

Effect of irrigation and mulch on yield, consumptive use of water and water use efficiency of summer groundnut

G. SOUNDA, A. MANDAL, G. MOINUDDIN AND S. K. MONDAL

Dept. of Agronomy, Bidhan Chandra Krishi Viswavidyalaya
Mohanpur- 741252, West Bengal, India

ABSTRACT

Application of 3 irrigations at flowering, pegging and pod development stages along with mulching and as well as their interaction gave the highest pod yield, haulm yield and harvest index of summer groundnut. Seasonal consumptive use of water was increased with the application of frequent irrigation, although water use efficiency was reduced. The highest consumptive use of water was obtained when 4 irrigations were applied at branching, flowering, pegging and pod development stages and under no mulch condition, although the maximum water use efficiency was recorded under rainfed condition and with mulch treatment.

Key words : Irrigation, Mulch, Yield, CU, and WUE, Summer groundnut.

To meet the ever increasing demand of vegetable oil, improvement of production of major oilseed crops through area expansion and productivity through adoption of improved technology is most important. Among the oilseed crops groundnut is the king contributing about 45% of total area and 55% of total production under oilseeds in the country. But today the king is losing some ground in competition with other oilseeds.

Although moisture is the key factor of production but mismanagement of water like improper scheduling, lack of drainage etc. often leads to reduction in crop yield. For efficient utilization of applied water scheduling of irrigation to the crop would be on the scientific manner. Application of mulch materials can be of great use for conserving moisture, regulating soil temperature and for suppression of weeds during early stage of crop. Considering all the above facts in view, the present investigation was conducted to evaluate the effect of different levels of irrigation and mulch on performance of summer groundnut.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment was conducted at Central Research Farm, Bidhan Chandra Krishi Viswavidyalaya, Gayeshpur, Nadia, W.B., during *Pre-kharif* seasons of 2003 and 2004 on sandy loam soils having neutral pH and medium fertility status.

The experiment was laid out in a split plot design having 5 main plot treatments on different

levels of irrigation i.e. T_4 (4 irrigations given at branching, flowering, pegging and pod development stage), T_3 (3 irrigations applied at flowering, pegging and pod development stage), T_2 (2 irrigations scheduled at pegging and pod development stage), I_1 (1 irrigation given at pod development stage) and I_0 (rainfed) and 2 sub-plot treatments i.e. M_1 (mulching with rice straw at 6 t ha⁻¹) and M_0 (no mulching), which were replicated thrice. The treatments were randomly allocated in both main and sub-plots. Groundnut (Cv. TAG 24) was sown in rows with 30 cm X 10 cm spacing on 14th and 27th February of 2003 and 2004 respectively using a seed rate at 80 kg ha⁻¹ and harvest after 108 days of sowing. The crop was fertilized at the rate of 40 : 60 : 40 kg ha⁻¹ as N : P₂O₅ : K₂O, applied as basal. Soil samples were collected with the help of a screw auger from 4 soil layers i.e. 0-15, 15-30, 30-45 and 45-60 cm at sowing, before and 24 hours after each irrigation, harvesting and after rain for calculating moisture percentage, consumptive use (CU) of water and water use efficiency (WUE).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Pod Yield

The pod yield was increased significantly with the increase in irrigation level and the highest pod yield was obtained with I_3 level of irrigation, which was 63.5% higher over rainfed (I_0). Pod yield was decreased under frequent irrigation (I_4) by 7.52% as compared to I_3 level of irrigation (Table 1). Decreased pod yield with I_4 level of irrigation might

Table 1 Effect of irrigation, mulch and their interaction on pod yield, haulm yield and harvest index of summer groundnut (pooled data)

