

Impact of field water tube based irrigation and split application of nutrients on yield and water productivity (*Oryza sativa* L.)

Abstract

A field experiment was conducted at Department of Agronomy, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore during *Navarai* season (December - April) of 2021-22 to study the influence of field water tube and split nutrient application on yield and water productivity in transplanted rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). The field experiment was laid out in randomized complete block design having seven treatments and replicated thrice. The treatment details viz., T₁ – Control (conventional planting 100% RDF), T₂ – Alternate wetting and drying + LCC based nitrogen management, T₃ – Alternate wetting and drying with automated field water tube + 100% RDF, T₄ – Irrigation through field water tube + 100% N & K application in 7 days intervals, T₅ – Irrigation through field water tube + 100% N & K application in 10 days intervals, T₆ – Irrigation through field water tube + 75% N & K application in 7 days intervals, T₇ – Irrigation through field water tube + 75% N & K application in 10 days intervals. Experimental results showed that significantly more yield was recorded in T₅ which was on par with all other treatments except conventional method. Among the irrigation treatments T₅ recorded a higher grain yield of 6587 kg ha⁻¹ and which was on par with T₆ (6307 kg ha⁻¹). Hence, this study revealed that the Irrigation through field water tube with 75% N & K application in 7 days intervals confer 34.7 % water saving and better results in yield attributes in transplanted low land rice.

Keywords: Rice, Alternate wetting and drying, Field water tube, water productivity, yield attributes, yield

1. Introduction

Water is the single most vital component of sustainable rice production, especially in the traditional rice growing area. In recent years, changes in environmental conditions imposed multiple abiotic stresses that severely affected rice production in all ecosystems by strongly inhibiting plant growth and development (Joshi *et al.* 2020). According to Joshi *et al.* 2009; Caine *et al.* 2019, to produce 1 kg of rice, 2000–5000 L of water are required. Therefore, the need for “more rice with less water” is the need of the hour for global food security (Maneepitak *et al.*

2019; He *et al.* 2020). Thus, water availability is the key requirement for rice cultivation in each of the rice ecosystems. This forces us to develop new techniques of water management for rice cultivation that specifically improve production in different ecosystems (Carracelas *et al.* 2019).

Already there are different techniques in rice to reduce the water requirement including other production factors. However, the monitoring and regulation are very difficult to control timing and the quantity of water and it is also not really match with the actual time of water requirement.

Alternate wetting and drying is a water-conserving technology for irrigated rice cultivation that has the prospective to contribute to more efficient and sustainable water and energy use. This AWD gadget is a single instrument that measures water levels in rice fields to determine irrigation scheduling. It entails putting a perforated pipe (ideally PVC) in a rice field to monitor the water level. In one segment, a 15 cm diameter, 40 cm long pipe is installed at 10 cm above and 30 cm just below ground surface. Using AWD, farmers can save 15 to 30% of their water source.

In the case of AWD system, irrigation under various establishment methods and even under SRI system the irrigation adopted only provisionally and not suits with actual time of crop requirement or not a demand based approach. Its efficiency and suitability have to be assessed for effective irrigation and an easy tool to the farmers to regulate the irrigation as per demand driven approach. Split applications of nutrients are playing the major role in different growth stages of rice and avoid the nutrient losses, so the treatments contain 7 days and 10 days intervals with 75% and 100% RDF. Hence, the current study planned with the following treatments to evaluate the field under alternate wetting and drying with water tube in transplanted low land rice condition.

2. Materials and Methods

A field experiment was carried out during *Navarai* season (December - April) of 2021-22 at Wetland farm field No.M₃ of Department of Agronomy, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore which is located at the latitude of 11⁰ 0' N with longitude of 77⁰ 92' E and an altitude of 426.7 m above mean sea level. The soil of the experimental field is clay loam in texture and the soil classified taxonomically as Typic *Haplustalf* with pH and EC value of 8.70 and 0.31 dSm⁻¹, respectively. Soil was low in available nitrogen content (252 kg ha⁻¹) and medium in available phosphorus (11.5 kg ha⁻¹) and high in available potassium (751 kg ha⁻¹) along with 0.80 % of organic carbon content.

