

# Original Research Article

## Evaluation of rice varieties under dry seeding with surface drip at varying doses of nitrogen in comparison with rice under conventionally flooded transplanted condition.

Comment [Mu1]: Conditions. Do to all the likes of these.

### Abstract

**Aims:** A field experiment was conducted to evaluate the performance of 3 different rice varieties (KNM-1638, JGL-24423 & DRR Dhan-42) under drip irrigated dry direct seeded condition as well as conventionally flooded transplanted condition with 100 & 125% N.

**Study design:** Split-plot design with 3 varieties in the main plot and 2 levels of irrigation (1.0 Epan & 1.5 Epan) in combination with 2 doses of N (100 & 125% of RDF) in the sub-plot. An observation trial with these 3 varieties under transplanted condition with 100 & 125% N was taken up.

**Place and Duration of Study:** The experiment was conducted during *khari* seasons of 2022-23 and 2023-24 at College Farm, College of Agriculture, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad, Telangana, India.

**Methodology:** In each variety, the best-performing irrigation level was found at 100% N & 125% N. Growth parameters, yield parameters & yield of best-performing treatments under dry direct seeded (DDSR) condition was compared with conventionally flooded transplanted rice (CFTPR) with the same variety and same dose of N using one-sample t-test.

**Results:** KNM-1638 recorded significantly higher yield at 5% level of significance under transplanted condition compared to dry direct seeded condition both at 100% N ( $P=0.01$ ) & 125% N ( $P=0.01$ ). Grain yield was statistically comparable at 5% level of significance under dry direct seeded and transplanted condition for JGL-24423 at 100% N ( $P=0.18$ ). However, at 125% N, transplanted rice recorded superior yields to that of direct seeded rice at 5% level of significance ( $P=0.01$ ). DRR Dhan-42 registered comparable yields under direct seeded and transplanted condition with 100 ( $P=0.22$ ) & 125% N ( $P=0.07$ ) at 5% level of significance. There observed 57-68% of saving in irrigation water in DDSR compared to CFTPR.

**Conclusion:** Based on yield, economization of water and nitrogen, KNM-1638 is recommended for cultivation under the transplanted condition with 100% N; whereas, JGL-24423 & DRR Dhan-42 can be successfully cultivated under dry direct seeded condition with 100% N without yield penalty.

**Keywords:** Dry Direct Seeded Rice, Transplanted Rice, Irrigation water, Grain yield, Nitrogen.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Among the rice growing countries of the world, India has the largest rice acreage and ranks second in production. In India, rice is grown in about 45.77 m ha area with a production of 124.37 million tonnes and productivity of 2717 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> during 2020-21 [1]. In the state of Telangana, it is grown in 4.17 m ha with the production of 21.8 million tonnes and productivity of 5240 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> [2]. There is 20.5% contribution from agriculture & allied sectors to the gross value addition of the state and a source of employment to 55% of the population [2].

Comment [Mu2]: Rice-growing

Traditional rice production system involves submergence of 5-10 cm water throughout the crop season which entails the use of 3000-5000 L of water to produce 1 kg of grain [3]. In the face of industrialization and urbanization competition for fresh water from non-agricultural sectors would increase [4] which would reduce the water accessibility of agricultural sector [5] directly affecting the sustainability of irrigated rice production. The increase in rice production to feed the burgeoning global population needs to be envisaged under such situations of declining water resources.

Comment [Mu3]: Add 'the' before it

Comment [Mu4]: Add 'the' before it

Dry direct seeded rice (DDSR) with drip irrigation excludes ponding of water as in conventionally flooded transplanted rice (CFTR) thus saving huge amounts of water. According to Ghosh *et al.* [6] puddling, transplanting and irrigation for flooded rice demands 2295 mm of water. Dry direct seeded rice reduces water usage by eliminating nursery raising, puddling and ponding of water in the field [7]. Mahajan *et al.* [8] opined that shift from flooded rice to direct seeded rice would increase water use efficiency by way of reducing water requirements during land preparation. It accrues an array of benefits to growers as well as the environment. According to Tyagi *et al.* [9], direct seeded rice imparts benefits through resource conservation (water, labour, fertilizer, energy & time), early maturity, reduced risk of unfavourable weather conditions, best fit to climate change, mitigating greenhouse gas emissions and better growth of succeeding crop fitting into various crop diversification programme. In the scenario of labour shortages and increasing labour wages, dry direct seeded rice is a promising alternative to conventional transplanted rice with added advantage of water saving and improvement in physical condition of soil. Sharda *et al.* [10] opined that under water limited situations, drip irrigated direct seeded rice is a water cum energy saving profitable alternative to traditional puddled low land system of cultivation.

Comment [Mu5]: Direct-seeded. Do to all the likes of these.

Comment [Mu6]: Water-limited

Yang *et al.* [11] observed that an aerobic soil environment enhances tiller production in paddy along with the enhancement in the development and functioning of the root system. Hemlata *et al.* [12] reported that number of tillers  $m^{-2}$  in dry direct seeded rice was significantly higher (706.6) than in transplanted rice (534.3). Number of tillers per hill produced under aerobic rice with drip irrigation (30.69) was significantly higher than puddled transplanted rice (28.28) as well as aerobic rice under surface irrigation (26.76) [13]. Different researchers across the world have reported varied yield response of direct seeded rice depending on location and cultivar [14]. Transplanted rice recorded 14.8% higher grain yield over dry direct seeded rice in Telangana during *kharif* 2021-22 [15]. Kannan and Ravikumar [16] revealed that number of productive tillers  $m^{-2}$ , filled grains  $m^{-2}$  and grain yield were significantly superior in direct seeded rice (278, 32272, 5.31 t  $ha^{-1}$  respectively) compared to transplanted rice (238, 27525, 4.95 t  $ha^{-1}$  respectively). Direct seeded rice recorded higher number of panicles  $m^{-2}$  (461), grains per panicle (480) and fertility percentage (88%) over puddled transplanted rice [17]. An yield of 5-6 t  $ha^{-1}$  can be expected from aerobic rice culture with high yielding varieties [18, 19]. Many researchers have reported only slight reduction in yield; 8% [20], 6% [21] in direct seeded rice compared to puddled transplanted rice.

