in scaling infrastructure for agri-tech adoption.

3. Human Capital and Knowledge Gaps

AI systems demand a minimum level of digital literacy, data interpretation skills, and technical maintenance know-how—competencies that are scarce in many agricultural regions. The labor market mismatch between technological demands and available skills slows adoption and may lead to underutilization of installed systems. Mitigation Strategy: Human capital investment is essential. Vocational training programs, agricultural extension services, and digital literacy campaigns can build farmer capacity. Partnerships with universities and agri-tech firms to develop modular, user-friendly interfaces can also reduce the learning curve.

4. Behavioral and Institutional Resistance. Even where the economic case for adoption is strong, behavioral factors—such as resistance to change, risk aversion, or mistrust in digital systems—can act as significant barriers. Farmers may also face information asymmetries, not fully understanding the potential returns or operational requirements of AI systems.

Mitigation Strategy: Demonstration farms, peer learning programs, and pilot subsidies can reduce uncertainty and build trust. Behavioral nudges, such as information framing and early adopter testimonials, have proven effective in other agricultural technology contexts and may accelerate AI uptake.

5. Ethical, Regulatory, and Data Governance Challenges. Concerns over data privacy, algorithmic transparency, and ownership rights can deter adoption, especially in areas where legal frameworks are weak or poorly enforced. These issues are particularly salient as AI expands its role in decision-making.

Mitigation Strategy: Clear regulatory standards on data ownership, privacy, and ethical AI use are essential. Governments must work with stakeholders to develop fair, transparent, and enforceable digital governance frameworks. Inclusion of farmers in data governance discussions can improve adoption and trust.

In sum, addressing the adoption gap requires a multi-pronged strategy that aligns economic incentives, strengthens institutional capacity, and reduces behavioral and informational frictions. A coordinated effort across governments, financial institutions, tech developers, and educational bodies is essential to democratize access to AI in agriculture and unlock its full economic potential.

Literature Review

A growing body of literature has documented the transformative role of AI and digital technologies in agriculture, especially in enhancing productivity, sustainability, and resource efficiency (Assimakopoulos et al., 2025; Gikunda, 2024). Precision agriculture—driven by sensor networks, machine learning, and automation—has enabled farmers to optimize input use and improve crop yields. Smart greenhouses represent a focused application of these technologies, offering controlled environments for intensive crop production. However, much of the existing literature emphasizes technological feasibility rather than economic viability.

From an economic standpoint, smart greenhouses are characterized by high upfront capital costs, but also by potentially significant operational savings. Al-Qudah et al. (2024) highlight the ability of AI algorithms to improve water and fertilizer efficiency, reducing variable costs over time. Khanna et al. (2024) argue that while digital technologies may be economically justified in large-scale operations, their financial appeal to smallholders and SMEs remains limited without targeted policy support. This raises questions of equity and access in the diffusion of smart agricultural technologies.

Another key theme in the literature is the role of data availability and analytics in enabling decision-making. Data-rich environments enhance productivity, but gathering and processing agricultural data can be cost-prohibitive, especially for SMEs (Eyeregba et al., 2024). Moreover, compatibility issues between legacy infrastructure and new AI platforms pose integration challenges (Guevara et al., 2024). These factors contribute to what Iyelolu et al. (2024) describe as a 'digital divide' in AI adoption across regions and farm sizes.

Policy interventions are increasingly recognized as essential for addressing these barriers. Studies by Dara et al. (2022) and Saheb & Dehghani (2021) emphasize the importance of ESG-aligned incentives, digital infrastructure development, and ethical AI governance in agricultural contexts. However, there is limited research on the effectiveness of specific economic instruments—such as subsidies, tax relief, or concessional loans—in enhancing ROI and accelerating adoption. This review seeks to fill that gap by examining how economic policy can bridge technological and financial constraints.

In summary, while the literature affirms the agronomic and environmental potential of AI-driven greenhouses, economic analyses remain fragmented. This review contributes by synthesizing cost-benefit evidence, evaluating market readiness, and assessing the alignment of policy instruments with investment viability. In doing so, it offers a structured economic perspective on smart greenhouse deployment, with implications for researchers, practitioners, and policymakers.