The research plot was laid out in randomized block design having seven treatments with three replications. The treatment details viz., T₁ – Control (conventional planting 100% RDF), T₂ – Alternate wetting and drying + LCC based nitrogen management, T₃ – Alternate wetting and drying with automated field water tube + 100% RDF, T₄ – Irrigation through field water tube + 100% N & K application in 7 days intervals, T₅ – Irrigation through field water tube + 100% N & K application in 10 days intervals, T₆ – Irrigation through field water tube + 75% N & K application in 7 days intervals, T₇ – Irrigation through field water tube + 75% N & K application in 10 days intervals.

Rice variety 'CO51' was used for the experiment. Transplanting was done in both conventional (20 cm x 15 cm) and SRI (25 cm x 25 cm) methods as per treatments. The recommended dose of fertilizer (150 kg N ha⁻¹, 50 kg P₂O₅ ha⁻¹ and 50 kg K₂O ha⁻¹) was applied as basal and top dress as per treatment schedule. Observations were taken from five plants randomly selected from each net plot at different growth stages like active tillering, panicle initiation, flowering and maturity. Harvesting was done at the maturity stage and yield parameters were calculated. The yield and yield attributes such as productive tillers m⁻², 1000 grain weight (g), filled grains (%), panicle length (cm), panicle weight (g), number of filled grains panicle⁻¹, grain yield (kg ha⁻¹), straw yield (kg ha⁻¹) and harvest index were calculated at the time of harvest stage of rice. Water productivity such as number of irrigation, total irrigation water (mm), Water savings (%), and Field water use efficiency (WUE) was computed using the equation of Viets (1962).

$$\text{WUE} = Y/W \text{ (kg ha}^{-1} \text{ mm}^{-1}\text{)}$$

Where,

Y = Grain yield (kg ha⁻¹)

W = Total water used (I + Re) to produce the yield (mm)

I = Irrigation water applied (mm)

Re=Effective rainfall (mm)

Field water tube

The tube is made of 40-cm or more length plastic pipe or bamboo, and have a diameter of 15 cm or more so that the water table is easily visible. The tube is to be perforated with holes on all

sides. The tube is to be placed inside in the soil so that 15cm protrudes above the soil surface. Care is to be taken in such a way that the tube should penetrate through the bottom of the plough pan. The soil is to be removed the inside the tube so that the bottom of the tube is visible. The water table inside the tube is to be checked for the same level as that of outside the tube. The tube can be placed in a flat part of the field close to a bund at least 1m away, so it is easy to monitor the ponded water depth. After irrigation, the level of the water in the tube can be seen going down every day. The water depth from the top of the tube to the level of water inside the field water tube measured using a ruler. 15 cm is to be subtracted from the reading to obtain the depth of water level. A negative values means the water is standing on the field; positive value means water level is below the surface. After transplanting initially Irrigation were given up to active tillering stage as usual continues flooding (1-35 DAS) and irrigation through field water tube was followed active tillering to flowering stage (36 – 80 DAS) based on the treatment intervals. The irrigation water was measured by water meter.

