# IRRIGATION WATER MANAGEMENT OF RICE CROP IN NORTH DELTA

El-Hadidi, E.M.\*; M. E. Meleha\*\* and Maha A. A.Elbialy\*\*

\* Soil Science Dept., Fac. of Agric., Mansoura University, Egypt.

\*\* Irrigation Water Management Inst., National Water Res. Center, Egypt.

## ABSTRACT

Two field experiments were conducted at El Karada; water requirements research station, Kafr El Sheikh Governorate, North Delta, Water Management Research Institute, National Water Research Center, Egypt, during the two summer seasons of 2006 and 2007. The investigation aimed to produce more rice grain yield with less water by inducing planting methods and different densities. The experimental design was a randomized complete block, replicated 3 times. Six planting methods were followed in the permanent field, they were:  $T_1$  (Traditional transplanting),  $T_2$  Transplanting of seedlings rice on flat soil at distance of 20 cm. between rows and 15 cm between hills,  $T_3$  Transplanting of seedlings rice on flat soil at distance of 20 cm. between rows and 12.5 cm between hills ,  $T_4$  Transplanting of seedlings rice on flat soil at distance of 20 cm. between flat soil at dist

Results showed that the total water applied were 6564, 6300, 6340, 6420, 4244 and 3878 m<sup>3</sup>/fed. and 6597, 6551, 6593, 6617, 4490 and 4124 m<sup>3</sup>/fed. for T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>, T<sub>3</sub>, T<sub>4</sub>,T<sub>5</sub> and T<sub>6</sub> treatments over both seasons, respectively. Planting in bottom of furrows and beds saved 35.34%, 33.94% and 40.92%, 39.33% of irrigation water compared with traditional planting method over the two0seasons, respectively. Maximum paddy yield (6438.00 and 6460.67 kg fed<sup>-1</sup>) was produced by the treatment T<sub>4</sub> in the two seasons, respectively, while the rest (of transplanting methods (T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>, T<sub>7</sub>, T<sub>5</sub> and T<sub>6</sub>) produced comparatively lower grain yield. The planting method had no significant effect on (weight of 1000 grain (gm) in 2006 and 007, respectively. Maximum value of water productivity (0.80 and 0.78 LE.m<sup>-3</sup>) was produced by the treatment T<sub>4</sub> in the two seasons, respectively, while the lowest value (0.34 and 0.33 LE.m<sup>-3</sup>) was obtained by conventional transplanting T<sub>1</sub> during 2006 and 2007, respectively. Maximum economic efficiency (1.97 and 1.98) was achieved by the treatment T<sub>4</sub> this is in the two seasons, respectively, while the lowest value (0.91) was recorded by conventional transplanting T<sub>1</sub> during 2006 and 2007, respectively.

# INTRODUCTION

To mitigate the increasing water scarcity in Egypt, new ways of growing rice need to be developed that use less water than conventional lowland rice.

In order to enhance rice productivity in water-limited environments, there is a need to adopt water-saving practices.

Raj Gupta *et al.*(2002) showed that direct seeded rice on beds saves ~40% irrigation water, saves seed (less lodging), promotes in situ conservation of rainwater, improves crop yields (larger panicles and bolder seeds), improves N use efficiency, promotes crop diversification, obviates puddling and soil cracking and facilitates management of saline or alkali soils.

Atta *et al.*(2006) showed that planting in strips of furrows 80 cm wide resulted in the highest value of grain yield (9.05 t/ha), followed by planting in strips of furrows 60 cm wide( 9.00 t/ha) and traditional planting (8.71 t/ha).

Beecher *et al.*(2007) demonstrated that water productivity of the rice on the flat layout was 0.70 t/ML, compared with 0.59 t /ML in the flooded beds and 0.58 t/ML on the furrow irrigated rice.

