

Intercomparison of Mechanical Transplanted Rice and Direct Seeded Rice in Climate Change Resilient for Improving Crop-Water Productivity and Soil Health in North West IGP: A Review

Abstract:

It is commonly acknowledged that one of the most important problems facing humanity today is climate change. It is thought to pose a direct threat to our method of growing food, particularly rice. There are many ways that climate change impacts rice production. The manual puddled transplanted rice (PTR) system remains the most popular technique for establishing rice. However, this production technique is losing money as a result of diminishing water tables, growing water shortages, the water, manpower, and energy requirements of PTR, high labour costs, the detrimental impacts of puddling on the health of the soil and succeeding crops, and high methane emissions. These elements lead to the requirement for a different approach to crop establishment. Due to its lower input requirement than PTR, the direct-seeded rice (DSR) method is becoming more and more common. Pre-germinated seeds are sown in standing water (water seeding), puddled soil (wet-DSR), or a prepared seedbed (dry-DSR). DSR uses 12 to 35 percent less water and manpower than conventional farming methods while producing comparable yields and reducing methane emissions by 10 to 90 percent. Farmers were encouraged to move to DSR culture by improved short-duration, high-yielding varieties and effective nutrient, weed, and resource management strategies. This transition is however accompanied by a number of limitations, including an increase in weeds, the establishment of weedy rice, herbicide resistance, nitrous oxide emissions, nutritional disorders, particularly those involving N and micronutrients, as well as a rise in the lodging of soil-borne diseases. If the right weed, water, and fertiliser management techniques are used, these problems can be resolved. Weeds can be reduced with the use of methods like the stale bed technique, mulching, crop rotation, Sesbania co-culture, seed priming, pre-emergence and post-emergence spray, and an organised weed monitoring programme. For sustainable rice production, chemical to biotechnological techniques will be needed, such as rice types that are herbicide-resistant and more competitive allelopathic variants. N₂O emissions can also be decreased by employing techniques like deep urea application and nitrification inhibitors. The creation of site- and soil-specific integrated packages will promote the use of DSR more widely and lessen the environmental impact of PTR. The purpose of the current article is to identify the gaps, define the best agronomic practises, and develop an integrated package of technologies for DSR, while also outlining some potential future directions. The DSR package's sustainable rice production methods use fewer resources and emit fewer greenhouse gases.

Keywords: Direct seeded rice, transplanted rice, wet-DSR, dry-DSR, GHG emissions

Introduction:

Rice is typically transplanted using 4- to 6-week-old seedlings on well-tilled puddled soils under the traditional mode of rice production, known as mechanical transplanted rice (TPR). Using standing water to plough a field is known as puddling. Puddling causes a loss in soil permeability and anaerobic conditions. Standing water controls weeds by decomposing the weed seeds. The soil's softening facilitates transplanting. The loss through deep percolation is reduced as a result of the deposition of smaller soil particles, which plug the pores. Fe, Zn, and P become more available to plants under anaerobic conditions. Puddling and seedling transplanting use up about 30% of the total amount of water. Puddling breaks down soil aggregates and capillary pores, disperses clay particles (creating a crust on the surface of coarse-textured soil), and develops a hard pan that prevents successive crops from penetrating the soil deeply (**Haque et al., 2016**). It worsens the physical state of the soil, raises bulk density, and lowers hydraulic conductivity. Puddling has many drawbacks, including physical harm and nitrogen loss (de-nitrification) under anaerobic conditions. According to (**Aslam et al., 2002**), up to 30% of the irrigation water applied to the rice crop is used for puddling. Due to the disrupted soil structure caused by puddling, the energy needed to prepare the field for subsequent crops has increased (**Gill et al., 2014**). When a dried puddled layer is ploughed under in fine-textured soils, large clods result. Before planting the subsequent crops, repeated cultivation is necessary to develop the fine tilth that will allow seed to soil contact. About 11% of the entire cost of producing rice is attributable to fuel costs, personnel costs, and equipment wear and tear during ploughing and puddling (**Rashid et al., 2009**). Furthermore, conventional tillage causes the soil to emit greenhouse gases rather than absorb them (**Busari et al., 2015**). To maintain the long-term production of rice, alternative rice establishment techniques, such as direct sowing, non-puddled transplanting, and minimal or no tillage, can be used.