3.Result and Discussion

3.1. Water Productivity of Rice

The water use and water use efficiency were presented in Table 1. Results shows that the number of irrigation was recorded to be the highest (27) under the treatment T₁ conventional planting with 100 % recommended dose of fertilizers followed by treatment T₂ (Alternate wetting and drying with LCC based nitrogen management), T₃ (Alternate wetting and drying with automated field water tube with 100 % recommended dose of fertilizers), T₄ (Irrigation through field water tube with 100% N & K application in 7 days intervals) and T₆ (Irrigation through field water tube with 75% N & K application in 7 days intervals) which were provided with 19 irrigations. The lowest number of irrigations (18) was recorded under irrigation through field water tube with 100% N & K application in 10 days intervals (T₅) and Irrigation through field water tube with 75% N & K application in 10 days intervals (T₇). The results are in conformity with the findings of Faruki *et al.* 2011 and Rahman and Bulbul 2014. Reduction in the number of irrigations under alternate wetting and drying was due to the irrigation intervals. The number of days taken for depleting 7, 10 for 20 cm below the ground level is more when compared to treatment T₁ (conventional planting with 100 % recommended dose of fertilizers) and T₂ (SRI with alternate wetting and drying with LCC based nitrogen management). Among the different treatments alternate wetting and drying depletion levels irrigation after 20 cm depletion, increased the intervals between one irrigation to another.

The total irrigation water consumed was the highest 1203 mm under treatment T₁ (conventional planting with 100 % recommended dose of fertilizers) followed by T₂ – Alternate wetting and drying with LCC based nitrogen management. A considerable decline in total irrigation water was observed with the minimum of (785 mm) under irrigation through field water tube with 75% N & K application in 7 days intervals (T₆). The reduction in total irrigation water was due to widening interval between irrigations. The results are in concord with the findings of Oliver *et al.* 2008, AbdulLatif 2011 and Rahman and Bulbul 2014.

Significantly higher water use efficiency 8.0 kgha⁻¹mm⁻¹ was registered under irrigation through field water tube with 75% N & K application in 7 days intervals (T₆) which was on par with treatments T₅ (Irrigation through field water tube with 100% N & K application in 10 days intervals), T₃ (Alternate wetting and drying with automated field water tube with 100 % recommended dose of fertilizers) and T₄ (Irrigation through field water tube with 100% N & K application in 7 days intervals). The lowest water use efficiency (5.0 kgha⁻¹mm⁻¹) was recorded under conventional planting with 100 % recommended dose of fertilizers (T₁). Monitoring depletion water level below the soil surface with the use of field water tube in AWD is safe to limit water use by 18 % without reduction in rice yield (Kulkarni, 2011). The Higher water use efficiency in the rest of the AWD treatments as against the conventional irrigation practice could be attributed to optimum need based irrigation using monitoring device *i.e.* field water tube. Higher consumptive use with more frequent irrigations without increase in yields could have led to decreased water use efficiency under conventional practice of irrigation. This is in agreement with the findings of Bouman *et al.* 2007. The above results are in accordance with the findings of Oliver *et al.* 2008 and Rahman and Bulbul 2014.

The maximum water saving (34.7 %) was noted when transplanted rice was irrigated through field water tube with 75% N & K application in 7 days intervals (T₆) followed by Irrigation through field water tube with 100% N & K application in 10 days intervals (T₅). The minimum water saving (14%) recorded under Alternate wetting and drying with LCC based nitrogen management (T₂). Bhuiyan and Tuong (1995) concluded that a standing depth of water throughout the season is not needed for high rice yields. About 40–45 per cent of the water normally used in irrigating the rice crop in the dry season was saved by applying water in small quantities only to keep the soil saturated throughout the growing season, without sacrificing rice yields. A similar result was obtained by Sato and Uphoff 2007 with the use of intermittent

irrigation in SRI management. These results are in line with the findings of Bouman *et al.* 2007 and Chapagain *et al.* 2011.

3.2. Yield attributes and Yield of rice

The yield and yield attributes are presented in Table 2. Results shows that imposing of Alternate wetting and drying along with LCC based nitrogen management (T_2) recorded significantly higher number of productive tillers (364 m^{-2}) at harvest stage and it was on par with all other treatments except T_1 (conventional planting with 100% RDF) and T_7 (Irrigation through field water tube with 75% N & K application in 10 days intervals). The lowest number of productive tillers (311 m^{-2}) was recorded under T_1 (conventional planting with 100 % recommended dose of fertilizers). Higher tiller production under the above irrigation practices would have favoured greater conversion to productive tillers, due to enhanced nutrient uptake and development of more floral and fruiting bodies *i.e.*, panicle with high productive components. This may further be attributed to the capacity of sink to receive the photosynthesis from assimilating surface and store effectively under favorable soil plant water status as evidenced by Sathyanarayana *et al.*, 2007.