Jagroop *et al.* (2007) revealed that the grain yield of rice transplanted on furrows and on beds was at par with recommended planting method of flat planting. The furrow and bed planting saved 119.5 cm (39%) irrigation water from puddling to harvest and 44.2 to 50.0% more water expense efficiency than the recommended practice on flat planting under same age (30 days) of seedlings

The objective of this investigation was to produce more rice grain yield with less water by inducing planting methods and different densities.

# MATERIALS AND METHODS

Two field experiments were conducted at El Karada, water requirements research station, Kafr El Sheikh Governorate, North Delta, Water Management Research Institute, National Water Research Center, Egypt, during the two summer seasons of 2006 and 2007. The soil of the experimental was clayey textured with pH of 8.3. The average of electric conductivity of soil over 0-60 cm depth was 2.3 dSm<sup>-1</sup>. The previous crop was wheat during 2006 and during 2007 seasons. The experimental design was a randomized complete block, replicated 3 times the experimental consists of 18 plots and each plot was 320 m<sup>2</sup>. Six planting methods were followed in the permanent field (treatments), they were: T<sub>1</sub> (Traditional transplanting), T<sub>2</sub> Transplanting of seedlings rice on flat soil at distance of 20 cm. between rows and 15 cm between hills, T<sub>3</sub> Transplanting of seedlings rice on flat soil at distance of 20 cm. between rows and 12.5 cm between hills, T<sub>4</sub> Transplanting of seedlings rice on flat soil at distance of 20 cm. between rows and 10 cm between hills, T<sub>5</sub>: Transplanting in bottom of furrows (30 cm). and T<sub>6</sub>: Transplanting in bottom of beds (35 cm). the raised furrow was 20 cm high x 35 cm wide with 60 cm distance from med furrow to med another, while the raised beds was 20cm high X 45 cm wide with 80 cm distance from med bed to med another. Rice cultivar Sakha 104 was transplanted on the first of June and 5th june and harvested on 10th and 15th September for 2006 and 2007 seasons, respectively. The fertilizers requirements for the nursery were added according to the recommended doses according to Crops Research Institute, Agricultural Research Center (ARC). Nitrogen fertilizer in the form of ammonium sulphate (20.6 % N) was used at a rate of 60 kg N/fed. Phosphate fertilizer in the form of Calcium superphosphate (15.5 P2O5) at the rate of 30 Kg P2O5 per feddan was added during permanent field preparations. The complementary fertilizers such as potassium and Zinc were applied as recommended in time. All other cultural practices for rice production were followed. Yields were determined by crop-cut sampling in two diagonally opposite corners of each plot using a 1m x1 m sampling frame in experiment, and grain yields are recorded as kg/ fed. at 14 % moisture content. Ten plants were chosen at random to determine: 1000 grain weight (gm) and grain yield as kg/ fed. all obtained data were analyzed statistically using analysis of variance technique and significant means were separated using

least significance difference test (LSD) for comparing the treatment means (Steel and Torrie, 1980).

#### Irrigation water applied

Irrigation water was measured using water meter (in m<sup>3</sup>). Irrigation water was transmitted through lined ditches with controlled gates, to each plot. The submerged head for each irrigation was about 5 cm at irrigation intervals every 3 days (Continuous flooding).

# Grain Yield (kg/fed.):

The central 60  $\mbox{m}^2$  were harvested to determine grain yield in ton/fed as adjusted at 14% moisture content.

## **Economic evaluation**

Economic evaluation Refers to the combinations of inputs that maximize individual or social objectives. Economic efficiency is defined in terms of two conditions necessary and sufficient. Necessary condition is met in production processes when there is producing the same amount of inputs. But the sufficient condition for efficiency encompasses individual or social goals and values (John and frank, 1987).

