Effect of Irrigation Scheduling Based-IW/CPE Ratio on Soil Qualities, Growth Characteristics and Yield of Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) crop in Eastern Uttar Pradesh, India

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to assess the Effect of irrigation scheduling based on the IW/CPE ratio on soil qualities, growth characteristics and yield of wheat in Eastern Uttar Pradesh. A field experiment was conducted during *rabi* season of the year 2016-17. In this experiment, the treatment combinations consisting of five irrigation levels *viz.,* CRI stage (I_1), 0.6 IW/CPE ratio (I_2), 0.8 IW/CPE ratio (I_3), 1.0 IW/CPE ratio (I_4), and 1.2 IW/CPE ratio (I_5) were tried in randomized block design. Whereas the initial irrigation of all treatments is done at the CRI stage (21 DAS), and then, according to the IW/CPE ratio treatments, the crop of the net plot area was harvested from the individual plot for observation. The final seed weight per plot was recorded in kg and converted to q/ha. The result showed the growth attributes, *viz.,* plant height, dry matter accumulation, number of effective shoots per m^2, and yield-attributing characters, *viz.,* 1000 grain weight, harvest index, grain, straw, and Biological yield by crop was significantly higher at 1.0 IW/CPE ratio (I_4) in the moisture regime, which was at par with 1.2 IW/CPE ratio (I_5) in the moisture regime and significantly higher than at the CRI stage (I_1), 0.6 IW/CPE ratio (I_2), and 0.8 IW/CPE ratio (I_3).

Keywords: Moisture regime; soil properties; wheat; growth attributes; yield.

1. INTRODUCTION

"Wheat (*Triticum aestivum L*.) is a vital food crop that contributes to food security. In 2021-22, wheat was cultivated on around 222.62 million hectares globally, generating 779 million metric tonnes with a productivity of 3.49 Metric tonnes per hectare" [1]. "Water is the scarcest input since it is essential for plant turgidity, nutrient absorption, and the metabolic process, and it has a significant influence on the efficiency of applied inputs and individual component production. When watering rabi crops, surface irrigation methods are utilized, with irrigation efficiency as low as 30-40% due to increased non-beneficial evapotranspiration" [2]. Irrigated wheat systems account for more than 40% of wheat output in developing countries [3]. Additionally, the irrigation schedule is critical for water management. Irrigation failures during the critical development stage may result in significantly decreased grain output because of lower test weight [4]. As one of the most successful agronomic management measures, efficient water management not only boosts crop productivity but also reduces sensitivity to disease and insect pests by providing an optimum environment for these biotic stressors to flourish (Singh et al*.* 2012). The IW/CPE ratio meteorological approach was introduced by Parihar et al*.* [5], which is a ratio between a constant quantity of irrigation water (IW) and cumulative pan evaporation minus precipitation. This IW/CPE technique is beneficial because of its ease of usage and excellent water efficiency. It is an accepted truth that as water demands for home, industrial, and other reasons increases, less and less water will be available for agriculture in the future. Even if all irrigation potential is realized, it is anticipated that roughly half of all cultivated land will remain rainfed [6]. Water for irrigation is a critical

restriction for expected crop yield. Evaporation from an open pan is closely related to evapotranspiration by a complete crop cover. Irrigation is now an extremely expensive input, thus it will be utilized sparingly. As a basis for agricultural irrigation scheduling, [7] proposed a substantially more feasible meteorological technique of IW/CPE, the ratio between a set volume of irrigation water (IW) and Cumulative Pan Evaporation. Because of its ease of use, the IW/CPE ratio technique deserves special consideration. The IW/CPE ratio is used for watering wheat and comparing treatments at crucial development stages. With this in mind, an attempt was made to investigate the effect of irrigation scheduling based on the IW/CPE ratio on the characteristics of the soil, yield, and water use efficiency of wheat crops. In a study by Patel and Upadhyay [8], better grain production with IW: CPE ratio 1.0 of 6 cm irrigation led to enhanced yield parameters such as effective tiller meter^{-2}, number of grains per spike, grain weight per spike, and 1000-grain weight.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Field trials were carried out at the Student's Instructional Farm of Acharya Narendra Deva University of Agriculture & Technology, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, during the 2016-17 *rabi* season. The farm sits 42 kilometers away from Faizabad on Raibareily Road, at 26.47 N latitude and 82.12 E longitude, approximately 113 meters above mean sea level. The experimental soil has a pH of 8.20, an EC of 0.30 dSm^{-1}, organic carbon of 4.0 g kg^{-1}, available N of 187, P of 17.25, and K of 269 kg ha^{-1}.

