



RESEARCH PAPER

Effect of different irrigation methods on productivity of maize in vertisols of Northern Karnataka

C.B. Meti* and Subhas Balganvi

Department of Agricultural Engineering, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad (Karnataka) India
(Email: meticb@uasd.in)

Abstract : Field experiment was conducted to know the response of different surface irrigation methods for maize at Water and Land Management Institute Campus, Dharwad of Northern Karnataka during 2013-14 to 2015-16. The study revealed that, the increase in grain yield was 16.05 and 6.00 per cent in alternate furrow irrigation and in conventional furrow irrigation, respectively over flooding method of irrigation. The saving in irrigation water was to the extent of 32.10 and 10.83 per cent, respectively in alternate furrow irrigation and conventional furrow irrigation over flooding method of irrigation. The water productivity was 20.66, 14.34 and 11.96 kg/ha-mm in alternate furrow irrigation, conventional furrow irrigation and flooding method of irrigation, respectively. The increase in water productivity was 72.27 per cent in alternate furrow irrigation over flooding method of irrigation and 19.54 per cent in conventional furrow irrigation as compared with that of surface flooding method. The gross benefit-cost ratios were 2.94, 2.675 and 2.53 in alternate furrow irrigation, conventional furrow irrigation and flooding method of irrigation, respectively. The increase in net income per ha-mm of water used was 87.93 and 24.38 per cent, respectively in alternate furrow irrigation and in conventional furrow irrigation over flooding method of irrigation.

Key Words : Alternate furrow irrigation, Flooding, Water productivity, Benefit-cost ratio, Net profit

View Point Article : Meti, C.B. and Balganvi, Subhas (2022). Effect of different irrigation methods on productivity of maize in vertisols of Northern Karnataka. *Internat. J. agric. Sci.*, 18 (2) : 675-678, DOI:10.15740/HAS/IJAS/18.2/675-678. Copyright@ 2022: Hind Agricultural Society.

Article History : Received : 19.03.2022; Revised : 11.04.2022; Accepted : 13.05.2022

INTRODUCTION

Water is a critical natural resource, a basic human need and precious national asset. In view of its limited availability and more demands, it is imperative to use it with utmost efficiency. As a consequence of unscientific use of the limited irrigation potential developed at the huge cost, the productivity, profitability and environmental quality have been affected adversely. The scientific and judicious management of water is needed for increasing and sustaining agricultural production to meet the

demands of the fast expanding population. The most critical input happens to be water, which has become scarce. In an effort to make irrigation more efficient to obtain more crops per drop of water, farmers have to adopt alternative improved irrigation methods over conventional flooding method of irrigation. Among all the surface irrigation methods, alternate furrow irrigation for wide spaced crops is a more efficient method to provide irrigation water at the root zone of plants and it permits the irrigator to limit the watering closely to the crop water

requirements. Bandyopadhyay *et al.* (2010) Geeta *et al.* (2012), Kalpana and Anita (2014), Playan and Mateos (2006) and Prasad *et al.* (1987), Shaozhong *et al.* (2000) and Yvan *et al.* (1993), reported the benefits of alternate furrow irrigation and conventional furrow irrigation over flooding method of irrigation in terms of crop yield, water saving and water productivity of different crops.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study was conducted from 2013-14 to 2015-16 during *Rabi*/summer in Water and Land Management Institute, Dharwad of Northern Karnataka by growing maize CI 4 as test crop. The area under each treatment was 0.4 ha. The treatments comprising of alternate furrow irrigation [AFI], conventional furrow irrigation [CFI] and flooding method of irrigation [FMI]. Alternate furrow irrigation means furrows were alternately irrigated during consecutive irrigation. In conventional furrow irrigation, every furrow was irrigated during each irrigation. Whereas in case of flooding method of

irrigation, water was flooded to the field. The recommended package of practices was followed to all the treatments. The water applied through different methods of irrigation was measured through water meter. The observations were recorded on rainfall, quantity of water applied, plant height, cob length and grain yield. The water productivity, gross benefit: cost ratio, net income, net income per ha-cm of water used and increase in net income per cm of water used over flooding method of irrigation were calculated following standard methods and with the prevailing market rates during the period of study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data presented in the Table 1 revealed that the mean plant height of maize was 2.07, 2.12 and 1.93 cm, respectively in alternate furrow irrigation, conventional furrow irrigation and flooding method of irrigation. The average cob length was 15.50, 14.83 and 13.07 cm, respectively in alternate furrow irrigation, conventional