Thousand grain weight (g), filled grains (%), panicle length (cm) and panicle weight (g) were not influenced significantly due to various treatments.

More number of filled grains (170 panicle^{-1}) was observed in Alternate wetting and drying with LCC based nitrogen management (T_2) which was on par with all other irrigation and fertilizer treatments under study except T_1 (conventional planting with 100 % recommended dose of fertilizers) and T_7 (Irrigation through field water tube with 75% N & K application in 10 days intervals). The lowest number of filled grains (139 panicle^{-1}) was recorded under irrigation through field water tube with 75% N & K application in 10 days intervals. These results are consistent with findings of Hameed *et al.* 2011. This result maybe attributed due to water deficits during floral development can severely damage seed set, through pollen sterility or abortion of embryos, or can prematurely end grain filling (Saini and Westgate, 2000).

Similar to productive tillers and filled grains the grain yield was also significantly higher (6587 kg ha^{-1}) in irrigation through field water tube with 100% N&K application in 10 days intervals (T_5) compared to all other treatments except T_3, T_2, T_4 , and T_6 . The lowest grain yield (5992 kg ha^{-1}) was recorded in conventional planting with 100 % recommended dose of fertilizers (T_1). The results shown that grain yield did not decline when plants grieved little water stress. If

water deficit is properly controlled especially during grain filling stage of rice, it enhanced whole-plant senescence. The increase in yield components might be due to adequate moisture availability throughout the crop growth period. The improved yield might also be due to increased nutrient uptake. This result in agreement with the findings of Oliver *et al.* 2008 and Rahman and Bulbul. 2014. Rice is more sensitive to water stress especially at critical growth stages such as panicle initiation, anthesis and grain filling (Tao *et al.*, 2006). Water stress executed during the reproductive period can lead to reduce in grain yield (Lilley and Fukai .,1994). Decrease in yield can be attributed to decrease in number of filled grains panicle⁻¹ and average length and low percentage of grain filling.

Higher straw yield (11537 kg ha⁻¹) was produced in Alternate wetting and drying with LCC based nitrogen management (T₂) over all treatments barring T₁ and T₃. The lowest straw yield (9667 kg ha⁻¹) was recorded under irrigation through field water tube with 100% N & K application in 7 days intervals (T₄). The increase in straw yield was also due to the enhanced nutrient uptake throughout the crop growth period under sufficient water supply and increased nitrogen application. The lowest straw yields which can be attributed to water stress suffered by the crop because of the prolonged dry period. These results are consistent with findings of Hameed *et al.* 2011.

The harvest index was significantly higher (0.40) in Irrigation through field water tube with 100% N & K application in 10 days intervals (T₅) and except control (conventional planting with 100 % recommended dose of fertilizers). The lowest harvest index (0.33) was recorded under conventional planting with 100 % recommended dose of fertilizers (T₁). Similar results were reported by Gowri (2005), Oliver *et al.* 2008 and Rahman and Bulbul 2014. It might be due to the increased yield in plants with higher irrigation regimes.

4. Conclusion

From the experimental results, it is accomplished that Irrigation through field water tube with 75% N & K application in 7 days intervals (T₆) recorded water saving of 418 mm and higher grain yield of 6307 kg ha⁻¹ and saving 25 % N & K over the conventional method. Hence, current study revealed that irrigation after depletion of 20 cm of ponded water in field water tube can save 34.7 % irrigation water and 25 % N & K saving once in seven days without affecting the grain yield.