Direct Seeded Rice

According to **Farooq et al. (2011)**, direct seeded rice (DSR) is the method of establishing the crop from seeds sowed in the field as opposed to by transplanting seedlings from the nursery. This method lowers the overall water demand because it eliminates puddling and doesn't require constant immersion. Therefore, in the context of a changing environment, it is more appropriate to use the DSR technique (Table 1) for rice production as opposed to the traditional TPR.

Advantages of DSR

Earlier reports have noted a number of benefits of direct-seeding methods of establishment over transplanting. In addition to providing higher economic returns, the DSR technique of establishment is simpler, uses less labour and water, and is mechanization-friendly (**Bhushan et al., 2007; Jehangir et al., 2005**). Due to early flowering, DSR crops are said to have shorter crop cycles and mature seven to ten days earlier (**Farooq et al., 2006**). Greenhouse gas emissions in DSR are lower than in TPR (**Balasubramanian and Hill, 2002**). As there are no growth delays caused by transplanting stress and injury, DSR typically establishes earlier than TPR. This helps the plant escape the late-season drought by hastening the plant's growth and development (**Tuong, 2008**). Due to the fact that dry direct seeding is done on dry fields, the overall water requirement has been significantly lowered (**Bouman and Tuong, 2001**). Successful crops can be cultivated comfortably because there are no

issues brought on by the existence of hard/plow pan. Farmers will need to embrace water-saving technologies like DSR because soil erosion and water shortages are a result of the changing climate.

Disadvantages of DSR

DSR has a number of advantages over TPR, and while it is used in numerous settings with different modifications, it has not yet been widely accepted. DSR has a number of obstacles, including the lack of suitable cultivars, which causes irregular germination and a high death rate. Other significant problems include a severe weed infestation and the lack of an efficient post-emergence herbicide (Singh et al., 2005). The expense of weed treatment is increased in DSR because to the relative higher weed infestation (Rao et al., 2007). Similar to Zn and Fe deficiencies, high infiltration rates in DSR and an unbalanced fertiliser N application are to blame (Gao et al., 2006).

Direct Seeding Systems	Condition of seed bed	Seed environment	Sowing method practiced	Ideal ecology/environment
Direct seeding in dry bed (Aerobic rice)	Dry soil	Seeds are sown directly in dry and mostly aerobic soil	Broadcasting/drilling/sowing/ in rows	Mainly in rainfed area, some in irrigated areas with precise water control
Direct seeding in wet bed	Puddled soil	Pre-germinated seeds sown, may be aerobic or anaerobic	Various	Mostly in favourable rainfed lowlands and irrigated areas with good drainage facility
Direct seeding in standing water	Puddled soil, standing water	Dry or Pre-germinated seeds sown mostly in anaerobic condition	Broadcasting on standing water of 5-10 cm	In areas with red rice or weedy rice problem and in irrigated lowland areas with good land levelling
Aerobic wet seeding	Puddled soil	Mostly aerobic	Broadcasting on puddle soil surface; row seeding in open furrows or on flat soil surface	In irrigated areas with good drainage
Anaerobic wet seeding	Puddled soil	Mostly anaerobic with a thin layer of settling mud, row seeding in furrows and covering with soil	Broadcasting and covering	In irrigated areas with good drainage

Table 1. DSR system classification (Adapted from Joshi et al., 2013)




Figure 1. An illustration of the main obstacles to conventional agriculture, potential remedies, and the results of emerging agronomic practices

