

- CARPENTER, J.B. 1942. A toximetric study of some eradicant fungicides. *Phytopath.* 32 : 845-856.
- FROYD, J.D., C.J. PAGET, L.R. GUSE, B.A. DREIKORN and J.L. PAFFORD. 1976. Tricyclazole : A new systemic fungicide for control of *P. oryzae* on rice. *Phytopath.* 66 : 1135-1139.
- GANESAN, M. 1987. Re-evaluation of pesticides in rice ecosystem against pests and diseases. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore. P. 87.
- KUMAR, K., D.R. SINGH and G. RAM. 1975. Bioassay of new fungicides against *H. oryzae* and *H. sativum* in vitro. *Labdev. J. Sci. Tech.* 9-B(3/4) : 225-226.
- PALIT, S., S. GANGOPADHYAY and N.K. CHAKRABARTI. 1982. Testing of 3 fungicides against brown spot disease of rice. *Pestology.* 6(3) : 13-15.
- REDDY, E.J.S., M.P. CHARY and S.M. REDDY. 1985. In vitro evaluation of different fungicides in the control of sheath blight on rice caused by *A. oryzae*. *Pesticides.* 19(8) : 67-68.

<https://doi.org/10.29321/MAJ.10.A01805>

Madras Agric. J. 79 (12) : 674 - 679 December 1992

## LIGHT INTERCEPTION AND PRODUCTIVITY IN RICE

A. ARJUNAN, K. BALAKRISHNAN, R. SADASIVAM and M. NAGARAJAN\*

### ABSTRACT

A study was carried out to determine the relationship between light interception and productivity in rice. Cultivar difference could be observed in leaf area index, leaf angle, light extinction co-efficient (k), dry matter production grain yield. The study suggests that the rice cultivar with optimum leaf area index, upright leaves (low leaf angle) and lower light extinction co-efficient should be screened for higher production potential. Grain yield had negative and significant correlation with leaf angle ( $r = -0.3710^*$ ) and light interception ( $r = -0.3889^*$ ), the dry matter production was found to have positive and significant ( $r = 0.3214^*$ ) association with grain yield.

Crop growth and productivity is mainly decided by the efficiency in utilisation of solar radiation by the green leaf area. Crop photosynthesis is a

measure of light utilisation by leaf area. Photosynthesis in the field is primarily dependent upon the incident solar radiation, leaf angle or leaf orientation, and

\* Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore 641 003.

leaf area index. The association of light interception and crop productivity has been studied by Monteith (1965). Earlier studies on the relationship between light interception and productivity in rice revealed that the leaf orientation affects the productivity because it determines the light distribution and further utilisation (Uchijima, 1976). However studies on the inter association of light utilising attributes in relation to production potential of rice has not been attempted so far. Hence a study was undertaken to find out the relationship between light utilisation attributes and productivity in rice.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was conducted during samba season of 1987-88 with thirty rice cultivars in a randomised block design with three replications at paddy breeding station Coimbatore. The recommended dose of fertilizer (NPK : 100 : 50 : 50 kg/ha) was also applied. The crop was transplanted with a spacing of 20 x 10 cm. The leaf area was measured by leaf area meter at flowering phase and leaf area index was worked out. The leaf angle was measured as per the method suggested by (Alluri and Vergara 1975). The incident solar radiation falling on the canopy and also below the canopy was measured at flowering stage with integrated quantum Radio meter/photometer and expressed as microeinstein/sec/m<sup>2</sup>. The light interception (Balakrishnan and Natarajaratnam 1987) and light extinction co-efficient (k) (Monsi and Sacki, 1953) were worked out. The data were subjected

to correlation co-efficient. The yield of grain and straw were estimated at harvest stage.

#### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data on the leaf area index, incident radiation falling on the canopy, within the canopy, light interception, leaf angle, light extinction co-efficient, dry matter production and grain yield were presented (Table 1). The leaf area index differ significantly among-cultivars. It ranged from 2.89 to 6.74. The highest leaf area index was recorded in 6.74 in IR 54 followed by 5.41 in ASD 5. Cultivar difference in leaf area index also leads to variations in light absorption. The variations in light intensity within the canopy reveals the difference in light absorption by varieties. It leads to the difference in light interception among varieties. The highest light interception of 96.5% was recorded in ASD 5 at leaf area index 5.41. The lowest light interception of 80.6% was observed at leaf area index 2.89 in Ponni. The higher light interception represents the poor transmittance of light to the lower canopy in turn decides the efficient utilisation of light for photosynthesis. The lower light interception indicates the high transmittance of light to the lower canopy and thus poor utilisation of highest for photosynthesis. Leaf angle, as a measure of leaf orientation also varied among cultivars. It ranged from 11.3 to 50.3. The lowest angle (11.3°) represents the upright leave was recorded in MDU 2. The light extinction coefficient also

TABLE 1 : Light utilising attributes.

| Rice genotypes | Leaf area Index | Light Incidence upper cropping ( $\mu\text{E/s/m}^2$ ) | Light Incidence lower cropping | Light Inter ception (percent) | Leaf Angle | K     | Dry matter produc tion ( $\text{g/m}^2$ ) | Grain yield ( $\text{g/m}^2$ ) |
|----------------|-----------------|--|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------|-------|---|--------------------------------|
| Co 30          | 3.54            | 280  | 50                             | 82.1                          | 38.1       | 0.48  | 1612                                      | 419                            |
| Co 36          | 4.24            | 350  | 50                             | 85.7                          | 20.0       | 0.45  | 776                                       | 173                            |
| Co 38          | 4.75            | 310  | 30                             | 90.3                          | 40.0       | 0.49  | 1305                                      | 385                            |
| Co 42          | 3.93            | 330  | 40                             | 87.8                          | 20.0       | 0.53  | 1357                                      | 385                            |
| Co 43          | 4.63            | 340  | 50                             | 85.3                          | 18.7       | 0.41  | 1402                                      | 524                            |
| Co 44          | 3.15            | 350  | 50                             | 85.7                          | 18.7       | 0.62  | 1357                                      | 479                            |
| TNAU 4372      | 3.00            | 360  | 40                             | 88.9                          | 14.0       | 0.73  | 1422                                      | 522                            |
| TNAU 80030     | 4.66            | 490  | 70                             | 85.7                          | 13.0       | 0.42  | 1483                                      | 453                            |
| TNAU 80042     | 4.82            | 330  | 80                             | 75.7                          | 18.7       | 0.30  | 1380                                      | 480                            |
| TNAU 831520    | 4.64            | 420  | 50                             | 88.1                          | 20.0       | 0.45  | 1188                                      | 448                            |
| TNAU 831521    | 4.84            | 420  | 50                             | 88.1                          | 16.0       | 0.43  | 1357                                      | 522                            |
| IR 20          | 5.20            | 310  | 40                             | 87.0                          | 14.3       | 0.39  | 1596                                      | 541                            |
| IR 42          | 4.24            | 360  | 50                             | 86.1                          | 14.7       | 0.46  | 1450                                      | 257                            |
| IR 54          | 6.70            | 280  | 40                             | 85.7                          | 19.0       | 0.29  | 1420                                      | 535                            |
| IR 62          | 4.31            | 370  | 50                             | 86.5                          | 14.3       | 0.46  | 1475                                      | 422                            |
| IR 64          | 3.95            | 370  | 60                             | 83.7                          | 19.3       | 0.46  | 1232                                      | 335                            |
| IET 7301       | 3.74            | 410  | 70                             | 82.9                          | 20.0       | 0.47  | 1438                                      | 573                            |
| IET 7303       | 3.02            | 410  | 60                             | 85.4                          | 18.7       | 0.64  | 1406                                      | 569                            |
| IET 7590       | 3.17            | 400  | 60                             | 85.0                          | 21.0       | 0.59  | 1737                                      | 514                            |
| AS 781/1       | 3.61            | 360  | 70                             | 83.4                          | 40.3       | 0.45  | 1478                                      | 388                            |
| AD 9408        | 3.81            | 480  | 50                             | 89.6                          | 17.7       | 0.59  | 974                                       | 379                            |
| ADT 38         | 4.30            | 320  | 40                             | 87.5                          | 20.7       | 0.48  | 1083                                      | 275                            |
| ASD 5          | 5.41            | 530  | 20                             | 96.2                          | 40.0       | 0.060 | 1322                                      | 264                            |
| ASD 11         | 2.89            | 460  | 50                             | 89.1                          | 50.3       | 0.76  | 1519                                      | 227                            |
| Bhavani        | 5.18            | 390  | 40                             | 89.7                          | 46.3       | 0.44  | 1425                                      | 320                            |
| Ponni          | 2.89            | 310  | 60                             | 80.6                          | 29.7       | 0.56  | 1488                                      | 448                            |
| White Ponni    | 5.09            | 360  | 30                             | 91.6                          | 40.0       | 0.49  | 1586                                      | 429                            |
| Paiyur         | 4.55            | 420  | 60                             | 85.7                          | 14.3       | 0.43  | 1304                                      | 294                            |
| PY 1           | 4.45            | 410  | 40                             | 90.2                          | 17.3       | 0.52  | 1448                                      | 228                            |
| MDU 2          | 3.87            | 440  | 80                             | 81.8                          | 11.3       | 0.44  | 1548                                      | 543                            |
| Mean           | 4.219           | 379  | 51                             | 86.37                         | 23.54      | 0.494 | 1385.6                                    | 412.9                          |
| SE             | 0.1569          | -  | -                              | -                             | -          | -     | 34.486                                    | 20.097                         |
| CD             | 0.2772          | -  | -                              | -                             | -          | -     | 57.592                                    | 47.463                         |