# **RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

#### Irrigation water applied:

Data for total water applied are presented in Table (1).and fig. 1. and 2. It was evident that  $T_1$  (Traditional transplanting) received the highest amount of irrigation water (6564 and 6797 m<sup>3</sup>/fed.) followed by  $T_4$  (6420 and 6617 m<sup>3</sup>/fed.) in the first and second season, respectively. While the treatment  $T_6$  received the lowest amount of irrigation water (3878 and 4124 m<sup>3</sup>/fed) followed by  $T_5$  (4244 and 4490 m<sup>3</sup>/fed.) in the first and second seasons, respectively. This difference could be attributed to climatic factors and planting patterns.

From these results we can report that planting in bottom of furrows and beds saved 35.34%, 33.94% and 40.92%, 39.33% of irrigation water compared with traditional planting method over the two seasons, respectively. These results are in accordance with those reported by Atta *et al.*(2006), Jagroop *et al.*(2007), and Meleha *et al.*(2008).

|                |  | 20  | 06                  | 2007   |   |                     |  |  |
|----------------|--|---|---------------------|--|---|---------------------|--|--|
| Treat.         | Total water<br>applied (m <sup>3</sup><br>fed <sup>1</sup> ) | water<br>saving<br>(m <sup>3</sup> fed <sup>1</sup> ) | Water<br>saving (%) | Total water<br>applied (m <sup>3</sup><br>fed <sup>1</sup> ) | water<br>saving<br>(m <sup>3</sup> fed <sup>1</sup> ) | Water<br>saving (%) |  |  |
| T <sub>1</sub> | 6564   | -   | -                   | 6797   | -   | -                   |  |  |
| $T_2$          | 6300   | 264   | 4.02                | 6551   | 246   | 3.62                |  |  |
| $T_3$          | 6340   | 224   | 3.41                | 6593   | 204   | 3.00                |  |  |
| $T_4$          | 6420   | 144   | 2.19                | 6617   | 180   | 2.65                |  |  |
| T5.            | 4244   | 2320  | 35.34               | 4490   | 2307  | 33.94               |  |  |
| $T_6$          | 3878   | 2686  | 40.92               | 4124   | 2673  | 39.33               |  |  |

| Table 1: | : Total water applied (m <sup>3</sup> fed <sup>1</sup> ) and amount of water sa | iving in |
|----------|---|----------|
|          | (m <sup>3</sup> fed <sup>-1</sup> ) and as (%) in both 2006 and 2007 seasons.   | -        |



Fig. 1: Total water applied (m<sup>3</sup> fed<sup>.-1</sup>) and amount of water saving in (m<sup>3</sup> fed<sup>.-1</sup>) or as (%) in 2006 season.



Fig. 2: Total water applied (m<sup>3</sup> fed<sup>.-1</sup>) and amount of water saving in (m<sup>3</sup> fed<sup>.-1</sup>) as (%) in 2007 season.

# Grain Yield (kg/fed.):

Data in table 2 show that the maximum rice grain yield (6438.00 and 6460.67 kg fed.<sup>-1</sup>) was produced by the treatment of T<sub>4</sub> this in the two seasons, respectively, while the rest of transplanting methods (T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>, T<sub>3</sub>, T<sub>5</sub> and T<sub>6</sub>) produced comparatively lower, grain yield each of 3883.33, 5120.00, 5509.33, 3897.00 and 3907.00 kg.fed<sup>-1</sup> and 3898.33, 5158.50, 5431.00, 3994.67 and 4065.00 kg.fed<sup>-1</sup> during 2006 and 2007, respectively.