Drivers of the Rice Direct Seeding Shift from Puddled Transplanting

Water Scarcity

Water is becoming a limited resource on a global scale. An alarming rate of groundwater table decline has been observed. On the other hand, traditional rice farming uses a lot of water. Water cannot be recreated, so it must be conserved and provided with enough drops. According to **Bouman and Tuong (2001)**, up to 5000 L of water may be required to produce just 1 kilogramme of rough rice, which is considerably too much. According to **Barker et al. (1998)**, rice uses two to three times as much freshwater as any other cereal, and according to **Carrigere (2007), Tuong et al. (2005)**, rice accounts for nearly 50% of all irrigation water utilised in Asia. According to data adjusted from **Gardner-Outlaw and Engelman (1997)**, the amount of water available per person in India declined by 72.3% between 1951 and 2005 (5831 m³ and 1611 m³ in 1951 and 2015, respectively), and it is predicted to continue declining by 77.8% until 2050 (1292 m³ in 2050). Because of the growing population, falling water tables, diminishing water quality, ineffective irrigation infrastructure, and competition from non-agricultural industries, there is less water available. So, the adoption of direct sowing is motivated by water scarcity. There have been various attempts to identify alternatives to traditional PTR throughout the past ten years. (**Ladha et al., 2009**) Enough water will be available for crop production thanks to excellent water management. The possibility of DSR as a substitute for PTR has been noted in numerous research. For instance, wet-DSR was found to save irrigation water during on-farm testing in the Philippines (**Tabbal et al., 2002**) by an average of 67-104 mm (11–18%) while CT-PTR used the same irrigation application parameters. However, it was discovered in a different study carried out in the Malaysian Muda region by **Cabango et al. (2002)** that the application of irrigation water in dry-DSR was less by about 200 mm (40%) than CT-PTR.

Similar water savings of 10-15% have been reported in India using dry-DSR compared to CT-PTR when irrigation application criteria included the presence of hairline cracks or tensiometer-based (-20 kPa at 20-cm depth) tensiometers (**Bhushan et al., 2007; Jat et al., 2009; Sudhir-Yadav et al., 2011**). DSR has a greater capacity for climate change adaptation than PTR since it uses less water and can withstand water stress better. In the near future, climate change is anticipated to increase the variability of rainfall as well as the risk of drought and water stress. Dry-DSR with minimal, decreased, or no tillage increases the potential of this technique by reducing labour costs in response to the developing water crisis (**Chaudhari et al., 2015; Kaur and Singh, 2017**).

Soil Health

According to several studies (**Goptal et al., 2010, Gupta et al., 2006, Ladha et al., 2009**), puddling has varying effects on the health of the soil (soil quality, particularly on soil physical properties), which is claimed to be another reason for the transition from CT-PTR to dry-DSR on ploughed soil (no puddling) or in ZT conditions, where an upland crop is grown after rice. Given that soil in the rice-wheat system experiences the wetting and drying phenomenon, this is particularly pertinent (**Ladha et al., 2003**). Puddling dissolves soil aggregates, disperses small clay particles, eliminates capillary pores, and creates hard pan at shallow depths. Although puddling aids in weed management, greater water and nutrient availability, seedling transplantation, and establishment, it has a negative impact on the development and productivity of following upland crops (**Gathala et al., 2011**).