Comment [Mu7]: A yield

Comment [Mu8]: High-yielding

Rice is one among the most input intensive crops of the world with fertilizers alone contributing 20-25% of the total production cost [22]. Further, they have emphasized that rice cultivation alone consumes 24.7 Mt of fertilizers and accounts for 14% of total annual fertilizer use in the world. Fertilizer industry is one among the high energy intensive industries and non-judicious application of fertilizers poses threat to environment and questions sustainable development. Therefore an ideal nutrient management strategy needs to be introduced in rice culture, that would not only enhance productivity, profitability and nutrient use efficiency but should also be eco-friendly and environmentally sustainable. So in

Comment [Mu9]: Input-intensive

Comment [Mu10]: Energy-intensive

the present study response of 2 doses of N (100 & 125% N) is tested in direct seeded and transplanted condition.

Success of growing rice in aerobic soil environment as in drip irrigated direct seeded rice cultivation largely relies on choice of ideal rice varieties adapted to water limited conditions. Though the traditional upland varieties are suitable for aerobic system due to their drought tolerance, they tend to lodge under the high input levels [23]. On the other hand, the input responsive, high yielding low land varieties are severely yield limited under water scarce environment [24]. The varieties chosen for aerobic rice cultivation need to carry the high yield potential of low land varieties with drought tolerant characters of upland varieties. In the present scenario, where farmers are reluctant to take up aerobic rice cultivation, research should focus on identifying superiorly performing rice varieties under aerobic environment and the same should be introduced to farming community. So the present study was conducted to evaluate the performance of 2 popular rice varieties of Telangana viz., KNM-1638 & JGL-24423 with the proven drought tolerant variety, DRR Dhan-42 at varying doses of N.

Comment [Mu11]: relies

Comment [Mu12]: low-land

Comment [Mu13]: drought-tolerant

Comment [Mu14]: characteristics

## 2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

### 2.1 Location of the Experimental Site

The experiment was conducted during *kharif* seasons of 2022-23 and 2023-24 at College Farm, College of Agriculture, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad, Telangana, India. The site is geographically situated at 17°19'24.7" N–Latitude, 78°24'34.0" E–Longitude and at an altitude of 542.6 m above mean sea level. Meteorological parameters recorded from a meteorological observatory situated at Agro Climate Research Centre, ARI, Rajendranagar were used to characterize the weather conditions prevailed during crop growing seasons. Mean maximum temperature & mean minimum temperature during crop growing season of *kharif*, 2022 was 29.6°C & 18.6°C respectively. Mean maximum temperature & mean minimum temperature recorded during *kharif*, 2023 were 30.6°C & 20.6°C respectively.

In *kharif* of 2022-23 a total of 409.40 mm of rainfall was received in 23 rainy days. Total rainfall received during *kharif*, 2023-24 was 329.50 mm in 18 rainy days. Mean weekly evaporation during *kharif*, 2022-23 ranged between 2.70 - 4.80 mm with a mean value of 3.44 mm; whereas in *kharif*, 2023-24 it ranged between 2.80 - 5.40 mm with a mean value of 3.94 mm.

The soil of the experimental site was sandy clay loam in texture & mildly alkaline (pH: 7.6) in reaction. The soil was low in available nitrogen (245.4 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), high in available phosphorus (48.2 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and high in available potassium (528 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) with low organic carbon (0.53%).

### 2.2 Design of Experiment & Cultural Practices

The experiment was laid out in split plot design with 3 main and 4 sub treatments allocated randomly and replicated thrice. Three varieties were tested in the main plot;

M<sub>1</sub>- KNM-1638

M<sub>2</sub>- JGL-24423

M<sub>3</sub>- DRR Dhan-42.

KNM-1638 is a high yielding short duration (120-125 days) variety with anyield potential of 7-8 t ha<sup>-1</sup>. JGL-24423 is a variety suitable for both *kharif* and *rabi*. Crop duration is 125 days in *kharif* with a yield potential of 8.8-9 t ha<sup>-1</sup>. DRR Dhan-42 is a high yielding short duration (120 days) drought tolerant variety suitable for upland and drought prone shallow low lands. The variety performs ideally both under direct seeding and transplanting. The variety has high yield potential (5-5.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) and can replace other existing low yielding varieties of the same duration with a yield advantage of 0.5-1.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>.

Comment [Mu15]: a yield

In the sub-plot, 2 irrigation regimes were tested in combination with 2 doses of nitrogen.

S<sub>1</sub>: Irrigation scheduled at 1.0 Epan with 100% N (150 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>)

S<sub>2</sub>: Irrigation scheduled at 1.0 Epan with 125% N (187.5 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>)

S<sub>3</sub>: Irrigation scheduled at 1.5 Epan with 100% N (150 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>)

S<sub>4</sub>: Irrigation scheduled at 1.5 Epan with 125% N (187.5 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>)

Seed rate adopted was 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. Line sowing was done at 20 cm row spacing. Plants were later thinned out to create a plant to plant spacing of 10 cm. The recommended dose of fertilizer followed was 150:60:40 kg NPK ha<sup>-1</sup>. Gross & net plot sizes were 28.80 m<sup>2</sup> & 23.04 m<sup>2</sup> respectively. Irrigation was scheduled on every alternate day based on pan evaporation value of the previous 2 days.

Comment [Mu16]: plant-to-plant

Comment [Mu17]: an alternate

An observation trial was taken up with these 3 rice varieties under transplanted condition with 100 & 125% N. A water level of 1.5 cm was maintained at the time of transplanting. Water level was gradually increased to 5 cm. Flood irrigation was given at 5 cm depth each time after the disappearance of ponded water. Irrigation was withheld 15 days before harvest to allow uniform ripening. A seed rate of 20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> was used and spacing under transplanted condition was maintained at 20 cm x 10 cm. Plot size and cultural practices except irrigation management was maintained same in both direct seeded and transplanted condition.

### 2.3 Recording of Observations

Five plants from the net plot area were selected randomly and tagged in each experimental plot. Observations related to yield attributes were recorded at maturity before harvest from these tagged plants. Number of tillers per m<sup>2</sup> & number of panicles m<sup>-2</sup> were counted from the net plot area using 1 m<sup>2</sup> quadrant. Thousand well filled grains were collected from net plot area at harvest. It was adjusted to 14% moisture level and weighed for the estimation of test weight.

Comment [Mu18]: well-filled

For obtaining grain & straw yields plants from the net plot area was harvested, sun dried for 3 days, threshed and winnowed. Grain was weighed at 14% moisture level and expressed as kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. Straw from the net plot area obtained after threshing was sun dried for one week and dry weight was recorded. It was expressed in kg ha<sup>-1</sup>.

Comment [Mu19]: sun-dried. Do to all

### 2.4 Statistical Analysis

The best performing irrigation level under 100% N & 125% N within each variety was compared with corresponding dose of N & variety grown under transplanted condition using one sample t-test at 5% level of significance.