The experiment was laid out in a randomized block design with four replications. Five treatments comprised four levels of irrigation scheduling: (a) I_1; CRI stage, (b) I_2; 0.6 IW/CPE ratio; (c) I_3; 0.8 IW/CPE ratio; (d) I_4; 1.0 IW/CPE ratio; and (e) I_5; 1.2 IW/CPE ratio. The wheat variety PBW-154 was used as a test crop. It was sown at a 20 cm row-to-row distance on December 2^{nd,} 2016 and harvested on April 14th, 2017. Fertilization was done by using inorganic fertilizers and half of the nitrogen and the full dose of phosphorus and potash were applied at the time of sowing as per treatments. After the initial irrigation, the remaining nitrogen was top-dressed according to treatment. Urea, DAP, and muriate of potash were used to apply N, P, and K, respectively. A t-test with a 5% threshold of significance was used to compare the treatments. Whereas the initial irrigation of all treatments is done at the CRI stage (21 DAS), and then, according to the IW/CPE ratio treatments, the crop of net plot area was harvested from the individual plot for observation. The final seed weight per plot was recorded in kg and converted to q/ha. Soil moisture samples were collected from depths of 0-20, 20-40, and 40-60 cm before and after crop sowing and harvesting. Fresh weight of sample was recorded and these soil samples were dried in an oven at 105 ^{0}C till the constant dry weight.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Growth Attributes

3.1.1 Effect on crop growth

Table 3 summarizes data on progressive plant height at several stages of crop growth as impacted. In general, plant height was successfully raised up to the 90 DAS stage. Following that, the rate of increase in plant height was modest until the crop was harvested. The data show that the influence of moisture regimes was not significant at the 30 DAS stage, but it had a substantial effect on plant height at the 60, 90, and harvest stages. The tallest plants had an irrigation practice of I_4 89.50 cm (IW/CPE of 1.0), which was comparable to I_5 85.07 cm (IW/CPE of 1.2), while the lowest plants had I_1 64.50 cm (at CRI stage), I_2 80.70 cm (0.6 IW/CPE ratio) and I_3 83.75 cm (0.8 IW/CPE ratio). The finding was in case close conformity with those of Deo et al. [13], Jat et al. [14], Dangar et al. [15], Nayak et al.[16] and Kaur & Mahal [17]. Dry matter accumulation is sum of the metabolism process in the plant and is largely related to yield initially. Higher dry matter production was due to an increase in plant height and uptake of nutrients through adequate irrigation supply. The total dry matter production of I_4 (1.0 IW/CPE ratio) 944.25 g which was statistically at par I_5 (1.2 IW/CPE ratio) 929.25 g and significant over with I_2 (0.6 IW/CPE ratio) 870.40g, I_3 (0.8 IW/CPE Ratio) 915.00 g and I_1 (at CRI stage) 581.25 g which resulted in the lowest dry matter accumulation. The finding were in case close conformity with those of Deo et. al. [13], Jat et. al. [14], Dangar et. al. [15], Chouhan et. al. [18] and Kumar et. al. [19].

3.1.2 Effect on yield attributing parameters

The yield attributes parameters were significantly influenced by the different moisture regimes

presented in Table 3. The yield attributes character like effective shoots m^2 was under-recorded 398 m^{-2} with moisture regime I_4 (1.0 IW/CPE Ratio) which was statistically at par I_5 (1.2 IW/CPE ratio) 385 m^{-2} significant over with I_1 (at CRI stage) 292.75 m^{-2} I_2 (0.6 IW/CPE ratio) 351.75 m^{-2} and I_3 (0.8 IW/CPE Ratio) 374.25 m^{-2}. The 1000 grain wt. and harvest index was under-recorded 43.22 g and 42.90% with moisture regime I_4 (1.0 IW/CPE Ratio) which was statistically at par I_5 (1.2 IW/CPE ratio) 42.75 g & 42.60%, I_3 (0.8 IW/CPE Ratio) 42.50 g & 42.07% and I_2 (0.6 IW/CPE ratio) 42.00 & 42.04% and significant over with I_1 (at CRI stage) 36.00 g & 38.48%. "It was due to a timely and adequate supply of water at the crop growth and development stages, and this did interfere with crop growth, and profuse tillring continued at an increasing rate at harvest" [20] A similar result has also been reported by Deo et al. [13], Dangar et al. [15] and Kumar et al. [19].