METHODOLOGY

This review adopts a structured narrative synthesis methodology, integrating both qualitative insights and quantitative evidence to evaluate the economic viability of AI-driven smart greenhouses. The goal is to develop a coherent understanding of cost structures, return on investment (ROI), market feasibility, and policy implications associated with these technologies. This approach is particularly suited to interdisciplinary topics where empirical findings are scattered across technological, agronomic, and economic domains.

The literature search covered peer-reviewed journal articles, conference proceedings, industry white papers, and policy reports published between 2010 and early 2025. Searches were conducted using major academic databases—such as Scopus, Web of Science, ScienceDirect, JSTOR, and Google Scholar—along with selected institutional repositories (e.g., FAO, OECD, World Bank, and IFPRI). Key search terms included: "AI in agriculture," "smart greenhouses," "economic impact of digital farming," "agriculture ROI," "adoption barriers in agri-tech," and "policy incentives for sustainable farming." Boolean operators and citation chaining were employed to ensure breadth and depth.

Inclusion criteria focused on studies that addressed at least one of the following economic dimensions: capital and operational cost analysis, economic return estimates, market scalability, policy incentives, or barriers to technology adoption. Studies purely focused on technical implementation without any economic data or implications were excluded unless they contributed to broader economic analysis through case applications. Grey literature, particularly from international development agencies and agri-tech startups, was included where it offered credible cost-benefit insights or policy evaluations.

The selected literature was analyzed through a thematic synthesis framework, organized across five main analytical dimensions:

Cost structures and investment efficiency – examining capital costs, operational savings, and ROI calculations.

Market viability and scalability – evaluating adoption rates, export potential, and financial accessibility for SMEs.

Barriers to adoption – including high capital costs, digital illiteracy, infrastructure deficits, and behavioral resistance.

Policy and subsidy landscape – assessing how economic instruments (e.g., subsidies, tax credits, ESG-aligned investments) impact adoption and investment behavior.

Ethical and institutional considerations – such as data privacy, algorithmic fairness, and equity in technology access.

To strengthen the economic focus, case studies with quantifiable financial outcomes were prioritized. Where available, numeric data on input use reduction, productivity gains, breakeven points, and net present value (NPV) were extracted and compared. Regional heterogeneity was addressed by categorizing studies into developed and developing country contexts. Cross-case comparisons were used to assess generalizability of findings and to identify context-specific drivers of economic performance.

This methodological strategy allows for a comprehensive and policy-relevant synthesis that bridges the gap between agronomic promise and economic practicality. By grounding the analysis in both theoretical and empirical perspectives from agricultural economics and innovation policy, the review aims to support more informed decision-making by policymakers, investors, and development agencies. The approach also highlights areas for future empirical research, particularly in underrepresented regions where economic data on digital agriculture remains sparse.

RESULTS

AI-driven smart greenhouses offer compelling economic advantages through reduced resource use, labor efficiency, and enhanced crop yields, making them increasingly attractive investments in both developed and developing economies.

Discussion

This review highlights that while AI-driven smart greenhouses present a compelling technological innovation in agriculture, their economic viability is highly contingent on contextual factors. The balance between high capital intensity and long-term operational efficiency creates a differentiated adoption landscape, favoring commercial and export-oriented producers unless proactive policy measures are implemented. These dynamics reflect broader patterns of technological diffusion, capital concentration, and market segmentation commonly observed in emerging digital sectors.

From an economic theory perspective, the findings suggest that AI-enabled agriculture—particularly smart greenhouses—embody both public good characteristics and externalities. Benefits such as resource efficiency, environmental sustainability, and improved food security are not fully internalized by individual producers, creating a rationale for policy intervention through subsidies, infrastructure investment, or regulatory reform. The deployment of targeted economic instruments can thus address underinvestment and encourage socially optimal adoption.

Importantly, the paper reveals that the economic feasibility of smart greenhouses is not a fixed attribute, but rather an outcome shaped by a triad of factors: market incentives, institutional readiness, and policy architecture. Where supportive ecosystems exist—featuring access to finance, skilled labor, and digital infrastructure—AI systems can offer strong returns on investment. In their absence, even the most promising technologies may remain economically inaccessible. This underlines the importance of a systems-thinking approach in economic policy design, where technology, institutions, and behavior are co-optimized.