Numerous research that examined how rice puddling affected subsequent wheat crops have been published. 28 of the 35 similar studies that **(Kumar and Ladha, 2011)** collected and assessed revealed negative effects of puddling on following wheat crop productivity. Only one study had good results for puddling, while five examples mentioned no influence. Location, soil type, rice establishment technique, number of crop cycles, rice yield, wheat yield, and the percentage of variation in wheat yield were the factors taken into account. The effectiveness of wheat was assessed in two medium-term trials conducted at Pantnagar (5 years) and Modipuram (7 years), depending on whether it had received puddled or dry DSR. The Pantnagar site was found to have 12% greater wheat yield in dry-DSR plots than in CT-TPR in each of the five years. At Modipuram, however, the wheat yield was constant for the first three years before increasing by 0.5–1.0 t/ha (9–25%) in the latter years in dry-DSR plots **(Gathala et al., 2011)**. Poor root development caused by the previous rice crop's puddling was the key factor in the reduced grain yield of wheat following CT-PTR **(Aggarwal et al., 1995; Boparai et al., 1992; Chenkual and Acharya, 1990)**. Similar to this, **(Gangwar et al., 2008; Gangwar et al., 2008)** contrasted the productivity of the DSR-based cropping system and the PTR-based cropping system. He noted that the productivities of the DSR-wheat, DSR-chickpea, and DSR-mustard systems were greater than those of the PTR systems (13.53 t/ha, 12.12 t/ha, and 11.81 t/ha, respectively). Although it is clear that puddling is advantageous to the rice crop, it is also harmful to the growth and productivity of the following crop because it negatively impacts soil health **(Mishra et al., 2018; Srivastava et al., 2016)**. Therefore, it is crucial to develop alternatives to puddling. The areas where there is less water availability and where crops are cultivated following rice farming should receive more attention.

GHG Emission

Global warming is a result of greenhouse gas emissions, primarily CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O, which are emitted as a result of agriculture. Crop production is responsible for 27% of food emissions, according to data from the meta-analysis by **Joseph Poore and Thomas Nemecek (2018)**, which was published in science. The production of crops for human consumption accounts for about 21% of the emissions from these foods, whereas the production of crops for animal feed accounts for 6%. This includes things like the release of nitrous oxide from fertilisers and manure, carbon dioxide from agricultural equipment, and methane emissions from rice cultivation. They are the direct emissions that come from agricultural output. Cropping systems based on rice are important. GHG emissions from rice fields, mostly CO₂ and CH₄, are significant and dependent on management techniques. As a result, rice is a key crop for reducing GHG emissions **(Wassmann, 2004)**. With 155 million acres of land under cultivation, rice is one of the three most important crops in the world. By 2025, India's growing population will consume 25% more rice **(Matloob et al., 2015)**. Punjab, India, the "food bowl of India," produces 50% of the country's rice in the Indo-Gangetic Plain in Northern India. Puddled transplanting is the most typical method of rice growing in the IGP. Because of the anaerobic soil conditions caused by prolonged flooding, this culture of flooded rice is the main source of methane emissions. According to **Houghton (1996), Reiner and Milkha (2000)**, this is responsible for 10–20% of all worldwide methane emissions. Because there is a lack of oxygen, C molecules are reduced to

CH₄ in waterlogged soils. The presence of standing water in traditional rice fields limits the amount of oxygen that may reach the soil. Methanogens, a tiny but specific bacterial group, deplete the soil's oxygen content and create anaerobic conditions. Therefore, conventional PTR, where standing water conditions are maintained during the crop growth, has considerable methane emissions. On the other hand, anaerobic conditions are not produced in DSR fields since they are not perpetually immersed under water. Methane emissions are hence minimal (**Pathak et al., 2013**). (**Pathak et al., 2013**) carried out a 2-year field experiment in the Jalandhar district of Punjab, India, to measure the potential of DSR with TPR for reducing GHG emissions and saving water and labour. He discovered that the GWP of CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O was 2.91 t/ha on average in TPR and 1.94 t/ha in DSR. Another finding was that the conversion of the entire TPR state to DSR would result in a 33% decrease in GWP. Additionally, with DSR, 3–4 irrigations were avoided while maintaining production. When compared to TPR, DSR used 58% fewer tractors and 45% fewer workers. This demonstrates that DSR can be a workable substitute for PTR for mitigating and adapting to climate change while also raising farmers' income by lowering GHG emissions, water use, and labour (both human and machine) without reducing yield (**Pathak et al., 2013**). The Indonesian Agricultural Environment Research Institute (IAERI), located in Central Java, Indonesia, carried out a similar study. According to (**Susilawati et al., 2019**), CH₄ emissions were 47% lower in DSR than PTR. Under DSR, GWP decreased by 46.4% without a material yield loss. Numerous studies comparing the CH₄ emissions from various tillage and crop establishment methods with comparable water management strategies found that wet or dry-DSR had lower CH₄ emissions than CT-PTR (8–22% or 24–79%, respectively) (**Kumar & Ladha et al., 2011**). ZT-dry-DSR is 20% more effective than CT-TPR at reducing GWP, according to (**Ishibashi et al., 2009**). (**Pathak et al., 2009**) performed simulations for Indian circumstances and discovered that, in comparison to CT-TPR, dry-DSR on raised beds or ZT can reduce CO₂ equivalent per hectare by 40–44%. According to (**Harada et al., 2007**), switching from puddling to zero tillage resulted in a 42% decrease in GWP in Japan. From study to study, CH₄ emissions differ, even in CT-PTR. According to **Aulakh et al. (2011)**, the cause may result from the individual or combined effects of meteorological conditions, edaphic variables, and water management. As a result, it may be said that DSR is more effective at reducing GHG emissions, particularly CH₄ (**Cassman, 1999**) if suitable crop management techniques are used. The dissimilatory nitrate reduction to ammonium (DNRA) route can also shield NO₃ from leaching losses and reduce N₂O emissions under DSR (**Pandey et al., 2020**).