Comment [Mu20]: best-performing

OP Stat software (designed and developed by the Computer Section, CCS HAU, Hisar) was used for carrying out one sample t-test.

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

From the grain yield data of two years it was found that variety KNM-1638 ( $M_1$ ) did not differ statistically among different sub-plot levels. So under 100 & 125% N, 1.0 Epan irrigation level was selected as best treatment ( $M_1S_1$  &  $M_1S_2$ ) from the economic utilization of water point of view. In case of JGL-24423 ( $M_2$ ) & DRR Dhan-42 ( $M_3$ ), significantly higher yields were obtained at 1.5 Epan with 100 & 125%N. So  $M_2S_3$  &  $M_2S_4$  are selected as best treatments for  $M_2$  and  $M_3S_3$  &  $M_3S_4$  are selected as best treatments for  $M_3$ .

The best treatment under each variety was compared with conventionally flooded transplanted rice. Mean values of the 2 year data are furnished in Tables & Figure.

#### 3.1 Number of tillers $m^{-2}$

Drip irrigated dry direct seeded rice (DDSR) & continuously flooded transplanted rice (CFTPR) did not produce any significant difference in tiller number either at 100 (Table 1) or at 125% N (Table 2) for KNM-1638 ( $M_1$ ). In the case of JGL-24423 ( $M_2$ ),  $M_2S_3$  &  $M_2S_4$  recorded 45 & 42% higher number of tillers compared to  $M_2 + 100\%N$  &  $M_2 + 125\%N$  under transplanted condition respectively. So there was significant difference in tiller numbers between DDSR & CFTPR in JGL-24423. A similar trend was observable in DRR Dhan-42 ( $M_3$ ) as well.  $M_3S_3$  produced 70.8% higher number of tillers than  $M_3 + 100\% N$  in flooded condition (Table 1). There was 60.1% increase in tiller production for  $M_3S_4$  compared to  $M_3 + 125\% N$  under transplanted condition (Table 2).

Tiller number was significantly higher under dry direct seeding compared to flood irrigated transplanted rice for both JGL-24423 & DRR Dhan-42. Choudhary [25], Yang *et al.* [11] & Flessa and Fischer [26] revealed that aerobic soil environment promotes tiller emergence in rice. Tiller production & leaf area development superseded in DDSR over transplanted rice [27] which could be attributed to higher seedling vigour [28], which allows DDSR to achieve more light interception, increased WUE [29] and early canopy cover. On the other hand, in TPR, early growth and vigour are slowed down by root damage brought on by nursery uprooting and transplanting shock. In direct seeding, a rice cultivar possessing higher seedling vigour is preferred because a crop plant with greater vigour tends to overpower the weed plant and inhibit its growth. Compared to KNM-1638, JGL-24423 & DRR Dhan-42 have registered higher number of tillers pointing towards their suitability under DDSR cultivation than KNM-1638.

Comment [Mu21]: flood-irrigated

**Table 1. Comparison of number of tillers  $m^{-2}$  at flowering in  $M_1S_1$ ,  $M_2S_3$  &  $M_3S_3$  with conventionally flooded transplanted system of  $M_1 + 100\% N$ ,  $M_2 + 100\% N$  &  $M_3 + 100\% N$  respectively**

Treatments	No. of tillers $m^{-2}$	Treatments	No. of tillers $m^{-2}$	Treatments	No. of tillers $m^{-2}$
$M_1S_1$ (DDSR)	252.17	$M_2S_3$ (DDSR)	370.50	$M_3S_3$ (DDSR)	422.83
$M_1 + 100\% N$ (CFTPR)	237.00	$M_2 + 100\% N$ (CFTPR)	255.00	$M_3 + 100\% N$ (CFTPR)	247.50

<b>t Stat</b>	0.73	<b>t Stat</b>	4.79	<b>t Stat</b>	6.88
<b>P(0.05)</b>	0.54	<b>P(0.05)</b>	0.04	<b>P(0.05)</b>	0.02

**Table 2. Comparison of number of tillers m<sup>-2</sup> at flowering in M<sub>1</sub>S<sub>2</sub>, M<sub>2</sub>S<sub>4</sub> & M<sub>3</sub>S<sub>4</sub> with conventionally flooded transplanted system of M<sub>1</sub> +125% N, M<sub>2</sub> +125% N & M<sub>3</sub> + 125% N respectively**

Treatments	No. of tillers m <sup>-2</sup>	Treatments	No. of tillers m <sup>-2</sup>	Treatments	No. of tillers m <sup>-2</sup>
<b>M<sub>1</sub>S<sub>2</sub> (DDSR)</b>	254.00	<b>M<sub>2</sub>S<sub>4</sub> (DDSR)</b>	383.50	<b>M<sub>3</sub>S<sub>4</sub> (DDSR)</b>	420.33
<b>M<sub>1</sub> +125% N (CFTPR)</b>	248.00	<b>M<sub>2</sub> +125% N (CFTPR)</b>	270.00	<b>M<sub>3</sub> +125% N (CFTPR)</b>	262.50
<b>t Stat</b>	0.62	<b>t Stat</b>	4.60	<b>t Stat</b>	6.61
<b>P(0.05)</b>	0.60	<b>P(0.05)</b>	0.04	<b>P(0.05)</b>	0.02

### 3.2 Number of panicles m<sup>-2</sup>

The number of panicles m<sup>-2</sup> produced by transplanted rice of KNM-1638 (M<sub>1</sub>) was significantly higher than that produced under dry direct seeded condition (Table 3 & 4). Though the number of tillers was statistically comparable in direct seeding & transplanting (Table 1 & 2), number of panicles produced under transplanted condition increased significantly. This could be attributed to higher tiller mortality encountered at direct seeded condition; whereas, most of the tillers produced under transplanted condition were passed over to productive tillers.

Number of panicles produced in DDSR & CFTPR was comparable for both JGL-24423 (M<sub>2</sub>) & DRR Dhan-42 (M<sub>3</sub>) (Table 3 & 4). The significantly lower number of tillers produced under transplanted condition in these two varieties (Table 1 & 2) was compensated by the higher tiller mortality rate encountered in dry direct seeded condition. Due to the prevailing aerobic environment at the vegetative stage, number of tillers produced in dry direct seeded rice would be higher than that produced in flooded rice. However, almost half of the tillers would disappear at maturity stage in dry direct seeded rice [30 & 31] due to intraspecific competition among tillers [32 & 33]. Tiller mortality could also be attributed to the reduced availability of plant nutrients including micro nutrients in the non-flooded upland soils [34].

