

1994 and 10.1 percent in 1995. Water saving in ADT 38 and CO 45 due to adoption of  $I_2$  irrigation level compared to  $I_1$  was 9.6 percent.

#### REFERENCES

- ALEXANDER, D., SADANANDAN, N. and KARUNAKARAN, K. (1988). Azolla growth under different rice planting methods in Kerala. *IRRN*, 13(4): 24-25.
- ARASGON, E.L. AND DEDATTA, S.K. (1982). Drought response of rice at different nitrogen levels using line source sprinkler system. *Irrig.Sci.*, 3 : 63-73.
- CHANDRAGIRI, K.K. (1988). Studies on the influence of planting geometry and time of application of N on growth and yield of short duration rice varieties. Ph.D. Thesis, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore.
- IRUTHAYARAJ, M.R. and MORACHAN, Y.B. (1980). Note on the effect of seasons, stages, water management and nitrogen levels on the uptake of phosphorus in two swamp rice varieties. *Indian J. Agric. Res.*, 14(4) : 254-258.
- ISLAM, M.Z., HAG, K.A. and BHUIYAN, L.R. (1986). Effect of different water management practices on grain yield, weed population and recovery of applied nitrogen in rice cultivation. *Bangladesh J. Agric.*, 1(1): 57-64.
- MALI, C.V. and VARADE, S.B. (1981). Response of rice to varying soil moisture conditions in vertisols. I Studies on soil pH and nutrient availability. *Zeithrift fur Aucker-Und Pflanzenbau* 150(2): 129-139.
- MUTHUKRISHNAN, P. (1990). Studies on irrigation, weed and biofertiliser management in transplanted lowland rice. Ph.D. Thesis, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore.
- NELSON, W.L. (1981). Interaction of potassium with moisture and temperature. *Potash Rev.Sub.* 16, Suite, 87 : 1-11.
- PANDEY, N., TRIPATHI, R.S. and MITTRA, B.N. (1992). Yield, nutrient uptake and water use efficiency of rice as influenced by nitrogen and irrigation. *Annals Agric., Res.* : 372-374.
- SAH, R.N. and MIKKELSON, D.S. (1983). Availability and utilisation of fertiliser by rice under alternate flooding. *Plant and Soil*, 75 : 2127-234.
- SAHRAWAT, K.L. (1981). Influence of water regime on growth yield and nitrogen uptake of rice. *Comm. soil sci. Pl. Analysis*, 12: 919-932.
- SINGANDHUPE, R.B. and RAJPUT, R.K. (1990). Nitrogen use efficiency in rice under varying moisture regimes, sources and levels in semi-reclaimed sodic soil *Indian J. Agron.*, 35 : 73-81.

(Received : August 1998 Revised : September 1999)

Madras Agric. J., 86(7-9): 351 - 355 July - September 1999  
<https://doi.org/10.29321/MAJ.10.A00615>

## ALTERNATE CROPPING SYSTEM FOR SINGLE RICE BASED LOWLANDS OF KARAIKAL REGION OF UNION TERRITORY OF PONDICHERRY

J. RAMMOHAN, B. CHANDRASEKHARAN, R. POONGUZHARAN and M. SUBRAMANIAN

P.J.N. College of Agriculture and Research Institute,  
 KARAIKAL - 609603

#### ABSTRACT

Field experiments were conducted during 1993-95 at Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru College of Agriculture and Research Institute, Karaikal for evolving alternate cropping systems for the Karaikal region of Union Territory of Pondicherry, which is situated at the tail end of Cauvery delta zone. Rice-cotton system was found to be the best system since it outyielded the conventional system (rice-blackgram) and other cropping systems evaluated (rice-soybean, rice-vegetable cowpea and rice-sesame). The system rice-cotton recorded the maximum gross and net returns followed by rice-vegetable cowpea system. The rice-cotton system may be adopted in areas where water is available for atleast ten irrigations during summer and in areas where water is available for only five irrigations rice-vegetable cowpea system may be economical. Among the four levels of N (0, 75, 112.5 or 150 Kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) applied to rice, application of 150 Kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> increased not only the yield of rice but also the production potential of the system in all the cropping systems studied.

KEY WORDS: Rice based system, Alternative system

Rice is the principal food crop cultivated in the lowlands of Karaikal region which is situated in the tail end of Cauvery delta. With augmented

and controlled supplies of water from Mettur reservoir, rice is cultivated during three different seasons in a year viz., kuruvai (June-July to

September - October), samba (August-September to January-February) and thaladi (October-November to January-February). The second and third rice crops are usually followed by rice fallow blackgram as a conventional practice, which is cultivated from January-February to March.

