

 $\ \, \textbf{International Journal of Agricultural Engineering / Volume 7 } \ | \ \, \textbf{Issue} \quad 1 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ \, \textbf{April}, \ 2014 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 267-270 \ | \ 2$ 

## Study of different methods of maize harvesting and threshing in Hoshiarpur district of Punjab

## **AJAIB SINGH**

Received: 30.11.2013; Accepted: 20.03.2014

Author for correspondence:

AJAIB SINGH Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Bahowal, HOSHIARPUR (PUNJAB) INDIA Email: as.ajaib82@gmail.com

- **ABSTRACT:** This study was conducted to evaluate the performance of different methods of maize harvesting and threshing *i.e.* manual harvesting and threshing with conventional maize thresher ( $T_1$ ), manual harvesting and threshing with maize dehusker-cum thresher ( $T_2$ ) and harvesting, threshing and cleaning using self propelled maize combine harvester ( $T_3$ ) in district Hoshiarpur of Punjab. Threshing efficiency of conventional thresher, maize dehusker-cum-sheller and self propelled maize combine harvester was in the range of 97-99%, 97-98% and 95-97%, respectively. The total grain losses were highest (2-4%) for harvesting of maize with combine harvester and least (0.5-1.5%) for conventional maize thresher. The net cost of harvesting per hectare was highest (Rs. 9000/-) in  $T_3$  and lowest (Rs. 2650/-) in  $T_1$ . The total income from the maize residue per hectare was highest (Rs. 5250/-) in  $T_1$  as compared to  $T_2$  (Rs. 3750/-) and  $T_3$  but there was saving of 100-140 man-h/ha as labour requirement for de-husking of the crop in  $T_2$  and  $T_3$ . The maize residue left in  $T_3$  can be incorporated into the soil with rotavator operation which helps in improvement of soil health.
- KEY WORDS: Maize harvesting, Threshing, Dehusker-cum-sheller
- HOW TO CITE THIS PAPER: Singh, Ajaib (2014). Study of different methods of maize harvesting and threshing in Hoshiarpur district of Punjab. *Internat. J. Agric. Engg.*, **7**(1): 267-270.