Conclusion:

To successfully switch from traditional flooded rice cultivation to improved resilient rice production, production must be increased. Resilient rice production systems with better crop establishment techniques, enhanced water, weed, and nutrient management practises, and utilisation of microbial resources have been found to be particularly beneficial in water-stressed locations and for farmers with limited resources. Stress-relieving microorganisms have the potential to protect the production and stability of the agro-ecosystem, which might improve the sustainability of agriculture globally and move us closer to becoming one of the ideal agricultural producing nations. However, managing biotic

and abiotic stresses in rice is a major issue; as a result, climate-smart microorganisms must be developed to counteract environmental extremes. Utilising microbial resources and adopting resilient rice farming techniques can increase rice's overall productivity and yield potential while assisting in climate change mitigation.

References:

1. Aggarwal GC, Sidhu AS, Sekhon NK, Sandhu KS, Sur HS (1995) Puddling and N management effects on crop response in a rice-wheat cropping system. *Soil Till Res* 36:129–139
2. Aslam, M., Qureshi, A.S., Horinkova, V.M., 2002. Water saving strategies for irrigated rice. *J. Drain. Water Manag.* 6, 25-34.
3. Aulakh MS, Wassmann R, Rennenberg H (2001) Methane emissions from rice fields: quantification, mechanisms, role of management, and mitigation options. *Adv Agron* 70:93–260
4. Balasubramanian, V., Hill, J.E., 2002. Direct seeding of rice in Asia: emerging issues and strategic research needs for the 21st century. In: Pandey, S., Mortimer, M., Wade, L., Tuong, T.P., Lope, K., Hardy, B., (eds.) *Direct Seeding: Research Strategies and Opportunities*. International Rice Research Institute, Los Banos, Philippines pp. 15-42.
5. Barker R, Dawe D, Tuong TP, Bhuiyan SI, Guerra LC (1998) The outlook for water resources in the year 2020: Challenges for research on water management in rice production. In: *Assessment and Orientation towards the 21st Century, 7–9 September 1998 proceedings of 19th Session of the International Rice Commission, Cairo, Egypt*, FAO pp 96–109
6. Bhushan, L., Ladha, J.K., Gupta, R.K., Singh, S., Tirol-Padre, A., Saharawat, Y.S., Gathala, M., Pathak, H., 2007. Saving of water and labor in a rice-wheat system with no-tillage and direct seeding technologies. *Agron. J.* 99, 1288-1296.
7. Boparai BS, Singh Y, Sharma BD (1992) Effect of green manuring with *Sesbania aculeata* on physical properties of soil and on growth of wheat in rice-wheat and maize-wheat cropping systems in semiarid region of India. *Arid Soil Res Rehab* 6:135–143
8. Bouman, B. A. M., Tuong, T.P., 2001. Field water management to save water and increase its productivity in irrigated lowland rice. *Agric. Water Manag.* 49,11-30.
9. Busari, M. A., Kukal, S. S., Kaur, A., Bhatt. R., 2015. Conservation tillage impacts on soil, crop and the environment. *Int. Soil Water Conserv. Res.* 16(2), 119-129.
10. Cabangon RJ, Tuong TP, Abdullah NB (2002) Comparing water input and water productivity of transplanted and direct-seeded rice production systems. *Agric Water Manage* 57(1):11–31
11. Carrigere Valle/ SD (2007) More crop per drop. *Rice Today* 6(2):10–13
12. Cassman KG (1999) Ecological intensification of cereal production systems: yield potential, soil quality, and precision agriculture. *Proceed Nat Academy Sci, USA* 96(11):5952–5959
13. Chaudhari SK, Bardhan G, Kumar P, Singh R, Mishra AK, Rai P, Singh K, Sharma DK (2015) Shortterm tillage and residue management impact on physical properties of a reclaimed sodic soil. *J Indian Soc Soil Sci* 63(1):30–38