**TABLE 2 : Correlation of light utilising attributes with dry matter production and grain yield.**

| Attributes            | DMP     | Grain yield |
|-----------------------|---------|-------------|
| Leaf area index       | -0.1034 | +0.1944     |
| Leaf angle            | +0.1656 | -0.371*     |
| Light interception    | -0.076  | -0.3889*    |
| 'K' valve             | +0.0539 | -0.1578     |
| Dry matter production | -       | +0.3214*    |

\* Significant at 5% level

**TABLE 3 : Intercorrelation of light utilising attributes.**

| Attributes         | Leaf area Index | Leaf angle | Light interception | KK'valve   |
|--------------------|-----------------|------------|--------------------|------------|
| Leaf area index    | -               | -0.3839*   | -0.3710*           | -0.1578 NS |
| Leaf angle         | -               | -          | +0.3644*           | +0.2699 NS |
| Light interception | -               | -          | -                  | +0.3902*   |
| 'K' valve          | -               | -          | -                  | -          |

\* Significant at 5% level.

varied among varieties due to its difference in leaf area index and higher transmission among cultivars. The lowest light extinction coefficient indicates the efficient light utilisation ( $k = 0.29$ ), was recorded in IR 54 at leaf area index 6.70 with lower leaf angle and ( $19.0^\circ$ ) and higher light interception (85.7). The variety IR 54 also performed moderately better in drymatter production ( $1420 \text{ g/m}^2$ ) and grain yield ( $535 \text{ g/m}^2$ ). Yoshida (1981) also reported that erect leaves of optimum leaf area index (4-7) with low higher extinction coefficient are efficient in light utilisation for photosynthesis and resulted in higher productivity in rice. The superiority in grain yield and biological yield in crops with small and erect leaves has also been reported for crops such as barley and wheat (Tanner

et. al. 1966). Eventhough the cultivar, ASD 5 is efficient in light interception (96.2) at optimum leaf area index (5.41), very low productivity was recorded ( $1322 \text{ g/m}^2$ ) dry matter, ( $264 \text{ g/m}^2$ ) grain yield). The reason may be attributed to its higher light extinction coefficient (0.48) and droppy nature of the leaves (leaf angle  $40.0^\circ$ ). This was in agreement with the findings of the Hayashi and Ito, (1969).

The dry matter production had weak and positive association with leaf angle and k value (Table 2). Significant and negative correlations were obtained between grain yield with leaf angle (-0.3710\*), light interception (-0.3889\*) also had significant negative association with drymatter with grain yield was also obtained (+ 0.3214\*). Yoshida (1972)

also obtained similar such positive correlation between grain yield and dry matter production.