5. References

1. Bhuiyan, S. I., & Tuong, T. P. 1995. Water use in rice production: Issues, research opportunities and policy implications. Paper presented at the Inter-Center Water Management Workshop, 29-30 September 1995. Colombo, Sri Lanka: *International Irrigation Management Institute*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
2. Bouman BAM, Lampayan RM, Tuong TP 2007. Water management in irrigated rice. Coping with water scarcity. Manila, Philippines: *International Rice Research Institute*. P 53
3. Caine, R. S., Yin, X., Sloan, J., Harrison, E. L., Mohammed, U., Fulton, T., & Gray, J. E. 2019. Rice with reduced stomatal density conserves water and has improved drought tolerance under future climate conditions. *New Phytologist*, 221(1), 371-384.
4. Carracelas, G., Hornbuckle, J., Rosas, J., & Roel, A. 2019. Irrigation management strategies to increase water productivity in *Oryza sativa* rice in Uruguay. *Agricultural water management*, 222, 161-172.
5. Chapagain, T., Riseman, A., & Yamaji, E. 2011. Achieving more with less water: Alternate wet and dry irrigation (AWDI) as an alternative to the conventional water management practices in rice farming. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 3(3), 3.
6. Faruki, M. R. I., Ali, M. H., Saha, R. C., & Roy, A. K. 2011. Effect of water saving technology through alternate wetting and drying for boro rice cultivation. *J. Agrofor. Environ*, 5(1), 11-14.
7. Gowri, S. 2005. Physiological studies on aerobic rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *M. Sc. (Ag.) Thesis submitted to Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore*, 641(003).
8. Hameed, K. A., Mosa, A. K. J., & Jaber, F. A. 2011. Irrigation water reduction using System of Rice Intensification compared with conventional cultivation methods in Iraq. *Paddy and Water Environment*, 9(1), 121-127.
9. He, G., Wang, Z., & Cui, Z. 2020. Managing irrigation water for sustainable rice production in China. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 245, 118928.
10. Joshi, R., Mani, S.C., Shukla, A., & Pant, R. C. 2009. Aerobic rice: water use sustainability. *Oryza-An Int J on Rice*, 46(1), 1-5.
11. Joshi, B., Chaudhary, A., Singh, H., & Kumar, P. A. 2020. Prospective evaluation of individual and consortia plant growth promoting rhizobacteria for drought stress

amelioration in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *Plant and Soil*, 457(1), 225-240.

12. Kulkarni, S. 2011. Innovative technologies for water saving in irrigated agriculture. *Int. J. Water Resources and Arid Environ*, 1(3): 226-231.
13. Latif, M. A., & Yamaji, E. I. J. I. 2011. A study on field water tube's effectiveness as a practical indicator to irrigate SRI. *IJERD- International Journal of Environmental and Rural Development*, 2(2), 24-29.
14. Lilley, J. M., & Fukai, S. 1994. Effect of timing and severity of water deficit on four diverse rice cultivars III. Phenological development, crop growth and grain yield. *Field Crops Research*, 37(3), 225-234.
15. Maneepitak, S., Ullah, H., Datta, A., Shrestha, R. P., Shrestha, S., & Kachenchart, B. 2019. Effects of water and rice straw management practices on water savings and greenhouse gas emissions from a double-rice paddy field in the Central Plain of Thailand. *European Journal of Agronomy*, 107, 18-29.
16. 17. Oliver, M. M. H., Talukder, M. S. U., & Ahmed, M. 2008. Alternate wetting and drying for rice cultivation. *Journal of the Bangladesh Agricultural University*, 6(2), 409-414.
17. Rahman, M. R., & Bulbul, S. H. 2014. Effect of alternate wetting and drying (AWD) irrigation for Boro rice cultivation in Bangladesh. *Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries*, 3(2), 86-92.
18. Saini H S, Westgate M E. 2000. Reproductive development in grain crops during drought. *Advances in Agronomy*, 68, 59-96.
19. Sato, S., & Uphoff, N. 2007. Raising factor productivity in irrigated rice production: Opportunities with the System of Rice Intensification. *CAB review: Perspectives in Agriculture, Veterinary Science, Nutrition and Natural Resources*. Wallingford, UK: Commonwealth Agricultural Bureau International, 54, 2.
20. Satyanarayana, A., Thiyagarajan, T. M., and Uphoff, N. 2007. Opportunities for water saving with higher yield from the system of rice intensification. *Irrigation Science*, 25(2), 99-115.
21. Tao, H., Brueck, H., Dittert, K., Kreye, C., Lin, S., & Sattelmacher, B. 2006. Growth and yield formation of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) In the water-saving ground cover rice production system (GCRPS). *Field Crops Research*, 95(1), 1-12.