14. Chenkual V, Acharya CL (1990) Effect of rice–wheat and maize–wheat rotations on soil physical properties including soil–water behavior in an acidic Alfisol. *J Indian Soc Soil Sci* 38:574–582
15. Farooq, M., Basra, S.M.A., Wahid, A., 2006. Priming of field sown rice seed enhances germination, seedling establishment. *Plant Growth Regul.* 49, 285-294.
16. Farooq, M., Siddique, K.H.M., Rehman, H., Aziz, T., 2011. Rice direct seeding: Experiments, challenges and opportunities. *Soil. Till. Res.* 111, 87-98.
17. Gangwar KS, Gill MS, Tomar OK, Pandey DK (2008) Effect of crop establishment methods on growth, productivity and soil fertility of rice (*Oryza sativa L.*)- based cropping systems. *Ind J Agron* 53:102–106
18. Gangwar KS, Tomar OK, Pandey DK (2008) Productivity and economics of transplanted and directseeded rice (*Oryza sativa L.*)- based cropping systems in Indo-Gangetic plains. *Ind J Agric Sci* 78:655–658
19. Gao, X.P., Zou, C.Q., Fan, X.Y., Zhang, F.S., Hoffland, E., 2006. From flooded to aerobic conditions in rice cultivation: consequences for zinc uptake. *Plant Soil* 280, 41- 47.
20. Gardner-Outlaw T, Engelman R (1997) Sustaining water, easing scarcity: a second update. Population Action International, Washington, DC, p 19
21. Gathala MK, Ladha JK, Kumar V, Saharawat YS, Kumar V, Sharma PK, Sharma S, Pathak H (2011) Tillage and crop establishment affects sustainability of South Asian rice-wheat system. *Agron J* 103(4):961–971
22. Gill, J.S., Walia, S.S., Gill, R.S., 2014. Direct seeded rice: an alternative rice establishment growth and competition with winter wheat in western Canada. *Crop Protect.* 2, 971-980.
23. Gopal R, Jat RK, Malik RK, Kumar V, Alam MM, Jat ML, Mazid MA, Saharawat YS, McDonald A, Gupta R (2010) Direct dry seeded rice production technology and weed management in rice-based systems. Technical Bulletin. International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center(CIMMYT), New Delhi, India, 28pp
24. Gupta RK, Ladha JK, Singh S, Singh R, Jat ML, Saharawat Y, Singh VP, Singh SS, Singh G, Sah G, Gathala M, Sharma RK (2006) Production technology for direct seeded rice, Technical Bulletin Series 8. In: Rice–Wheat Consortium for the Indo-Gangetic Plains, New Delhi, India, 14p.
25. Haque, M.E., Bell, R.W., Islam, M.A., Rahman, M.A., 2016. Minimum tillage unpuddled transplanting, an alternative crop establishment strategy for rice in conservation agriculture cropping systems. *Field Crops Res.* 185, 31-39.
26. Harada H, Hitomi K, Hayato S (2007) Reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by no-tilling rice cultivation in Hachirogata polder, northern Japan: Life-cycle inventory analysis. *Soil Sci Plant Nutr* 53:668–677
27. Houghton JT, Meira Filho LG, Callander BA, Harris N, Katterberg A, Maskell K (1996) IPCC report on climate change: the science of climate change. WG1 Contribution to the IPCC Second Assessment Report on Methane Emission from Rice Cultivation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK

28. Ishibashi E, Yamamoto S, Akai N, Tsuruta H (2009) The influence of no-tilled direct seeding cultivation on greenhouse gas emissions from rice paddy fields in Okayama, Western Japan. 5. Annual emission of CH₄, N₂O and CO₂ from rice paddy fields under different cultivation methods and carbon sequestration into paddy soils. *Jpn J Soil Sci Plant Nutr* 80:123–135
29. Jat ML, Gathala MK, Ladha JK, Saharawat YS, Jat AS, Kumar V, Sharma SK, Kumar V, Gupta RK (2009) Evaluation of precision land levelling and double zero-till systems in the rice-wheat rotation: Water use, productivity, profitability and soil physical properties. *Soil Till Res* 105:112–121
30. Jehangir, W.A., Masih, I., Ahmed, S., Gill, M.A., Ahmad, M., Mann, R.A., Chaudhary, M.R., Turrall, H., 2005. Sustaining Crop Water Productivity in Rice-Wheat Systems of South Asia: A Case Study from Punjab Pakistan. Draft Working Paper. Int Water Manag Inst. Lahore, Pakistan.
31. JK, Singh Y, Erenstein O, and Hardy B (ed) Integrated Crop and Resource Management in the Rice-Wheat System of South Asia. International Rice Research Institute, Los Baños, Philippines, pp 321–33
32. Joshi, E., Kumar, D., Lal, B.V., Gautam, P., Vyas, A.K., 2013. Management of direct seeded rice for enhanced resource - use efficiency. *Plant Knowl. J.* 2(3), 119-134.
33. Kaur J, Singh A (2017) Direct seeded rice: prospects, problems/constraints and researchable issues in India. *Curr Agri Res J* 5(1):13–32
34. Khade, V.N., Patil, B.D., Khanvilkar, S.A., Chavan, L.S., 1993. Effect of seeding rates and level of N on yield of direct-seeded (Rahu) summer rice in Konkan. *J. Maharashtra Agric. Univ.* 18, 32-35.
35. Kumar V, Ladha JK (2011) Direct seeding of rice: recent developments and future research needs. *Adv Agron* 111:297–413
36. Ladha JK, Dawe D, Pathak H, Padre AT, Yadav RL, Singh B, Singh Y, Singh Y, Singh P, Kundu AL, Sakal R, Ram N et al (2003) How extensive are yield declines in long-term rice-wheat experiments in Asia? *Field Crops Res* 81:159–180
37. Ladha JK, Kumar V, Alam MM, Sharma S, Gathala M, Chandna P, Saharawat YS, Balasubramanian V (2009) Integrating crop and resource management technologies for enhanced productivity, profitability, and sustainability of the rice-wheat system in South Asia. In: Ladha JK, Singh Y, Erenstein O, Hardy B (ed) Integrated Crop and Resource Management in the Rice-Wheat System of South Asia. International Rice Research Institute, Los Baños, Philippines, pp 69–108
38. Matloob A, Khaliq A, Chauhan BS (2015) Weeds of direct-seeded rice in Asia: problems and opportunities. *Advan Agro* 130:291–336
39. Mishra AK, Mahinda AJ, Shinjo H, Jat ML, Singh A, Funakawa S (2018) Role of conservation agriculture in mitigating soil salinity in Indo-Gangetic Plains of India. In: Gupta SK, Goyal MR, Singh A (ed) Engineering Practices for Management of Soil Salinity. Apple Academic Press Inc., pp. 87–114