Table 1: Year wise and mean plant height, cob length, grain yield and increase in grain yield of maize as influenced by different methods of surface irrigation

Sr. No.	Parameters	Alternate furrow irrigation				Conventional furrow irrigation				Flooding irrigation			
		2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	2015 - 2016	Mean	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	2015 - 2016	Mean	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	2015 - 2016	Mean
1.	Average plant height (m)	2.10	2.07	2.03	2.07	2.30	2.10	1.97	2.12	2.00	1.95	1.85	1.93
2.	Average cob length (cm)	15.50	15.70	15.30	15.50	15.00	14.90	14.60	14.83	13.00	13.20	13.00	13.07
3.	Grain yield (q/ha)	78.77	75.45	69.70	74.64	72.95	69.57	62.15	68.22	67.37	64.85	60.67	64.30
4.	Increase in grain yield over flooding method (%)	16.92	16.34	14.88	16.05	8.28	7.28	2.44	6.00	-	-	-	-

Table 2 : Rainfall, number and depth of irrigation, total water applied and water saving for maize under different methods of surface irrigation

Sr. No.	Parameters	Alternate furrow irrigation				Conventional furrow irrigation				Flooding irrigation			
		2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	2015 - 2016	Mean	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	2015 - 2016	Mean	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	2015 - 2016	Mean
1.	Rain fall during cropping period (cm)	2.20	6.06	3.85	4.04	2.20	6.06	3.85	4.04	2.20	6.06	3.85	4.04
2.	Effective rainfall (cm)	2.20	6.06	3.75	4.00	2.20	6.06	3.75	4.00	2.20	6.06	3.75	4.00
3.	Number of irrigations	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00	7.00
4.	Depth of each irrigation (cm)	4.60	4.70	4.90	4.73	6.20	6.40	6.50	6.37	7.70	6.80	7.10	7.20
5.	Total water applied for irrigation (cm)	32.20	32.90	34.30	33.13	43.40	44.80	45.50	44.57	53.90	47.60	49.70	50.40
6.	Total water applied including effective rainfall (cm)	32.42	38.96	38.05	36.48	43.62	50.86	49.25	47.91	54.12	53.66	53.45	53.74
7.	Saving of irrigation water over flooding (%)	40.09	27.39	28.81	32.10	19.40	5.22	7.86	10.83	-	-	-	-

furrow irrigation and flooding method of irrigation. The grain yield of maize was 74.64, 68.22 and 64.30 q/ha, respectively in alternate furrow irrigation, conventional furrow irrigation and flooding method of irrigation. The increase in grain yield in alternate furrow irrigation and conventional furrow irrigation was to the extent of 16.05 and 6.00 per cent, respectively over flooding method of irrigation.

The mean depth of water applied during each irrigation was 4.73, 6.37 and 7.20 cm, respectively in alternate furrow irrigation, conventional furrow irrigation and flooding method of irrigation. The total irrigation water applied was 33.13, 44.57 and 50.40 cm, respectively in alternate furrow irrigation, conventional furrow irrigation and flooding method of irrigation. The total water applied including effective rainfall was 36.48, 47.91 and 53.74 cm, respectively in alternate furrow irrigation, conventional furrow irrigation and flooding method of irrigation. The saving in irrigation water was to the extent of 32.10 and 10.83 per cent, respectively in alternate furrow irrigation and in conventional furrow irrigation over flooding method of irrigation (Table 2).

The water productivity was 20.66, 14.34 and 11.96 kg/ha-mm in alternate furrow irrigation, conventional furrow irrigation and flooding method of irrigation, respectively. The increase in water productivity was 72.27 per cent in alternate furrow irrigation over flooding method of irrigation and the same was 19.54 per cent in conventional furrow irrigation over flooding method of irrigation. The gross benefit:cost ratios were 2.94, 2.67

and 2.53 in alternate furrow irrigation, conventional furrow irrigation and flooding method of irrigation, respectively. The net income achieved was Rs 54781, 47568 and 43292 per hectare in alternate furrow irrigation, conventional furrow irrigation and flooding method of irrigation, respectively. The net income per ha- mm of water used was Rs. 151.33, 100.14 and 80.57 in alternate furrow irrigation, conventional furrow irrigation and flooding method of irrigation, respectively. The increase in net income per ha-mm of water used was 87.93 and 24.38 per cent, respectively in alternate furrow irrigation and in conventional furrow irrigation over flooding method of irrigation (Table 3). The similar findings were reported in other crops by Bandyopadhyay *et al.* (2010), Geeta *et al.* (2014), Kalpana and Anita (2014); Playan and Mateos (2006) and Prasad *et al.* (1987), Shaozhong *et al.* (2000) and Yvan *et al.* (1993).