|                | 2  | 2006                         | 2007   |                              |  |  |
|----------------|--|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--|--|
| Treatments     | Rice<br>productivity<br>(kg.fed <sup>1</sup> ) | Weight of 1000<br>grain (gm) | Rice<br>productivity<br>(kg.fed <sup>1</sup> ) | Weight of 1000<br>grain (gm) |  |  |
| <b>T</b> 1     | 3883.33  | 28.63                        | 3898.33  | 28.84                        |  |  |
| T <sub>2</sub> | 5120.00  | 28.70                        | 5158.50  | 28.92                        |  |  |
| T <sub>3</sub> | 5509.33  | 28.27                        | 5431.00  | 28.55                        |  |  |
| T <sub>4</sub> | 6438.00  | 28.40                        | 6460.67  | 28.64                        |  |  |
| T5.            | 3897.00  | 28.75                        | 3994.67  | 28.80                        |  |  |
| T <sub>6</sub> | 3907.00  | 28.95                        | 4065.00  | 28.99                        |  |  |
| F test         | **   | N.S                          | **   | N.S                          |  |  |
| L.S.D 0.01     | 82.61  | -                            | 186.03   | -                            |  |  |
| L.S.D 0.05     | 58.08  | -                            | 130.78   | -                            |  |  |

Table 2: Rice Productivity (kg fed<sup>-1</sup>) and weight of 1000 grain (gm) as affected by different planting methods during 2006 and 2007 summer seasons.

#### Weight of 1000 grain (gm)

Data presented in Table 2 indicated that the different methods of planting had insignificant effect on weight of 1000 grain (gm) in both seasons of study. Weight of 1000 grain values were 28.63, 28.70, 28.27, 28.40, 28.75 and 28.95 gm and 28.84, 28.92, 28.55, 28.64, 28.80 and 28.99 gm in 2006 and 2007, for  $T_1$ ,  $T_2$ ,  $T_3$ ,  $T_4$ ,  $T_5$  and  $T_6$  in 2006 and 2007, respectively.

The highest values were obtained with  $T_6$  in both seasons, while the lowest values were found with  $T_3$  treatment in both seasons.

#### Economic evaluation

Table 3 and 4 and fig. 3 show values of rice grain productivity (kg fed.-1), total income (LE fed.-1), net profit (LE fed.-1), water applied (m<sup>3</sup>fed.-1), water productivity (LE.m<sup>-3</sup>) and economic efficiency as affected by different planting methods during 2006 and 2007 summer seasons, respectively.

Results indicated that the maximum values of total income (LE fed.<sup>-1</sup>), net profit (LE fed.<sup>-1</sup>), and water applied ( $m^{3}$ fed.<sup>-1</sup>), water productivity (LE.m<sup>-3</sup>) and economic efficiency were obtained under T<sub>4</sub> in 2006 and 2007 seasons.

# Table 3: Values of productivity (kg fed<sup>-1</sup>), total income (LE fed<sup>-1</sup>), net profit (LE fed<sup>-1</sup>), water applied (m<sup>3</sup>fed.<sup>-1</sup>), water productivity (LE.m<sup>-3</sup>) and economic efficiency as affected by different planting methods during 2006 summer season

| Т     | Productivity<br>(kg.fed <sup>1</sup> ) | Total                     | Costs (LE.Fed <sup>-1</sup> ) |       |       | Net<br>profit               | Water                                  | Water                                 | Economic   |
|-------|--|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-------|-------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|------------|
| eat.  |  | (LE<br>fed <sup>1</sup> ) | variable                      | fixed | total | (LE.<br>Fed <sup>-1</sup> ) | (m <sup>3</sup><br>fed <sup>-1</sup> ) | productivity<br>(LE.m <sup>-3</sup> ) | efficiency |
| $T_1$ | 3883.33                                | 4660.00                   | 1045                          | 1400  | 2445  | 2215.00                     | 6564                                   | 0.34                                  | 0.91       |
| $T_2$ | 5120.00                                | 6144.00                   | 1185                          | 1400  | 2585  | 3559.00                     | 6300                                   | 0.56                                  | 1.38       |
| $T_3$ | 5509.33                                | 6611.20                   | 1185                          | 1400  | 2585  | 4026.20                     | 6340                                   | 0.64                                  | 1.56       |
| $T_4$ | 6438.00                                | 7725.60                   | 1200                          | 1400  | 2600  | 5125.60                     | 6420                                   | 0.80                                  | 1.97       |
| $T_5$ | 3897.00                                | 4676.40                   | 940                           | 1400  | 2340  | 2336.40                     | 4244                                   | 0.55                                  | 1.00       |
| $T_6$ | 3907.00                                | 4688.40                   | 940                           | 1400  | 2340  | 2348.40                     | 3878                                   | 0.61                                  | 1.00       |