Comment [Mu22]: direct-seeded. Do to all

Comment [Mu23]: one word

M<sub>2</sub>S<sub>3</sub> & M<sub>2</sub>S<sub>4</sub> respectively recorded 42% & 41% reduction in productive tillers over the total number of tillers produced during flowering. Although the number of tillers produced under transplanted condition was lower, most of it became productive tillers (11% reduction only). Number of productive tillers is the major decisive factor for yield [35]. Hence the difference in tiller number was compensated and comparable yields were realised.

Similar is the case of DRR Dhan-42, there observed 34 & 33% reduction in productive tillers over the number of tillers produced under flowering stage in M<sub>3</sub>S<sub>3</sub> & M<sub>3</sub>S<sub>4</sub> respectively. There

was only a meagre reduction (7-8%) in panicle number under transplanted condition over the number of tillers produced during flowering.

Tiller mortality has nullified the supremacy of higher number of tillers produced under DDS condition. According to Soriano *et al.* [30], the higher number of tillers produced has got little contribution to final grain yield as the number of productive tillers did not differ significantly at maturity stage between the two establishment methods. Compared to JGL-24423, DRR Dhan-42 carried more number of tillers to the reproductive stage which shows its upper hand in dry direct seeded situations.

**Table 3. Comparison of number of panicles m<sup>-2</sup> in M<sub>1</sub>S<sub>1</sub>, M<sub>2</sub>S<sub>3</sub> & M<sub>3</sub>S<sub>3</sub> with conventionally flooded transplanted system of M<sub>1</sub> +100% N, M<sub>2</sub> +100% N & M<sub>3</sub> + 100% N respectively**

Treatments	No. of panicles m <sup>-2</sup>	Treatments	No. of panicles m <sup>-2</sup>	Treatments	No. of panicles m <sup>-2</sup>
M <sub>1</sub> S <sub>1</sub> (DDSR)	121.00	M <sub>2</sub> S <sub>3</sub> (DDSR)	216.50	M <sub>3</sub> S <sub>3</sub> (DDSR)	280.67
M <sub>1</sub> +100% N (CFTPR)	231.00	M <sub>2</sub> +100% N (CFTPR)	225.50	M <sub>3</sub> +100% N (CFTPR)	229.00
t Stat	-15.10	t Stat	-0.46	t Stat	2.70
P(0.05)	0.00	P(0.05)	0.69	P(0.05)	0.11

**Table 4. Comparison of number of panicles m<sup>-2</sup> in M<sub>1</sub>S<sub>2</sub>, M<sub>2</sub>S<sub>4</sub> & M<sub>3</sub>S<sub>4</sub> with conventionally flooded transplanted system of M<sub>1</sub> +125% N, M<sub>2</sub> +125% N & M<sub>3</sub> + 125% N respectively**

Treatments	No. of panicles m <sup>-2</sup>	Treatments	No. of panicles m <sup>-2</sup>	Treatments	No. of panicles m <sup>-2</sup>
M <sub>1</sub> S <sub>2</sub> (DDSR)	138.33	M <sub>2</sub> S <sub>4</sub> (DDSR)	225.17	M <sub>3</sub> S <sub>4</sub> (DDSR)	283.00
M <sub>1</sub> +125% N (CFTPR)	243.50	M <sub>2</sub> +125% N (CFTPR)	239.50	M <sub>3</sub> +125% N (CFTPR)	246.00
t Stat	-11.47	t Stat	-0.49	t Stat	3.21
P(0.05)	0.01	P(0.05)	0.76	P(0.05)	0.09

### 3.3 Test weight

Test weight was not affected by establishment methods. There observed no significant difference in test weight between direct seeded and transplanted rice in any of the

varieties (Table 5 & 6). Test weight of a variety do not vary with system of cultivation as it is a genetically controlled attribute which is in line with the observations of Prathiksha *et al.* [36] and Mali *et al.* [37].

**Table 5. Comparison of test weight (g) in  $M_1S_1$ ,  $M_2S_3$  &  $M_3S_3$  with conventionally flooded transplanted system of  $M_1 + 100\% N$ ,  $M_2 + 100\% N$  &  $M_3 + 100\% N$  respectively**

Treatments	Test weight	Treatments	Test weight	Treatments	Test weight
$M_1S_1$ (DDSR)	15.73	$M_2S_3$ (DDSR)	23.21	$M_3S_3$ (DDSR)	23.57
$M_1 + 100\% N$ (CFTPR)	15.61	$M_2 + 100\% N$ (CFTPR)	23.15	$M_3 + 100\% N$ (CFTPR)	23.40
<b>t Stat</b>	0.46	<b>t Stat</b>	0.02	<b>t Stat</b>	0.51
<b>P(0.05)</b>	0.69	<b>P(0.05)</b>	0.98	<b>P(0.05)</b>	0.66

**Table 6. Comparison of test weight (g) in  $M_1S_2$ ,  $M_2S_4$  &  $M_3S_4$  with conventionally flooded transplanted system of  $M_1 + 125\% N$ ,  $M_2 + 125\% N$  &  $M_3 + 125\% N$  respectively**

Treatments	Test weight	Treatments	Test weight	Treatments	Test weight
$M_1S_2$ (DDSR)	15.89	$M_2S_4$ (DDSR)	24.11	$M_3S_4$ (DDSR)	22.98
$M_1 + 125\% N$ (CFTPR)	15.72	$M_2 + 125\% N$ (CFTPR)	23.16	$M_3 + 125\% N$ (CFTPR)	23.32
<b>t Stat</b>	1.00	<b>t Stat</b>	2.46	<b>t Stat</b>	-3.01
<b>P(0.05)</b>	0.42	<b>P(0.05)</b>	0.13	<b>P(0.05)</b>	0.10

### 3.4 Number of filled grains per panicle

KNM-1638 ( $M_1$ ) recorded a significant difference in number of filled grains per panicle between direct seeded and transplanted rice. A significantly higher number of filled grains was reported in  $M_1 + 100\% N$  and  $M_1 + 125\% N$  in transplanted condition over their direct seeded counterpart (Table 7 & 8).