The inter association between light utilising attributes (Table 3), revealed that a significant negative correlations (0.3839\*) was obtained between leaf angle with leaf area index. Light interception had negative significant association with (-0.3170\*) with leaf area index. The positive and significant association of leaf angle with higher interception (-0.3644\*\*) revealed that the linear relationship of increased leaf angle leads to higher light interception. However, this is not related to productivity, because even though light interception was more in droopy leaves, because of self shading it negatively correlated with productivity.

It is evident from the negative association of light interception with both dry matter and grain yield (Table 2). The positive association of light interception (+0.3902\*) with k value is due to the negative association of leaf area index with leaf angle and light interception. This was in close conformity with the findings of Tanaka et al. (1969) and Tsunoda, (1959).

It was concluded from the study that the rice cultivars with optimum leaf area index, lower leaf angle and lower light extinction coefficient should be screened for higher production efficiency. It was also found out from the study that there was close association exists between light interception, leaf angle and leaf area index.

#### REFERENCES

- ALLURI, K and VERGARA, B.S. 1975. Leaf angle and drought resistance in upland rice. *SAB RAO J.* 8 : 41-46.
- BALAKRISHNAN, K and NATARAJARATNAM, N. 1987. Light interception and seed yield in pigeonpea. *International pigeonpea News letter*, No. 6 : 45.
- MONSI, M and SAEKI, T. 1953. *Japan. J. Bot.* 14 : 22-52. In : *Breeding for morphological and physiological traits* CD Wilson Plant Breeding II. (Frey, K.J. eds). The Iowa State University, Ames.
- MONTEITH, J.C. 1965. Light distribution and photosynthesis in field crops. *Ann. Bot (N.S).* 29 : 17-37
- HAYASHI, K and ITO, H. 1962. Studies on the form of plant in rice varieties with reference to the efficiency in utilising sunlight. I. The significance of extinction coefficient in rice plant communities. *Proc. Crop. Sc. Soc. Japan.* 30 : 329-333.
- TANAKA, T., MATSUSHIMA, S. KOJYO, S. and NITTA, 1969. Analysis of yield determining process and its application to yield prediction and curve improvement of low land rice. XC. On the relationship between plant type of rice plant community and light curve of carbon assimilation *Proc. Crop Sci. Japan.* 38. : 287-293.

- TANNER, J.W, GARDENER, C.J., STOSKOPF, N.C. and REINBERGS, E. 1966. Some observations on upright leaf-type small grains. *Can J. Plant Sc.* 46 : 690.
- TSUNODA, S. 1959. A developmental analysis of yielding ability in varieties of field crops II. The assimilation system of plants as affected by form, direction, and arrangement of single leaves. *Japan, J. Breed.* 9 : 237-244.
- YOSHIDA, S. 1972. Physiological aspects of grain yield *Ann. Rev. Plant Physiol.* 23 : 437-464.
- YOSHIDA, S. 1981. Fundamentals of rice crop science. IRRI, Phillipines. p. 267.

Madras Agric. J. 79 (12) : 679 - 684 December 1992

## ECONOMICS OF REARING AND MARKETING OF SHEEP IN NORTH-WESTERN ZONE

N.R. PADMANABAN

### ABSTRACT

A study was conducted in Salem and Dharmapuri districts with 100 sample respondents to find out the economics of sheep rearing. The study revealed that 73 per cent of the farmers tended macheri cross breed and on an average, each farmer tended 19.20 ewes and 1.39 rams. Annual addition of sheep per farm was 12.78 of which 6.11 were ewes. Maintenance cost per farm worked out to Rs. 1952.81, of which labour accounted for 75.04 per cent and feed cost 17.10 per cent. Income from sheep per farm amounted to Rs. 2699.33 of which 78 per cent by sale of sheep. Marketing cost per sheep worked out to Rs. 3-5 and marketing was mainly carried out in the nearby villages and in shandies.

Sheep population in North Western Zone comprising of Salem and Dharmapuri districts estimated to be 7.22 lakhs accounting for 13.18 per cent of Tamil Nadu. Among various subsidiary occupations, sheep rearing is found popular among the farming community

in this region, particularly to small and marginal farmers. The objectives of the study were (i) to find out the farmers attitude, (ii) to examine economics of sheep rearing, (iii) to assess its contribution to farm income and (iv) to estimate

1. Assistant Professor (Economics), Department of Agricultural Economics Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore.