8429

#### El-Hadidi, E.M. et al.

Table 4: Values of rice grain productivity (kg fed<sup>-1</sup>), total income (LE fed<sup>-1</sup>), net profit (LE fed<sup>-1</sup>), water applied (m<sup>3</sup>fed.<sup>-1</sup>), water productivity (LE.m<sup>-3</sup>) and economic efficiency as affected by different planting methods during 2007 summer season

| Tr             | Rice<br>produc.         | Total<br>income            | Costs (LE.Fed <sup>-1</sup> ) |       |       | Net profit<br>(LE. | Water<br>applied                    | Water<br>produc. | Economic<br>efficiency |
|----------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------|-------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------|
| eat.           | (kg.fed <sup>-1</sup> ) | (LE.<br>fed <sup>1</sup> ) | variable                      | fixed | total | Fed⁻¹)             | (m <sup>3</sup> fed <sup>-1</sup> ) | (LE.m⁻³)         |                        |
| T <sub>1</sub> | 3898.33                 | 4678.00                    | 1045                          | 1400  | 2445  | 2233.00            | 6797                                | 0.33             | 0.91                   |
| T <sub>2</sub> | 5158.5                  | 6190.20                    | 1185                          | 1400  | 2585  | 3605.20            | 6551                                | 0.55             | 1.39                   |
| T <sub>3</sub> | 5431                    | 6517.20                    | 1185                          | 1400  | 2585  | 3932.20            | 6593                                | 0.60             | 1.52                   |
| $T_4$          | 6460.67                 | 7752.80                    | 1200                          | 1400  | 2600  | 5152.80            | 6617                                | 0.78             | 1.98                   |
| $T_5$          | 3994.67                 | 4793.60                    | 940                           | 1400  | 2340  | 2453.60            | 4490                                | 0.55             | 1.05                   |
| T <sub>6</sub> | 4065                    | 4878.00                    | 940                           | 1400  | 2340  | 2538.00            | 4124                                | 0.62             | 1.08                   |



Fig. 3: Economic efficiency as affected by different planting methods during 2006 and 2007 summer seasons.

## **Recommendation:**

Using beds 80 cm wide ( $T_6$ ) as a method of rice transplanting is potentially high for water saving as approximately 40.13 % will be saved as average, and 2.44 % increase in grain yield/fed. at the same time, seedling rice can be transplanted on flat soil at distance of 20 cm. between rows and 10 cm. between hills to achieve the highest water productivity at North Delta.

# REFERENCES

- Atta, Y. I. M; M.E Meleha.; U. M. Gawish; and A. Tallet (2006) Improving Water Productivity in Rice Cultivation with High Potential for Water Saving. The 3<sup>rd</sup> Arab world region conference, Cairo, 4-11 December, 2006.
- Beecher, H. G.; Thompson, J. A.; Dunn, B.W.; Singh, R.P. and S. K. Mathews (2007) Using Raised Beds on Rice Farms – innovative ricebased cropping systems Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation. Publication No. 07/115 Project No.DAN-201A.