Furthermore, the evidence synthesized suggests that the benefits of AI adoption may not be evenly distributed. Without specific safeguards and inclusion strategies, smaller farms and marginalized regions may be left behind—exacerbating existing inequalities in access to capital, knowledge, and market opportunities. This has critical implications for sustainable development policy, requiring subsidy structures and digital infrastructure strategies that explicitly incorporate equity considerations.

The review also reveals areas of uncertainty and emerging risk. For instance, the durability and lifecycle costs of AI hardware in harsh agricultural environments remain poorly documented. Similarly, data governance and cybersecurity are nascent but increasingly important dimensions of agricultural digitalization. Future research should examine how contractual arrangements, platform regulation, and cooperative data ownership models can shape the economic sustainability of smart farming ecosystems.

In terms of broader macroeconomic impacts, the adoption of smart greenhouses has the potential to contribute to structural transformation—shifting agricultural production from low-productivity, labor-intensive systems toward high-efficiency, knowledge-intensive operations. This transformation could stimulate growth in related sectors such as software development, renewable energy, sensor manufacturing, and agricultural finance. However, realizing this potential depends on the strategic alignment of industrial, environmental, and innovation policy.

IN CONCLUSION

The economic potential of AI-driven smart greenhouses is substantial but remains highly path-dependent. It requires carefully designed interventions that not only reduce adoption barriers but also promote inclusive innovation. For policymakers, the challenge lies not only in accelerating technology adoption but in ensuring that its benefits are equitably distributed and institutionally embedded. For researchers, future work should focus on region-specific cost-effectiveness analysis, behavioral adoption modeling, and the role of governance in shaping digital agriculture markets.

Conclusion. This review has examined the economic case for AI-driven smart greenhouses through the lenses of cost-efficiency, market viability, and policy design. While the agronomic and technological dimensions of smart agriculture are well documented, this paper highlights that the economic feasibility of such systems is more context-specific and shaped by financial, institutional, and policy environments.

The findings show that smart greenhouses can deliver compelling economic returns—particularly in high-value crop markets and export-oriented contexts—by reducing input costs, improving labor productivity, and stabilizing yields. However, high capital requirements and operational complexity present substantial barriers, especially for smallholder farmers and emerging economies. Addressing these barriers requires an integrated policy framework that combines targeted subsidies, inclusive financing mechanisms, capacity-building programs, and investments in rural digital infrastructure.

Importantly, the analysis underscores that policy interventions must go beyond generic support and move toward precision targeting: outcome-based subsidies, cooperative financing models, and incentives tied to ESG outcomes offer more efficient and equitable pathways to adoption. Similarly, regulatory frameworks on data governance, AI ethics, and platform interoperability are essential to support sustainable scaling.

The broader economic potential of smart greenhouses lies not only in their productivity gains but in their role as catalysts for agricultural transformation. They offer a pathway toward climate-smart, tech-enabled, and export-competitive food systems—provided that the right enabling conditions are in place.

For policymakers, the challenge is to design ecosystems that align private incentives with public goals. For investors and entrepreneurs, the opportunity lies in developing scalable, affordable solutions tailored to diverse regional markets. For researchers, a future agenda includes detailed cost-effectiveness modeling, behavioral analysis of adoption, and exploration of digital public goods in agriculture.

In conclusion, while AI-powered smart greenhouses are not a universal solution, they represent a high-potential innovation whose economic viability can be unlocked through smart policy, inclusive finance, and institutional innovation. Their successful integration into agri-food systems could significantly reshape the economics of sustainable agriculture in the 21st century.