For JGL-24423 ( $M_2$ ), at 100% N, there was no significant difference in filled grains between DDSR & CFTPR (Table 7). But, at 125% N transplanted rice of JGL-24423 recorded a significantly higher number of filled grains (131.50) than direct seeded rice (121) (Table 8). There observed no significant difference in filled grains between direct seeded and transplanted rice for DRR Dhan-42 ( $M_3$ ) (Table 7 & 8). A slightly higher number was

observed in direct seeded rice though statistically non-significant. Kumar *et al.* [38] showed that the number of grains per panicle was higher in DSR compared to transplanted rice.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

**Table 7. Comparison of number of filled grains per panicle in M<sub>1</sub>S<sub>1</sub>, M<sub>2</sub>S<sub>3</sub> & M<sub>3</sub>S<sub>3</sub> with conventionally flooded transplanted system of M<sub>1</sub> +100% N, M<sub>2</sub> +100% N & M<sub>3</sub> + 100% N respectively**

Treatments	No. of filled grains	Treatments	No. of filled grains	Treatments	No. of filled grains
M <sub>1</sub> S <sub>1</sub> (DDSR)	107.33	M <sub>2</sub> S <sub>3</sub> (DDSR)	121.50	M <sub>3</sub> S <sub>3</sub> (DDSR)	123.67
M <sub>1</sub> +100% N (CFTPR)	139.00	M <sub>2</sub> +100% N (CFTPR)	126.50	M <sub>3</sub> +100% N (CFTPR)	116.00
t Stat	-14.36	t Stat	-3.46	t Stat	2.20
P(0.05)	0.00	P(0.05)	0.07	P(0.05)	0.16

**Table 8. Comparison of number of filled grains per panicle in M<sub>1</sub>S<sub>2</sub>, M<sub>2</sub>S<sub>4</sub> & M<sub>3</sub>S<sub>4</sub> with conventionally flooded transplanted system of M<sub>1</sub> +125% N, M<sub>2</sub> +125% N & M<sub>3</sub> + 125% N respectively**

Treatments	No. of filled grains	Treatments	No. of filled grains	Treatments	No. of filled grains
M <sub>1</sub> S <sub>2</sub> (DDSR)	106.67	M <sub>2</sub> S <sub>4</sub> (DDSR)	121.00	M <sub>3</sub> S <sub>4</sub> (DDSR)	123.67
M <sub>1</sub> +125% N (CFTPR)	140.00	M <sub>2</sub> +125% N (CFTPR)	131.50	M <sub>3</sub> +125% N (CFTPR)	121.00
t Stat	-35.92	t Stat	-5.20	t Stat	2.00
P(0.05)	0.00	P(0.05)	0.04	P(0.05)	0.18

### 3.5 Number of unfilled grains per panicle

Transplanted rice of KNM-1638 (M<sub>1</sub>) recorded a significantly lower number of unfilled grains per panicle over dry direct seeded rice both under 100 & 125% N (Table 9 & 10). There observed no significant difference in unfilled grains between direct seeded (20.50) and transplanted rice (19.00) in JGL-24423 (M<sub>2</sub>) at 100% N (Table 9). However, at 125% N, transplanted rice recorded a significantly lower number of unfilled grains (14.50) than dry direct seeded rice (23.17) (Table 10). A significantly higher number of unfilled grains per panicle was observed in M<sub>3</sub> + 100% N (26.00) in transplanted condition over M<sub>3</sub>S<sub>3</sub> (17.17) in direct seeded condition (Table 9). At 125% N also DRR Dhan-42 (M<sub>3</sub>) recorded a significantly lower number of unfilled grains under direct seeded condition (19.00) than transplanted condition (24.00) (Table 10). In DRR Dhan-42, higher number of spikelets might have been produced in transplanted condition due to lower number of panicles (Table 3 & 4) as the panicle number m<sup>-2</sup> and the spikelet number per panicle showed a compensatory

relationship [27 &39]. But due to poor vegetative growth under transplanted condition as observable from the significantly lower number of tillers (Table 1 & 2), higher proportion of the spikelets produced became chaffy. Sink activity superseded the source activity from the mid to late grain filling stages indicating transfer of assimilates from the vegetative organs to grains [40]. Reduced source intensity impacts plants' source-sink relationship, which lowers yield [41].

**Table 9. Comparison of number of unfilled grains per panicle in  $M_1S_1$ ,  $M_2S_3$  &  $M_3S_3$  with conventionally flooded transplanted system of  $M_1 +100\% N$ ,  $M_2 +100\% N$  &  $M_3 + 100\% N$  respectively**

Treatments	No. of unfilled grains	Treatments	No. of unfilled grains	Treatments	No. of unfilled grains
$M_1S_1$ (DDSR)	37.83	$M_2S_3$ (DDSR)	20.50	$M_3S_3$ (DDSR)	17.17
$M_1 +100\% N$ (CFTPR)	26.50	$M_2 +100\% N$ (CFTPR)	19.00	$M_3 +100\% N$ (CFTPR)	26.00
t Stat	9.71	t Stat	1.30	t Stat	-6.08
<i>P</i> (0.05)	0.01	<i>P</i> (0.05)	0.32	<i>P</i> (0.05)	0.03

**Table 10. Comparison of number of unfilled grains per panicle in  $M_1S_2$ ,  $M_2S_4$  &  $M_3S_4$  with conventionally flooded transplanted system of  $M_1 +125\% N$ ,  $M_2 +125\% N$  &  $M_3 + 125\% N$  respectively**

Treatments	No. of unfilled grains	Treatments	No. of unfilled grains	Treatments	No. of unfilled grains
$M_1S_2$ (DDSR)	38.00	$M_2S_4$ (DDSR)	23.17	$M_3S_4$ (DDSR)	19.00
$M_1 +125\% N$ (CFTPR)	23.00	$M_2 +125\% N$ (CFTPR)	14.50	$M_3 +125\% N$ (CFTPR)	24.00
t Stat	11.92	t Stat	4.67	t Stat	-5.77
<i>P</i> (0.05)	0.01	<i>P</i> (0.05)	0.04	<i>P</i> (0.05)	0.03

### 3.6 Grain yield

Significantly higher grain yield was recorded under transplanted condition for KNM-1638 ( $M_1$ ) at 100 (Table 11) & 125% N (Table 12). The higher grain yield could be attributed to significantly higher number of filled grains per panicle & panicles  $m^{-2}$  along with significantly lower number of unfilled grains per panicle as observed earlier. Uneven or poor crop establishment [42], higher spikelet sterility [43 & 44] and severe weed infestation [45, 46, 47] are considered to be the yield curtailing forces in dry direct seeded condition.

In the case of JGL-24423 ( $M_2$ ) at 100% N, there observed no difference of statistical significance in grain yield; although CFTPR recorded higher magnitude for grain yield (Table 11). Whereas, at 125% N, significantly higher grain yield was recorded under transplanted condition (5388 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) than under direct seeded condition (4892 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) (Table 12). This is due to significantly higher number of filled grains and significantly lower number of unfilled grains. The performance of JGL-24423 is better under transplanted condition; nonetheless, it is satisfactory under direct seeded condition as well.