Treatments	Pod yield (kg ha ⁻¹)	Haulm yield (kg ha ⁻¹)	Harvest Index (%)
I ₀	2210.8	6212.8	26.25
I ₁	2612.4	7034.4	27.09
I ₂	3020.9	7465.3	28.81
I ₃	3615.3	8259.5	30.46
I ₄	3343.3	7832.8	29.90
S.Em (±)	9.73	34.23	0.08
CD at 5%	29.17	102.62	0.24
Mulch			
M ₀	2898.3	7232.2	28.41
M ₁	3022.7	7489.7	28.60
S.Em (±)	4.81	18.42	0.06
CD at 5%	14.18	54.35	0.18
Interaction			
I ₀ M ₀	2109.6	5955.3	26.16
I ₀ M ₁	2312.1	6470.3	26.34
I ₁ M ₀	2536.9	6930.9	26.81
I ₁ M ₁	2687.8	7137.9	27.36
I ₂ M ₀	2899.2	7364.5	28.26
I ₂ M ₁	3142.6	7566.1	29.36
I ₃ M ₀	3371.9	7699.2	30.47
I ₃ M ₁	3858.6	8819.7	30.44
I ₄ M ₀	3573.9	8211.2	30.33
I ₄ M ₁	3112.4	7454.4	29.47
S. Em (±)	10.75	41.20	0.14
CD at 5%	a) 31.72 b) 52.08	a) 121.53 b) 189.29	a) 0.40 b) 0.53

N.B. Interaction CD (a) for comparing sub-plot means (mulch) at same level of main plot (irrigation)

Interaction CD (b) for comparing main plot means at same or different levels of sub-plot.

be due to poor aeration in the root zone resulting from frequent irrigation which consequently retarded nodulation and growth characters and ultimately yield attributes and yield was reduced. Padma and Rao (1992) also reported the same.

Mulch increased the pod yield of groundnut significantly (Table 1). The higher yield with mulch was attributed due to conservation of soil moisture and regulation of soil temperature by mulch which led to production of higher yield attributes and ultimately higher pod yield. Several workers also made similar type of observations (Cheong *et al.*, 1995 and Sanjeev *et al.*, 2001).

The interaction effect between levels of irrigation and mulch was also significant (Table 1). Among the different treatment combination I₃M₁ i.e. application of 3 irrigation alongwith mulching recorded the highest pod yield.

Haulm yield

Haulm yield was significantly influenced by irrigation level and the highest haulm yield was recorded at I₃ level of irrigation. As expected, I₀ treatment recorded the lowest haulm yield (Table 1). Reduction in plant height, branch per plant, dry matter accumulation and canopy development under rainfed condition due to moisture stress ultimately reduced the haulm yield of groundnut. Similar results were also reported by Jadav *et al.*, (1989).

Haulm yield was 3.6% higher under mulched condition over no mulch (Table 1). This might be due to better growth and development of crop under mulched condition resulting from better moisture conservation and creation of more congenial growing condition under mulching, Kathmale *et al.* (2000) also observed that haulm yield was significantly more under mulched condition as compared to unmulched one.

The interaction effect between levels of irrigation and mulch on haulm yield of groundnut was also significant. Mulching with all the levels of irrigation always produced higher haulm yield over no mulching except at I₄ and among the treatment combinations, I₃M₁ recorded the highest haulm yield (Table 1).

Harvest Index

Harvest index was significantly increased with the increase in irrigation frequency from I₀ to I₄ and the highest value was recorded in I₃ level of irrigation (Table 1). However, the lowest harvest index was always obtained under rainfed condition due to production of lower yield under stress condition. The beneficial effect of irrigation on harvest index was also observed by Patra *et al.* (1998).

Mulching as well as the interaction effect between levels of irrigation and mulching also had significant influence on harvest index of groundnut. Mulching gave higher harvest index than no mulching. However, among the treatment combinations I₃M₀, I₃M₁ and I₄M₀ were at par and I₄M₁ gave reduced harvest index due probably to the excess moisture condition of the soil. I₀M₀ combination recorded the lowest value of harvest index (Table 1).

Consumptive Use (CU)

Seasonal CU of water was increased with the increased level of irrigation and the highest CU was recorded when 4 irrigations were applied at

branching, flowering, pegging and pod development stages, which were closely, followed by I₃ level of irrigation during both the years and in mean data (Table 2). Frequent irrigation filled the root zone depth of groundnut crop with water upto field capacity very frequently and kept the soil moisture status in the root zone depth at higher level. The evapo-transpiration therefore proceeded at a faster rate leading to greater CU. The results are in conformity with the findings of Singh *et al.*, (1994).

production of higher pod yield and at the same time lower CU of water under this treatment.