Table 1. Physico-chemical properties of the experimental field

S. No	Particulars	Experimental value	Methods
A.	**Physical properties**		
	Sand	20.30	Hydrometer method [9]
	Silt	60.50	
	Clay	19.20	
	Texture	Silt loam	Triangular method [9]
B.	**Chemical analysis**		
	Soil pH (1:2.5)	8.20	Glass electrode pH meter [9]
	Electrical conductivity (dS $m^{-1)}$	0.30	Electrical conductivity Bridge [9]
	Organic carbon (g kg^{-1})	4.0	Rapid titration method [10]
	Available nitrogen (kg ha^{-1})	187.0	Alkaline permanganate method [11]
	Available phosphorus (kg ha^{-1})	17.25	Olsen's method [12]
	Available potash (kg ha^{-1})	269.0	Flame photometer method [9]

Table 2. Details of the treatments

A.	Irrigation schedule	Symbol used
1	T_1=Irrigation at CRI stage.	I_1
2	T_1+Irrigation at 0.6 IW/CPE	I_2
3	T_1+Irrigation at 0.8 IW/CPE	I_3
4	T_1+Irrigation at 1.0 IW/CPE	I_4
5	T_1+Irrigation at 1.2 IW/CPE	I_5

3.1.3 Grain, Straw and Biological yield

The grain, straw and biological yields were significantly influenced by the different moisture regimes presented in Table 4. The highest grain, straw and biological yield (42.67, 56.75 and 99.42 q ha^{-1}) were recorded with the levels of irrigation I_4 (1.0 IW/CPE ratio), which was statistically at par with I_5:1.2 IW/CPE (40.87, 55.06 except biological yield q ha^{-1}); however, it was significantly superior over I_1 at CRI stage (22.37, 35.75 and 58.12 q ha^{-1}), I_2 0.6 IW/CPE ratio(34.37, 47.37 & 81.74 q ha^{-1}) and I_3 0.8 IW/CPE Ratio (38.50, 53.00 & 91.50 q ha^{-1}). "Considering the progress of yield in percentage (%) higher over the application of irrigation at CRI stage. It was due to the timely and adequate supply of water at the crop growth and development stages and this did interfere with crop growth and profuse tillering continued at an increasing rate at harvest" [15,19].

3.2 Soil Properties

3.2.1 Bulk Density

"The Soil Bulk density as affected by different moisture regimes are presented in Table 5. It revealed that the different moisture regimes could not significantly influence the soil Bulk density. However, nominal soil bulk density buildup were observed at harvest of the crop. The range in soil bulk density were 1.36 (0-20 cm) to 1.43 (40-60 cm) dS m^2 respectively. The higher buildup in bulk density was recorded under moisture regime 1.2 IW/CPE (I_5) applied as seven irrigations and the minimum was recorded under the moisture regime at CRI stage

(I_1), where applied only one irrigation during the entire growth period" [21, 22, 23].

3.2.2 Soil pH, EC & OC

"The Soil pH, EC and organic carbon as affected by different moisture regimes are presented in Table 6. It revealed that the different moisture regimes could not significantly influence the soil pH, Electrical Conductivity and Organic Carbon. However, nominal reduction in soil pH, EC and buildup in organic carbon were observed at harvest of the crop. The range in soil pH and EC and organic carbon were 8.17 to 8.13, 0.20 to 0.29 and 4.1 to 4.8 g kg^{-1} respectively. The higher reduction in pH, EC and buildup in organic carbon was recorded under moisture regime 1.2 IW/CPE (I_5) applied as seven irrigations and minimum was recorded under moisture regime at CRI stage (I_1) where applied only one irrigation during the entire growth period". [21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26].