There observed no significant difference in grain yield between DDSR & CFTPR in DRR Dhan-42 ( $M_3$ ) although the magnitudes were little higher under DDSR (Table 11 & 12). DRR Dhan-42 can be successfully grown under both direct seeded and transplanted condition. Moreover, its drought tolerant nature makes it ideal for cultivation under dry direct seeded condition. Slightly lower grain yield under transplanted condition could be seen as a consequence of higher number of unfilled grains per panicle. Comparable yield in direct seeded and transplanted rice was observed by Kaur & Singh [48], Farooq *et al.* [28] and Bhushan *et al.* [43].

**Table 11. Comparison of grain yield (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) in  $M_1S_1$ ,  $M_2S_3$  &  $M_3S_3$  with conventionally flooded transplanted system of  $M_1 + 100\% N$ ,  $M_2 + 100\% N$  &  $M_3 + 100\% N$  respectively**

Treatments	Grain yield	Treatments	Grain yield	Treatments	Grain yield
$M_1S_1$ (DDSR)	3334	$M_2S_3$ (DDSR)	4977	$M_3S_3$ (DDSR)	5937
$M_1 + 100\% N$ (CFTPR)	4521	$M_2 + 100\% N$ (CFTPR)	5246	$M_3 + 100\% N$ (CFTPR)	5279
t Stat	-11.54	t Stat	-2.06	t Stat	1.75
P(0.05)	0.01	P(0.05)	0.18	P(0.05)	0.22

**Table 12. Comparison of grain yield (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) in  $M_1S_2$ ,  $M_2S_4$  &  $M_3S_4$  with conventionally flooded transplanted system of  $M_1 + 125\% N$ ,  $M_2 + 125\% N$  &  $M_3 + 125\% N$  respectively**

Treatments	Grain yield	Treatments	Grain yield	Treatments	Grain yield
$M_1S_2$ (DDSR)	3304	$M_2S_4$ (DDSR)	4892	$M_3S_4$ (DDSR)	
$M_1 + 125\% N$ (CFTPR)	4678	$M_2 + 125\% N$ (CFTPR)	5388	$M_3 + 125\% N$ (CFTPR)	5491
t Stat	-9.99	t Stat	-13.51	t Stat	3.47
P(0.05)	0.01	P(0.05)	0.01	P(0.05)	0.07

### 3.7 Straw yield

Significantly higher straw yield was recorded under transplanted condition than under direct seeded condition in KNM-1638 (Table 13 & 14). This could be due to higher tiller mortality under direct seeded condition. Higher source strength as realised from higher straw yield under transplanted condition has contributed to higher grain yield in KNM-1638. There was no significant difference in straw yield between direct seeded and transplanted rice in case of JGL-24423 & DRR Dhan-42 at both 100 (Table 13) & 125% N (Table 14).

**Table 13. Comparison of straw yield (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) in M<sub>1</sub>S<sub>1</sub>, M<sub>2</sub>S<sub>3</sub> & M<sub>3</sub>S<sub>3</sub> with conventionally flooded transplanted system of M<sub>1</sub> +100% N, M<sub>2</sub> +100% N & M<sub>3</sub> + 100% N respectively**

Treatments	Straw yield	Treatments	Straw yield	Treatments	Straw yield
M <sub>1</sub> S <sub>1</sub> (DDSR)	4019.81	M <sub>2</sub> S <sub>3</sub> (DDSR)	6362.64	M <sub>3</sub> S <sub>3</sub> (DDSR)	7703.35
M <sub>1</sub> +100% N (CFTPR)	4893.29	M <sub>2</sub> +100% N (CFTPR)	6482.71	M <sub>3</sub> +100% N (CFTPR)	7356.84
t Stat	-12.88	t Stat	-0.71	t Stat	1.78
P(0.05)	0.01	P(0.05)	0.55	P(0.05)	0.22

**Table 14. Comparison of straw yield (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) in M<sub>1</sub>S<sub>2</sub>, M<sub>2</sub>S<sub>4</sub> & M<sub>3</sub>S<sub>4</sub> with conventionally flooded transplanted system of M<sub>1</sub> +125% N, M<sub>2</sub> +125% N & M<sub>3</sub> + 125% N respectively**

Treatments	Straw yield	Treatments	Straw yield	Treatments	Straw yield
M <sub>1</sub> S <sub>2</sub> (DDSR)	4106.09	M <sub>2</sub> S <sub>4</sub> (DDSR)	6419.99	M <sub>3</sub> S <sub>4</sub> (DDSR)	7589.62
M <sub>1</sub> +125% N (CFTPR)	5003.05	M <sub>2</sub> +125% N (CFTPR)	6688.65	M <sub>3</sub> +125% N (CFTPR)	7426.00
t Stat	-8.58	t Stat	-2.38	t Stat	0.74
P(0.05)	0.01	P(0.05)	0.14	P(0.05)	0.54

### 3.8 Irrigation water applied

The amount of irrigation water applied in flood irrigated transplanted condition averages to 1194.95 mm (Fig. 1). Mean irrigation water applied in M<sub>1</sub> at 1.0 Epan (M<sub>1</sub>S<sub>1</sub> & M<sub>1</sub>S<sub>2</sub>) was 379.03 mm which is 3 times lower than the amount of water applied under transplanted condition. Mean irrigation water applied in M<sub>2</sub> at 1.5 Epan (M<sub>2</sub>S<sub>3</sub> & M<sub>2</sub>S<sub>4</sub>) was 509.18 mm which is 2 times lower than water input in flood irrigated transplanted condition. On an average, 499.73 mm irrigation water was applied in M<sub>3</sub> at 1.5 Epan (M<sub>3</sub>S<sub>3</sub> & M<sub>3</sub>S<sub>4</sub>) which is 2 times lower than water applied in transplanted condition. Irrigation water saving under drip irrigated direct seeded rice ranges from 57% (1.5 Epan) to 68% (1.0 Epan). Bouman and

Tuong [21]&Parthasarathiet al [49] reported a water saving of 50-60% & 50% respectively under dry direct seeding over transplanted rice. 685-815 mm additional water was utilized in flooded transplanted rice with comparable yield to that of drip irrigated direct seeded rice. The increased irrigation water needed for puddling and to compensate for natural field losses such as seepage and deep percolation is the reason for the higher water use in flooded transplanted fields [30 & 50]. DDSR had more irrigation events than TPR during both rice seasons, but its average water input was lower[27]. Reason could be saving of large amount of water by way of excluding puddling operations [48].