- Jagroop, K.; R. K. Mahey; K.K Vashist; and S.S. Mahal (2007). growth and productivity of rice (oryza sativa I) and water expense efficiency as influnced by different planting techniques. Environment and Ecology 25(1):235-238.
- John P.Doll , and O.Frank (1987) Production economics Theory with applications . Second edition Library of congress cataloging in publication data . M.S.A-New York .
- Meleha, M.E.; A.Z. El Bably; A.A. Abd Allah and W.M. El-Khoby. (2008). Producing More Rice with Less Water By Inducing Planting Methods In North Delta, Egypt. J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ., 33 (1): 805- 813, 2008.
- Raj Gupta, J.K. Ladha and Peter Hobbs (2002) rice wheat systems: emerging issues and opportunities Integrated Soil, Water and Nutrient Management for Sustainable Rice-Wheat Cropping systems in Asia Report of the First Research Co-ordination Meeting and Training Workshop of the Joint FAO/IAEA Co-ordinated Research Project, IAEA Headquarters, Vienna International Centre, 4 - 6 March 2002 and Seibersdorf Laboratories, 7-8 March 2002
- Steel, R.G.D., Torrie, J.H. (1980) Principles and Procedures of Statistics. McGraw Hill Book Co. Inc., New York.

# إدارة مياه الري لمحصول الأرز في شمال الدلتا السيد محمود الحديدي\*، محمد ابراهيم مليحة\*\* و مها عبدالله علي البيلي\*\* \* قسم الاراضي- كلية الزراعة – جامعة المنصورة

\*\* معهد بحوث ادارة المياه – المركز القومي لبحوث المياه - مصر

تم إجراء تجربة بحثية في محطة تجارب المقننات المائية بالقرضا – محافظة كفر الشيخ التابعة لمعهد بحوث ادارة المياه – المركز القومي لبحوث المياه – مصر ويهدف البحث الي الحصول على اقصى محصول من الارز باقل كميات من المياه من خلال ايجاد طرق زراعة جديدة وقد أستخدم تصميم القطاعات كاملة العشوائية في ثلاث مكررات حيث كانت المعاملات كالآتي: الشتل بالطريقة العادية، (T1)، زراعة الشنلات في صفوفٌ المسافة بينها 20 سم والمسافة بين الجور 15 سم (T<sub>2</sub>)، زراعة الشنلات في صفوف المسافة بينهًا 20 سم والمسافة بين الجور 12.5 سم (T<sub>3</sub>)، زراعة الشتلات في صفوف المسافة بينها 20 سم والمسافة بين الجور 10 سم (T<sub>4</sub>)، الشتل في خطوط عرض الخط 60 سم (T<sub>5</sub>) و الشتل في مصاطب عرض المصطبة 80 سم (T<sub>6</sub>). وقد أظهرت النتائج ان إجمالي كميات المياه المضافة قد بلغت 6564، 6300، 6340، 6420، 4244 و 3878 م3*/ف*دان و 6597، 6551، 6593، 6617، 4244 و 3878 م3/فدان بالنسبة للمعاملات T1، T3، T2، T1، T3، T1 وT6 على التوالي وذلك خلال موسمي الزراعة 2006 و 2007 على الترتيب. كميات المياه التي تم توفير ها من معاملتي الشتَّل في خطوط والشتلُّ في مصاطب هي 35.34% و 33.94 %و 40.92% و 38.98 على الترتيب مقارنة بالطَّريقة العادية خلالٌ موسمي الزرَّاعة 2006 و 2007 على الترتيب. تم تحقيق اعلى انتاجية (6438 و 6460.67 كجم /فدان) وذلك مع المعاملة T<sub>4</sub> في موسمي الزراعة2006 و 2007 على التوالي بالمقارنة مع باقي المعاملات (T1, T2, T3, T5, T6). لم يكن لطّرق الزراعة الجديدة اي تاثير معنوي على وزن الالف حبة خلال موسمي الزراعة 2006 و 2007 على التوالى. سجلت اعلى قيمة لانتاجية المياه ( 0.80 و 0.70 جنيه/م3) مع المعاملة T4 بينما سجلت المعاملة T1 اقل القيم (0.34 و 0.33 جنيه/م3) خلال موسمي الزراعة 2006 و 2007 على التوالي. وبالمثل الكفاءة الاقتصادية حيث كانت اعلى القيمُ (1.9% و 1.98°) واقل القيم ( 0.91) كانت مع المعاملة T<sub>1</sub> خلال موسمي الزراعة 2006 و 2007 على التوالي.