Table 3. Effect of moisture regimes on the growth attributes and yield attributes of the wheat crop

Treatments	Plant height (cm)				Dry matter accumulation (g m^{-2})				Effective of shoots m^{-2}	1000 grains (g)	Harvest Index
	30 DAS	60 DAS	90 DAS	At Harvest	30 DAS	60 DAS	90 DAS	At harvest			
I_1	18.16	35.77	64.12	64.50	68.10	173.13	409.00	581.25	292.75	36.00	38.48
I_2	18.46	39.30	78.99	80.70	67.97	227.17	632.07	870.40	351.75	42.00	42.04
I_3	18.28	41.40	82.60	83.75	66.35	240.91	704.74	915.00	374.25	42.50	42.07
I_4	18.41	46.20	87.95	89.50	66.95	285.68	743.50	944.25	398.00	43.22	42.90
I_5	18.08	43.70	85.07	86.90	68.82	268.30	722.69	959.25	385.00	42.75	42.60
SEm±	0.31	1.02	1.48	1.69	0.63	12.58	11.29	24.64	5.79	0.35	0.32
C.D. P=0.05	NS	3.15	4.57	5.19	NS	38.77	34.78	75.92	17.85	1.40	0.97

Table 4. Effect of moisture regimes on the yields after harvest of the wheat crop

Treatments	Grain yield (q ha^{-1})	Straw yield (q ha^{-1})	Biological yield (q ha^{-1})
I_1	22.37	35.75	58.12
I_2	34.37	47.37	81.74
I_3	38.50	53.00	91.50
I_4	42.67	56.75	99.42
I_5	40.87	55.06	95.93
SEm±	0.92	0.99	0.52
C.D. P=0.05	2.84	3.06	1.59

Table 5. Bulk density of before and after-harvest wheat crops is an influence by different moisture regimes

Treatments	Before sowing			After harvest		
Depth (cm)	**0-20 (cm)**	**20-40 (cm)**	**40-60 (cm)**	**0-20 (cm)**	**20-40 (cm)**	**40-60 (cm)**
I_1	1.37	1.39	1.40	1.36	1.38	1.39
I_2	1.36	1.38	1.39	1.35	1.37	1.38
I_3	1.38	1.40	1.41	1.36	1.39	1.40
I_4	1.39	1.41	1.42	1.37	1.40	1.40
I_5	1.40	1.42	1.44	1.37	1.40	1.43
SEm±	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
CD at 5%	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

Table 6. Effect of soil moisture regimes on the pH, EC and organic carbon (O.C.) of soil before and after harvest of wheat crop

Treatment	Before sowing			After harvest		
	pH	EC (dS m^{-1})	O.C (g kg^{-1})	pH	EC (dS m^{-1})	O.C (g kg^{-1})
I_1	8.18	0.30	4.0	8.17	0.29	4.1
I_2	8.19	0.31	4.1	8.16	0.27	4.3
I_3	8.20	0.29	4.2	8.16	0.24	4.4
I_4	8.21	0.32	4.4	8.15	0.26	4.7
I_5	8.22	0.28	4.3	8.13	0.20	4.8
SEm ±	0.13	0.01	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.02
CD (P=0.05)	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