Fig. 1. Irrigation water applied (mm) in dry direct seeded rice & conventionally flooded transplanted rice

#### 4. Conclusion

The 3 varieties tested responded differently under direct seeded and transplanted conditions. KNM-1638 recorded significantly higher yield under transplanted condition than under dry direct seeded condition especially due to higher number of panicles  $m^{-2}$ , filled grains per panicle & lower number of unfilled grains per panicle in the former. KNM-1638 is a variety suitable for transplanted condition. For the variety JGL-24423, at 100% N, there was no significant difference in grain yield between DSSR & CFTPR. However, at 125% N, CFTPR recorded superior yield to that of DDSR. JGL-24423 is more inclined to transplanted condition for growth and yield but performs satisfactorily under dry direct seeded situation as well. For economizing irrigation water and N application dry direct seeded crop of JGL-24423 with 100% N can be recommended. DRR Dhan-42 performs ideally under dry direct seeded condition securing comparable yields to that of TPR. Water input in drip irrigated dry direct seeded rice is 2-3 times lower than conventionally flooded transplanted rice with 57-68% saving of irrigation water, which makes it future of irrigated agriculture. Hence without yield penalty, DRR Dhan-42 and JGL-24423 can be cultivated under dry direct seeded system with 100% N.

## REFERENCES

1. GOI [Government of India]. Agricultural Statistics at a Glance-2022. Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare, New Delhi; 2023.
2. Government of Telangana, Telangana State Statistical Abstract. Telangana State Development Planning Society (TSDPS), Planning Department; 2021.
3. Joshi R, Mani SC, Shukla A, Pant RC. Aerobic rice: water use sustainability. *Oryza*.2009; 46(1):1-5.
4. Ercin AE, Hoekstra AY. Water footprint scenarios for 2050: A Global Analysis. *Enviro Int*.2014; 64:71–82.
5. Wang YB, Wu PT, Zhao XN, Li JL. Development tendency of agricultural water structure in china. *Chin J Eco-Agric*.2010; 18:399–404.
6. Ghosh A, Singh ON, RaoKS. Improving irrigation management in dry season rice cultivation for optimum crop and water productivity in non traditional rice ecologies. *Irrig. Drainage*.2010; 60(2):174-178.
7. Marasini S, Joshi TN, Amgain LP. Direct seeded rice cultivation method: a new technology for climate change and food security. *J. Agric. Environ*. 2016; 17:30-38.
8. Mahajan G, Chauhan BS, Timsina J, Singh PP, Singh K. Crop performance and water- and nitrogen-use efficiencies in dry-seeded rice in response to irrigation and fertilizer levels in North West India. *Field Crops Res*.2012; 134:59–70.
9. Tyagi R, Kathpalia J, Chander S. Comparative analysis between direct seeded rice and conventional transplanted rice method. *Pharma Innovation J*.2020; 9(6): 236-238.
10. Sharda R, Mahajan G, Siag M, Singh A, Chauhan BS. Performance of drip-irrigated dry-seeded rice (*Oryzasativa* L.) in South Asia. *Paddy Water Environ*.2017; 15:93–100.
11. Yang C, Yang L, Yang Y, Ouyang Z. Rice root growth and nutrient uptake as influenced by organic manure in continuously and alternately flooded paddy soils. *Agric. Water Manage*.2004; 70:67-81.
12. Hemlata, Joshi J, Meena SL, Rathore AL, Tandon, A, Sonit, A. Effect of crop establishment and irrigation methods on summer rice (*Oryzasativa*). *Indian J Agron*.2018; 63(2): 168-173.
13. Anusha S, Nagaraju. Performance of rice genotypes under drip irrigation in comparison with aerobic and puddled transplanted condition. *Mysore J. Agric. Sci*. 2015; 49(2): 193-197.
14. Liu H, Hussain S, Zheng M, Peng S, Huang J, Cui, K, Nie, L. Dry direct-seeded rice as an alternative to transplanted-flooded rice in Central China. *Agron. Sustain. Dev*.2015; 35: 285–294. DOI 10.1007/s13593-014-0239-0.
15. Maniraj N, Revathi P, Devi SKB, Shaker CK. Growth and yield attributes of rice as influenced by systems of cultivation in different varieties. *Biol Forum Int J*. 2022.14(2): 1541-1545.

16. Kannan VS, Ravikumar V. Development of crop geometry for drip irrigated rice cultivation. *Int J Environ Climate Change*. 2021; 11(4):97-105.
17. Deokaran, Singh M, Parvez A, Mishra JS, Bhatt BP. Direct seeded rice: an option for enhancing the productivity, resource use efficiency and minimizing the production cost of the rice. *J AgricSearch*. 2018; 5(3):159-162.
18. Bouman BAM, Yang XG, Wang HQ, Wang ZM, Zhao JF, Chen B. Performance of aerobic rice cultivars under irrigated conditions in North China. *Field Crops Res*. 2006; 97: 53–65. doi:10.1016/j.fcr.2005.08.015.
19. Peng S, Bouman BAM, Visperas RM, Castañeda A, Nie L, Park HK. Comparison between aerobic and flooded rice in the tropics: agronomic performance in an eight-season experiment. *Field Crops Res*. 2006; 96:252–259. doi:10.1016/j.fcr.2005.07.007.
20. Rajwade YA, Swain, DK, Tiwari, KN, Bhadoria, PBS. Grain yield, water productivity, and soil nitrogen dynamics in drip irrigated rice under varying nitrogen rates. *Agron J*. 2018; 110(3):868-878.
21. Bouman BAM, Tuong TP. Field water management to save water and increase its productivity in irrigated rice. *Agric Water Manag*. 2001; 49:11-30.
22. Jayanthi T, Basavaraja PK, Nagaraju RC, Gowda BC, Mallesh, Prakash NB. Nutrient use efficiency as influenced by fertigation of water soluble fertilizers in aerobic rice. *Pharma Innovation J*. 2023; 12(2):1175-1183.
23. Dey S, Ram KAK, Chhabra A, Reddy L, Janghel DK. Aerobic rice: smart technology of rice cultivation. *Int. J. of Curr. Microbiol. Applied Sci*. 2018; 7(8):1799-1804.
24. McCauley GN. Sprinkler vs. flooded irrigation in traditional rice production regions of southeast Texas. *Agron. J*. 1990; 82: 677–68.
25. Choudhary K. Effect of irrigation scheduling on growth, yield and quality of direct seeded basmati rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) varieties. MSc Thesis, Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences & Technology of Jammu. 2016; 117p.
26. Flessa H, Fischer WR. Plant-induced changes in the redox potentials of rice rhizospheres. *Plant Soil*. 1992; 143(1):55–60. doi:10.1007/BF00009128.
27. Ishfaq M, Akbar N, Anjum SA, Anwar-Ul-haq M. Growth, yield and water productivity of dry direct seeded rice and transplanted aromatic rice under different irrigation management regimes. *J. of Integrative Agric*. 2020; 19(11):2656–2673.
28. Farooq M, Kadambot S M, Rehman H, Aziz T, Lee D, Wahid A. Rice direct seeding: Experiences, challenges and opportunities. *Soil and Tillage Res*. 2011; 111: 87–98.
29. Anwar M P, Juraimi A S, Puteh A, Selamat A, Man A, Hakim M A. Seeding method and rate influence on weed suppression in aerobic rice. *Afric. J. of Biotechnol*. 2011; 10: 15259–15271.
30. Soriano JB, Wani SP, Rao AN, Gajanan L, Sawargaonkar, Gowda JAC. Comparative evaluation of direct dry-seeded and transplanted rice in the dry zone of Karnataka, India. *Philippine J. of Sci*. 2018; 147(1):165-174.