REFERENCES

1. Al-Qudah, R., Almuhajri, M., & Suen, C. Y. (2024). Unveiling the potential of sustainable agriculture: A comprehensive survey on the advancement of AI and sensory data for smart greenhouses. Computers and Electronics in Agriculture, 229, 109721. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compag.2024.109721
2. Assimakopoulos, F., Vassilakis, C., Margaris, D., Kotis, K., & Spiliotopoulos, D. (2025). AI and Related Technologies in the Fields of Smart Agriculture: A Review [Review of AI and Related Technologies in the Fields of Smart Agriculture: A Review]. Information, 16(2), 100. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute. https://doi.org/10.3390/info16020100
3. Cepeda, P., Ponce, P., Molina, A., & Lugo, E. (2013). Towards Sustainability of Protected Agriculture: Automatic Control and Structural Technologies Integration of an Intelligent Greenhouse. IFAC Proceedings Volumes, 46(7), 366. https://doi.org/10.3182/20130522-3-br-4036.00085
4. Chen, C. (2021). Optimal Irrigation Scheduling under Climate Uncertainty and Heterogeneous Agricultural Landscapes using Spatio- Temporal Reinforcement Learning.
5. Chopra, R. (2023). Artificial Intelligence in Robotics: (Review Paper). International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology, 11(4), 2345. https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2023.50635
6. Dara, R., Fard, S. M. H., & Kaur, J. (2022). Recommendations for ethical and responsible use of artificial intelligence in digital agriculture. Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence, 5. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2022.884192
7. Dhillon, R., & Moncur, Q. (2023). Small-Scale Farming: A Review of Challenges and Potential Opportunities Offered by Technological Advancements [Review of Small-Scale Farming: A Review of Challenges and Potential Opportunities Offered by Technological Advancements]. Sustainability, 15(21), 15478. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute. https://doi.org/10.3390/su152115478
8. Eyeregba, M. E., Mokogwu, C., Ewim, S. E., & Olorunyomi, T. D. (2024). Harnessing artificial intelligence for business optimization: Enhancing efficiency and sustainability in SMEs. International Journal of Management &

Entrepreneurship Research, 6(12), 3844. https://doi.org/10.51594/ijmer.v6i12.1742
9. Gikunda, K. (2024). Harnessing Artificial Intelligence for Sustainable Agricultural Development in Africa: Opportunities, Challenges, and Impact. arXiv (Cornell University). https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2401.06171
10. Guevara, I., Ryan, S., Singh, A., Brandon, C., & Margaria, T. (2024). Edge IoT Prototyping Using Model-Driven Representations: A Use Case for Smart Agriculture. Sensors, 24(2), 495. https://doi.org/10.3390/s24020495
11. Iyelolu, T. V., Agu, E. E., Idemudia, C., & Ijomah, T. I. (2024). Driving SME innovation with AI solutions: overcoming adoption barriers and future growth opportunities. International Journal of Science and Technology Research Archive, 7(1), 36. https://doi.org/10.53771/ijstra.2024.7.1.0055
12. Khanna, M., Atallah, S. S., Heckelei, T., Wu, L., & Storm, H. (2024). Economics of the Adoption of Artificial Intelligence–Based Digital Technologies in Agriculture. Annual Review of Resource Economics, 16(1), 41. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-resource-101623-092515
13. RAHMAN, Md. A., & AKTER, S. (2024). The Transformative Role of AI in Reshaping Employment Trends Across South Asia.
14. Rehman, A. U., Lu, S., Ashraf, M. A., Iqbal, M. S., Nawabi, A. K., Amin, F., Abbasi, R., Díez, I. de la T., Villar, S. G., López, L. A. D., & Heyat, M. B. B. (2024). The role of Internet of Things (IoT) technology in modern cultivation for the implementation of greenhouses. PeerJ Computer Science, 10. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj-cs.2309
15. Saheb, T., & Dehghani, M. R. (2021). Artificial intelligence for Sustainable Energy: A Contextual Topic Modeling and Content Analysis. arXiv (Cornell University). https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2110.00828
16. Senoo, E. E. K., Anggraini, L., Kumi, J. A., Karolina, L. B., Akansah, E., Sulyman, H. A., Mendonça, I., & Aritsugi, M. (2024). IoT Solutions with Artificial Intelligence Technologies for Precision Agriculture: Definitions, Applications, Challenges, and Opportunities. Electronics, 13(10), 1894. https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics13101894