4. CONCLUSION

From the results of one year experimentation, it can be concluded that the Wheat variety (PBW-154) for which irrigation scheduling performed at treatment of I_4 IW/CPE ratio 1.0 resulted in the highest growth attributes, yield attributes, yield and soil quality of wheat crop.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are highly grateful to Head of Department Soil Science & Agricultural Chemistry, A.N.D.U.A & T, Kumarganj, Ayodhya, Uttar Pradesh for providing necessary facility to carry out this work.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Anonymous. (2021-22) United States Department of Agriculture. Foreign Agricultural Service, Circular Series WAP. 2022:2-22.
2. Rajanna GA, Dhindwal AS. Sriharsha VP. Performance of clusterbean (*Cyamopsis tetragonoloba*) under variable irrigation schedules and crop-establishment techniques. Indian Journal of Agronomy. 2016;61: 223–230.
3. Rajaram S, Sayre KD, Diekmann J, Gupta RK, Erskine W. Sustainability Considerations in Wheat Improvement and Production. In: M. S. Kang, Ed., Agricultural and Environmental Sustainability-Considerations for Future, Haworth Food & Agricultural Products Press, New York. 2007:105-124.
4. Kumar P, Sarangi A, Singh DK. Parihar SS. Wheat Performance as influenced by Saline Irrigation Regimes and Cultivars. Journal of Agri Search. 2014;1(2):66-72.
5. Parihar SS, Sandhu KL. Sandhu BS. Comparison of irrigation schedule based on pan evaporation and growth stages in wheat. Indian Journal of Agronomy. 1976;68:650-653.
6. Vision.Perspective Plan, Directorate of Wheat Research, Karnal. 2020:36-41.
7. Parihar SS, Tiwari RB. Effect of nitrogen level on yield, nutrient uptake and water use of late sown wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.), Indian Journal of Agronomy. 2003;48(2):103-107.
8. Patel RM, Upadhya PN. Response of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) to irrigation under varying levels of nitrogen and phosphorus. Indian J. Agron. 1993;40(2):290.
9. Jeckson ML. Soil chemical analysis. Prentice hall of India Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi; 1973.
10. Walkley A. Black AI. Soil Sci. Old piper, S.S. Soil and plant analysis, Nans Publishers Bombay. 1934;37:29-38.
11. Subbiah BV. Asiza CL. A rapid procedure for the estimation of available N in soil. Current Sci. 1956;25:259-260.
12. Olsen SR, Cole CV, Watanable FS, Dean LA. Estimation of available phosphorus in soil by extraction with sodium bicarbonate. USDA, Cric. 1954;930:19-23
(C.F. methods of soil analysis. Ed. Black: C.A. Agronomy, No. American Society of Agronomy Inc. Madison, Wisconsin. 9;1044-1046.
13. Deo K, Mishra SR, Singh AK, Mishra AN. Singh S. Water requirement of wheat crop for optimum production using CROPWAT model. Journal of Medicinal Plants Studie. 2017;5(3): 338-342.
14. Jat ML, Shivran AC, Puniya MM, Boori PK, Ola BL, Verma HP. Effect of drip irrigation scheduling on growth and seed production

of fennel (*Foeniculum vulgar Mill.*) under semi-arid agro-climatic condition. International J. Seed Spices. 2015;5(2):67-73.
15. Dangar DM, Dwivedi DK. Mashru HH. Effect of irrigation regime and lateral spacing on drip irrigated wheat. International Journal of Agricultural Science and Research. 2017;7(1): 417-422.
16. Nayak MK, Patel HR, Prakash V, Kumar A. Influence of Irrigation Scheduling on Crop Growth Yield and Quality of Wheat. Journal of Agri. Search. 2015;2(1):65-68.
17. Kaur J, Mahal SS. Influence of paddy straw mulch on crop productivity and economics of bed and flat sown wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) under different irrigation schedules. Journal of Environmental Biology. 2016;38:243-250.
18. Chouhan BS, Kaushik MK, Napelia V. Solanki NS, Singh B, Devra NS, Kumawat P. Kumar A. Effect of sowing methods, scheduling of irrigation based on IW/CPE ratio and chemical weed control on plant height, dry matter accumulation and yield of wheat. Journal of Pharmacognosy and Photochemistry. 2017;6(3):169-172.
19. Kumar A, Kumar S, Singh AK, Kumar D, Harikesh, Gopal T, Pandey D. Pandey VK. Effect of Moisture Regime and Nutrient Management System on Yield and Economics of Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci**.** 2018;7(2):59-66.
20. Pal S, Kumar S, Kumar P, Singh A, Gangwar HK. Effect of moisture regime on IW/CPE ratio on soil properties, yield and water use efficiency of wheat crop (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci. 2020;9(3):2499-506.
21. Bhattacharyya R, Kundu S, Pandey SC, Singh KP. Gupta HS. Tillage and irrigation effects on crop yields and soil properties under the rice–wheat system in the Indian Himalayase. Agricultural water management. 2008;95:993-1002.
22. Adejumobi MA, Ojediran JO. Olabiyi OO. Effects of irrigation practices on some soil chemical properties on OMI irrigation scheme. Journal of Engineering Research and Applications. 2014;4 (10):29-35.
23. Yaseen R, Shafi J, Ahmad W, Rana MS, Salim M. Qaisrani SA. Effect of deficit irrigation and mulch on soil physical properties, growth and yield of Maize. Environment and Ecology Research. 2014;2(3):122-137.
24. Dastane NG. A practical manual for water use research in agriculture, Navbharat Prakashans, Poona-4, India; 1972.
25. Hameem A. Evaluation of raised-bed and conventional irrigation systems for yield and water productivity of wheat crop. Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences. 2017;13:143-149.
26. Kanwar JS. Chopra SL. Analytical Agricultural Chemistry, Kalyani Publishers, New Delhi; 1991.