Conclusion :

Based on three years study it was concluded that, the increase in grain yield was 16.05 per cent and 6.00 per cent in alternate furrow irrigation and in conventional furrow irrigation, respectively over flooding method of irrigation. Considerable saving in irrigation water to the extent of 32.10 and 10.83 per cent, respectively in alternate furrow irrigation and in conventional furrow irrigation over flooding method of irrigation. The increase in water productivity was to the extent of 72.27 per cent in alternate furrow irrigation over flooding method of irrigation and 19.54 per cent in conventional furrow

Table 3 : Grain yield, increase in yield, water productivity, gross benefit cost ratio, net income and increase in net income for maize under different methods of surface irrigation

Sr. No.	Parameters	Alternate furrow irrigation				Conventional furrow irrigation				Flooding irrigation			
		2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	2015 - 2016	Mean	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	2015 - 2016	Mean	2013 - 2014	2014 - 2015	2015 - 2016	Mean
1.	Grain yield (q/ha)	78.77	75.45	69.70	74.64	72.95	69.57	62.15	68.22	67.37	64.85	60.67	64.30
2.	Increase in grain yield over flooding method (%)	16.92	16.34	14.88	16.05	8.28	7.28	2.44	6.00	-	-	-	-
3.	Water productivity (kg/ha- mm)	24.30	19.37	18.32	20.66	16.72	13.68	12.62	14.34	12.45	12.09	11.35	11.96
4.	Increase in water productivity over flooding (%)	95.18	60.22	61.41	72.27	34.29	13.15	11.19	19.54	-	-	-	-
5.	Gross benefit:cost ratio	3.01	2.92	2.88	2.94	2.79	2.66	2.57	2.67	2.57	2.50	2.51	2.53
6.	Net income (Rs./ha)	55209	54495	54640	54781	49098	48027	45580	47568	43239	42835	43804	43292
7.	Net income per ha- mm of water used (Rs.)	170.00	140.00	144.00	151.33	113.00	94.43	93.00	100.14	79.89	79.87	81.95	80.57
8.	Increase in net income per ha-mm of water used over flooding (%)	112.79	75.28	75.71	87.93	41.44	18.22	13.48	24.38	-	-	-	-

irrigation. The gross benefit cost ratios were 2.94, 2.67 and 2.53 in alternate furrow irrigation, conventional furrow irrigation and flooding method of irrigation respectively.

REFERENCES

- Bandyopadhyay, K.K., Misra, A.K., Ghosh, P.K., Hati, K.M., Mandal, K.G. and Mohanty, M. (2010).** Effect of irrigation and nitrogen application methods on input use efficiency of wheat under limited water supply in a Vertisol of Central India. *Irrigation Sci.*, **28** : 285-299.
- Geeta, A., Suresh, J. and Saidaiah, P. (2012).** Study on response of sunflower (*Helianthus annuus* L.) genotypes for root and yield characters and water stress. *Current Biotica.*, **6**(1):32-41.
- Kalpana, R. and Anita Fanish (2014).** Micro irrigation and Fertigation to maize and millets. *Agric. Review*, **35**(2):103-112.
- Playan, E. and Mateos, L. (2006).** Modernization and optimization of irrigation systems to increase water productivity. *J. Agricultural Water Management*, **80**: 100-116.
- Prasad, S. R., Alam, M. and Singh, R. N. (1987).** Role of skip furrow irrigation in increasing water use efficiency in sugarcane under staggered row planting, *Indian Sugar*, **36** (11):569-573.
- Shaozhong, K., Zongsuo, L., Yinhua, P., Peize, S. and Jianhua, Z. (2000).** Alternate furrow irrigation for maize production in an arid area. *Agricultural Water Management*, **45** : 267-274.
- Yvan, E.G., Dean, E.E. and Roger, W.E. (1993).** Alternate furrow irrigation for soybean production. *Agricultural Water Management*, **24** (2) : 133-145.

18th
Year
★★★★★ of Excellence ★★★★★