31. Lampayan RM, Bouman BAM, De Dios JL, Espiritu AJ, Soriano JB, Lactaen AT, Faronilo JE, Thant KM. Yield of aerobic rice in rainfed lowlands of the Philippines as affected by nitrogen management and row spacing. *Field Crops Res.*2010; 116:165-174.
32. Hasanuzzaman M, Nahar K, Roy TS, Rahman ML, Hossain MZ, Ahmed JU. Tiller dynamics and dry matter production of transplanted rice as affected by plant spacing and number of seedling per hill. *Acad. J. of Plant Sci.* 2009; 2:162–168.
33. Hemlata, Kumar J, Sonit A, SinhaJ, Tandon A. Comparative studies on different methods of summer rice crop establishment under drip irrigation in relation to water use, growth and yield. *J. Soil and Water Cons.* 2017; 16(4):386-392.
34. Sahrawat KL. Soil fertility in flooded and nonflooded irrigated rice systems. *Archives Agron. Soil Sci.* 2012; 58:423-436.
35. KoutroubasS, Ntanos D. Genotypic differences for grain yield and nitrogen utilization in Indica and Japonica rice under Mediterranean conditions. *Field Crop.Res.*2003; 83:251–260.
36. Prathiksha GJ, Reddy MM, Rao MP, Shaker CK, Padmaja B. Energy consumption, economics, yield and quality of rice (*Oryzasativa*) in different crop establishment methods. *Oryza.*2017; 54(1): 37-43.
37. Mali M, Kumar M, Salam PK, Sharma GK, Saxena RR. Evaluation of different establishment methods for enhancing productivity and profitability of rice under puddle condition. *Int J CurrMicrobiol Applied Sci.*2018; 7(8):3340-3345.
38. Kumar A, Kumar S, Dahiya K, KumarS, Kumar M. Productivity and economics of direct seeded rice (*Oryzasativa* L.). *J Applied Nat Sci.*2015; 7(1): 410–416.
39. Xu L, Li X, Wang X, Xiong D, Wang F. Comparing the grain yields of direct-seeded and transplanted rice: a meta-analysis. *Agron.*2019; 9(767): doi:10.3390/agronomy9110767.
40. Wang X, Zhang X, Liu L, Liu X, Feng G, Wang J, YinY, Wei C. Post anthesis supplementary irrigation improves grain yield and nutritional quality of drip irrigated rice (*Oryzasativa* L.). *Front Plant Sci.*2023; 14:1126278. doi: 10.3389/fpls.2023.1126278.
41. Peleg Z, Reguera M, Tumimbang E, Walia H, Blumwald E. Cytokinin-mediated source/sink modifications improve drought tolerance and increase grain yield in rice under water-stress. *Plant Biotechnol J.* 2011; 9:747–758. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-7652.2010.00584.x
42. Rickman JF, Pyseth M, BunnaS, Sinath P. Direct seeding of rice in Cambodia. In “Proceedings of an International Workshop”, 30 October-2 November 2001. ACIAR Proceedings No. 101, Vientiane, Laos. 2001.
43. Bhushan L, Ladha JK, Gupta RK, Singh S, Tirol-Padre A, Saharawat Y, Gathala M, Pathak H. Saving of water and labor in a rice–wheat system with no-tillage and direct seeding technologies. *Agron. J.* 2007; 99, 1288–1296.
44. Choudhury BU, Bouman BAM, Singh AK. Yield and water productivity of rice-wheat on raised beds at New Delhi. India. *Field Crops Res.* 2007; 100:229-239.
45. Johnson DE, MortimerAM. Issues for integrated weed management and decision support in direct-seeded rice. In “Rice Is Life: Scientific Perspectives for the 21st Century” (K.

Toriyama, K.L. Heong, and B. Hardy, Eds.), p. 211-214. International Rice Research Institute, Los Baños, Philippines and Japan International Research Center for Agricultural Sciences, Tsukuba, Japan.2005.

46. Kumar V, Bellinder RR, Gupta RK, Malik RK, BrainerD DC. Role of herbicideresistant rice in promoting resource conservation technologies in rice-wheat cropping systems of India: A review. *Crop Prot.*2008; 27:290-301.

47. Rao AN, Johnson DE, Sivaprasad B, Ladha JK, Mortimer AM. Weed management in direct-seeded rice. *Adv. Agron.* 2007; 93:153-255.

48. Kaur, J, Singh, A. Direct seeded rice: prospects, problems, constraints and researchable issues India. *Curr.Agric Res.* 2017; 5(1):13-32. [http:// dx.doi.org/10.12944/CARJ.5.1.03](http://dx.doi.org/10.12944/CARJ.5.1.03).

49. Parthasarathi T, Vanitha K, Lakshamanakumar P, Kalaiyarasi D. Aerobic rice-mitigating water stress for the future climate change. *Int J Agron Plant Prod.*2012; 3(7):241–254.

50. Cabangon RJ, Tuong TP, Castillo EG, Bao LX, Lu G, Wang GH.et al., Effect of irrigation method and N-fertilizer management on rice yield, water productivity and nutrient-use efficiencies in typical lowland rice conditions in China. *Paddy Water Environ.* 2004; 2:195-206.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

UNDER PEER REVIEW