22. Viets, F.G. 1962. Fertilizers and the efficient use of water. *Advances in agronomy*, 14, 223-264

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Table 1. Effect of different levels of AWD on water use (mm) and water use efficiency ($\text{kg ha}^{-1} \text{mm}^{-1}$)

Treatments	Number of Irrigations	Water consumed (mm)	Effective rainfall (mm)	Total irrigation water (mm)	WUE ($\text{kg ha}^{-1} \text{mm}^{-1}$)	Water saving (%)
T ₁ : Control - conventional planting + Fertilizer (100% RDF)	27	1188	15	1203	5.0	0
T ₂ : SRI- Alternate wetting and drying + LCC Nitrogen management	19	1020	15	1035	6.2	14.0
T ₃ : Alternate wetting and drying with automated field water tube + Fertilizer (100% RDF)	19	840	15	855	7.7	28.9
T ₄ : Irrigation through field water tube + Fertilizer (100% N&K) application in 7 days intervals	19	832	15	847	7.5	29.6
T ₅ : Irrigation through field water tube + Fertilizer (100% N&K) application in 10 days intervals	18	825	15	840	7.8	30.2
T ₆ : Irrigation through field water tube + Fertilizer (75% N&K) application in 7 days intervals	19	770	15	785	8.0	34.7
T ₇ : Irrigation through field water tube + Fertilizer (75% N&K) application in 10 days intervals	18	912	15	927	6.6	22.9
SEd.					0.2	-
CD (p=0.05%)					0.5	-

Table 2. Effect of different levels of AWD on Yield and Yield attributes

Treatment	Number of productive tillers m ⁻²	1000 grain weight (g)	Filled grains (%)	Panicle length (cm)	Panicle weight (g)	Number of filled grains panicle ⁻¹	Grain yield (kg ha ⁻¹)	Straw yield (kg ha ⁻¹)	Harvest index
T ₁ : Control - conventional planting + Fertilizer (100% RDF)	311	16.1	90.6	22.3	2.7	145	5992	11464	0.33
T ₂ : SRI- Alternate wetting and drying + LCC Nitrogen management	364	16.1	91.7	22.1	2.8	170	6407	11537	0.36
T ₃ : Alternate wetting and drying with automated field water tube + Fertilizer (100% RDF)	335	16.0	92.2	21.3	2.7	158	6573	10533	0.38
T ₄ : Irrigation through field water tube + Fertilizer (100% N&K) application in 7 days intervals	340	16.1	91.4	21.1	2.9	164	6373	9667	0.40
T ₅ : Irrigation through field water tube + Fertilizer (100% N&K) application in 10 days intervals	346	16.0	90.0	20.9	2.8	152	6587	9747	0.40
T ₆ : Irrigation through field water tube + Fertilizer (75% N&K) application in 7 days intervals	355	16.1	92.7	20.7	2.5	154	6307	10240	0.38
T ₇ : Irrigation through field water tube + Fertilizer (75% N&K) application in 10 days intervals	325	16.0	91.8	20.8	2.5	139	6100	9820	0.39
SEd.	13	0.87	5.32	1.20	0.2	10	219	488	0.02
CD (p=0.05%)	29	NS	NS	NS	NS	21	477	1064	0.05

UNDER PEER REVIEW

UNDER PEER REVIEW