40. Pandey CB, Kumar U, Kaviraj M, Minick KJ, Mishra AK, Singh JS (2020) DNRA: a short-circuit in biological N-cycling to conserve nitrogen in terrestrial ecosystems. *Sci Total Environ* 738:139710
41. Pathak H, Saharawat YS, Gathala MK, Mohanty S, Ladha JK (2009) Simulating environmental impact of resource-conserving technologies in the rice-wheat system of the Indo-Gangetic Plains. In: Ladha
42. Pathak H, Sankhyan S, Dubey DS, Bhatia A, Jain N (2013) Dry direct-seeding of rice for mitigating greenhouse gas emission: field experimentation and simulation. *Paddy Water Environ* 11:593–601
43. Poore J, Nemecek T (2018) Reducing food's environmental impacts through producers and consumers. *Sci* 360(6392):987–992
44. Rao, A.N., Johnson, D.E., Sivaprasad, B., Ladha, J.K., Mortimer, A.M., 2007. Weed management in direct seeded rice. *Adv. Agron.* 93, 153-255.
45. Rashid, M.H., Alam, M.M., Khan, M.A.H., Ladha, J.K., 2009. Productivity and resource use of direct-(drum)-seeded and transplanted rice in puddled soils in rice-rice and rice-wheat ecosystems. *Field Crops Res.* 113(3), 274-281.
46. Reiner W, Milkha SA (2000) The role of rice plants in regulating mechanisms of methane emissions. *Biol Fertil Soils* 31:20–29
47. Singh, V.P., Singh, G., Singh, R.K., Singh, S.P., Kumar, A., Dhyani, V.C., Kumar, M., Sharma, G., 2005. Effect of herbicides alone and in combination in direct seeded rice. *Indian J. Weed Sci.* 37, 197-201.
48. Srivastava K, Jat H, Meena M, Choudhary M, Mishra AK, Chaudhari SK (2016) Long term impact of different cropping systems on soil quality under silty loam soils of Indo-Gangetic plains of India. *J Appl Nat Sci* 82:584–587.
49. Sudhir-Yadav GG, Humphreys E, Kukal SS, Walia US (2011) Effect of water management on dry seeded and puddled transplanted rice. Part 1. Crop performance *Field Crops Res* 120:112–122
50. Sudhir-Yadav HE, Kukal SS, Gill G, Rangarajan R (2011) Effect of water management on dry seeded and puddled transplanted rice. Part 2. Water balance and water productivity. *Field Crops Res* 120:123–132
51. Susilawati HL, Setyanto P, Kartikawati R, Sutriadi MT (2019) The opportunity of direct seeding to mitigate greenhouse gas emission from paddy rice field. In: *IOP Conf Ser Earth Environ Sci* 393(1):012
52. Tabbal DF, Bouman BAM, Bhuiyan SI, Sibayan EB, Sattar MA (2002) On-farm strategies for reducing water input in irrigated rice: case studies in the Philippines. *Agric Water Manage* 56:93–112
53. Tuong, L., 2008. Studies on direct-seeding adaptability of Cambodian rice cultivars and development of cultivars with good eating quality. PhD thesis, Science of Plant and Animal Production, United Graduate School of Agricultural Science, Tokyo University of Agriculture and Technology, Japan.

54. Tuong TP, Bouman BAM, Mortimer M (2005) More rice, less water Integrated approaches for increasing water productivity in irrigated rice-based systems in Asia. *Plant Prod Sci* 8:231–241
55. Wassmann R, Neue HU, Ladha JK, Aulakh MS (2004) Mitigating greenhouse gas emissions from rice–wheat cropping system in Asia. *Environ Dev Sustain* 6:65–90

UNDER PEER REVIEW