CONCLUSION

From the above discussion it can be concluded that 3 irrigations at flowering, pegging and pod development stages should be provided to the summer groundnut along with mulching to maximize the productivity. Increase in the frequency of irrigation enhanced CU of water while WUE was reduced due

Table 2 Effect of irrigation and mulch on consumptive use and water use efficiency of summer groundnut

Treatments	Consumptive use (cm)			Water Use Efficiency (Kg ha ⁻¹ mm ⁻¹)		
	2003	2004	Mean	2003	2004	Mean
Irrigation						
I ₀	26.93	24.46	25.70	8.20	9.04	8.62
I ₁	34.15	32.11	33.13	7.52	8.28	7.90
I ₂	41.33	43.48	42.41	7.30	6.95	7.13
I ₃	50.69	51.00	50.85	7.01	7.21	7.11
I ₄	53.88	52.80	53.34	6.20	6.34	6.27
Mulch						
M ₀	43.90	43.70	43.80	6.49	6.74	6.62
M ₁	38.88	37.83	37.86	7.78	7.99	7.89

CU of water was lower under mulched condition as compared to unmulched treatment (Table 2). This might be due to the fact that mulches created a protective cover on the soil surface and thus helped to keep the soil moisture at an optimum level through adequate monitoring of evapo-transpiration. The results are corroborated with the findings reported by Shajari *et al.* (1990).

Water use efficiency (WUE)

Data recorded in Table 2 indicated that increased level of irrigation greatly reduced the wide WUE of groundnut crop and the highest WUE was obtained under rainfed condition. However, I₁ i.e. application of one irrigation at pod development stage recorded higher WUE during both the years and in mean data than other level of irrigation. Lower CU of water under rainfed condition might be the main reason for maximum WUE. Similar results were also recorded by Tiwari *et al.*, (1994).

Straw mulches had a positive influence on WUE of groundnut crop (Table 2). Higher WUE under mulched condition was obtained due to

to increase in frequency of irrigation. Mulching also enhanced WUE of groundnut.

REFERENCES

- Cheong-Youngkeun; Oh-Youn Sup; Park-Ki Hun; Kim-jang Tae and Oh Myung Gyu (1995). The effect of black polythene film mulching on growth characters and yield of large seeded groundnut. *RDA-J. Agric. Sci. Upland and Industrial Crops*. 37 (1) : 88-94.
- Jadav, A.S.J. Washik, D.D. and Gaikwad, C.B. (1989). Effect of irrigation levels on the yield of summer groundnut. *J. Maharashtra Agric. Univ.* 14 (2) : 151-152.
- Kathmale, D.K.; Kamble, M.S.; Khadtare, S.V. and Patil, R.C. (2000). Polythene film mulch technology for yield maximization in summer groundnut. *Indian J. Agron.* 45 (3) : 608-612.
- Padma, V. and Rao, I.V.S. (1992). Influence of irrigation on the composition and quality of groundnut genotypes. *J. Oilseed Res.* 9 (1) : 159-163.
- Patra, A.K.J Tripathy, S.K. and Samui, R.C. (1998). Effect of sowing date, irrigation and spacing

- on yield components and yield of summer groundnut. *Annals Agric. Res.* 19 (4) : 407-410.
- Sanjeev, Kumar; Nagachan, S.V. and Kumar, S. (2001). Performance of winter ground (*Arachis hypogaea*) with polythene mulch under rainfed condition of Manipur Valley. *Indian J. Agron.* 46 (1) : 151-155.
- Shayari, A.R.; Gueye, M.; Yonemura, J. and Sasao, A. (1990). Research on water saving on sandy soil in drip irrigation, mulching, temperature control and crop production in drip irrigation. AMA, Agricultural mechanization in Asia, Africa and Latin America, 21 (4) : 25-28.
- Singh, B.V.; Sharma, S.K.; Verma, B.L. and Siag, R.K. (1994). Effect of irrigation schedule and phosphorus fertilization on yield, water use and phosphorus uptake by groundnut in North-West Rajasthan, *Indian J. Agron.* 39 (1) : 58-61.
- Tiwari, R.C.; Chaplot, P.C. and Sharma, A. (1994). Effect of irrigation schedules and sulfur levels on summer groundnut. *Legume Res.* 17 (2) : 101-104.