Because of the food habits of the people, drainage constraints imposed by land topography and rains during North-East monsoon period, it is not possible to completely give up rice cultivation in this region. The receipt of water from Mettur dam is not timely and the discharge is also sub-normal and inadequate for irrigation. Therefore, raising of first crop (kuruvai) in June and commencement of samba crop in August with river water irrigation has become bleak. Therefore, an imperative change of the cropping pattern in Karaikal region of the Union Territory of Pondicherry and evolving new cropping systems to meet the exigency of water scarcity and to boost the income of the farmer with the available water facilities are the immediate needs at this critical situation. Hence, a rice based cropping system along with some irrigated remunerative dry crops with better resource utilization is a necessity, since the prevailing system of rice-blackgram is not remunerative to the farming community of this region.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The field experiments were conducted in fields B<sub>7</sub> and C<sub>10</sub> of Western Block of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru College of Agriculture and Research Institute, Karaikal, Union Territory of Pondicherry during 1993-95. The soil was Typic Chromustert and sandy clay loam in texture. Experiment-I (Early sowing) was conducted in soil which had a pH of 7.90 with an EC of 0.40 dS m<sup>-1</sup> and the soil was low in OC (0.40%) and available N (181.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> (18.2 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and K<sub>2</sub>O (86.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). Experiment-II (late sowing) was conducted in soil with a pH of 7.80 and an EC of 0.50 dS m<sup>-1</sup> and the soil was low in OC (0.41%) and available N<sub>2</sub>, P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> and K<sub>2</sub>O (184.0, 18.7 and 88.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> respectively).

The treatments included five cropping systems viz., rice-blackgram (S<sub>1</sub>), rice-cotton (S<sub>2</sub>), rice-soybean (S<sub>3</sub>), rice-vegetable cowpea (S<sub>4</sub>) and rice-sesame (S<sub>5</sub>) and four levels of N application to rice viz., 0(N<sub>0</sub>), 75(N<sub>1</sub>), 112.5(N<sub>2</sub>) or 150(N<sub>3</sub>) kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in all the systems. The experiments were laid out in a split plot design with three replications, assigning the cropping systems to main plots and N levels to rice in sub-plots. The medium duration rice cv. ADT 39 (120-125 days duration) was transplanted at a planting density of 66 hills per sq.m. The rice-fallow crops were sown as per the treatment after the harvest of rice crop. Recommended package of practices were followed

Table 1a. Economic produce of the component crops in cropping systems (early sowing)

| System                                   | Yield of rice (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) |                |                |                |      | Yield of rice-fallow crops (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )* |                |                |                |      |
|--|--------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|------|
|  | N <sub>0</sub>                       | N <sub>1</sub> | N <sub>2</sub> | N <sub>3</sub> | Mean | N <sub>0</sub>                                     | N <sub>1</sub> | N <sub>2</sub> | N <sub>3</sub> | Mean |
| S <sub>1</sub> : Rice - blackgram        | 1997                                 | 4053           | 4833           | 5340           | 4056 | 292  | 492            | 797            | 981            | 640  |
| S <sub>2</sub> : Rice - cotton           | 1820                                 | 4367           | 5543           | 6050           | 4445 | 1515   | 1805           | 1991           | 2127           | 1859 |
| S <sub>3</sub> : Rice - Soybean          | 1853                                 | 4310           | 5393           | 6077           | 4408 | 387  | 732            | 836            | 939            | 724  |
| S <sub>4</sub> : Rice - Vegetable cowpea | 1957                                 | 4157           | 5210           | 5813           | 4284 | 2918   | 4450           | 5197           | 5700           | 4567 |
| S <sub>5</sub> : Rice - Sesame           | 1770                                 | 3760           | 5027           | 5700           | 4064 | 204  | 421            | 614            | 751            | 498  |
| Mean                                     | 1880                                 | 4130           | 5200           | 5800           |      |  |                |                |                |      |
|  |                                      | S.Em. ±        | C.D. at 0.05   |                |      | Not analysed                                       |                |                |                |      |
| For S                                    |                                      | 156            | 510            |                |      |  |                |                |                |      |
| For N                                    |                                      | 122            | 352            |                |      |  |                |                |                |      |
| For N at S                               |                                      | 273            | 786            |                |      |  |                |                |                |      |
| For S at N                               |                                      | 283            | 849            |                |      |  |                |                |                |      |

\* Data are mean of two years (1993-94 and 1994-95)

Table 1b. Economic produce of the component crops in cropping systems (late sowing)

| System                                   | Yield of rice (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) |                |                |                |      | Yield of rice-fallow crops (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )* |                |                |                |      |
|--|--------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|------|
|  | N <sub>0</sub>                       | N <sub>1</sub> | N <sub>2</sub> | N <sub>3</sub> | Mean | N <sub>0</sub>                                     | N <sub>1</sub> | N <sub>2</sub> | N <sub>3</sub> | Mean |
| S <sub>1</sub> : Rice - blackgram        | 1880                                 | 3267           | 4330           | 4950           | 3607 | 240  | 367            | 534            | 690            | 458  |
| S <sub>2</sub> : Rice - cotton           | 1673                                 | 3363           | 4847           | 5217           | 3775 | 1350   | 1577           | 1852           | 1943           | 1680 |
| S <sub>3</sub> : Rice - Soybean          | 1583                                 | 3057           | 4283           | 5010           | 3483 | 336  | 580            | 749            | 795            | 615  |
| S <sub>4</sub> : Rice - Vegetable cowpea | 1790                                 | 3197           | 4563           | 5340           | 3723 | 2689   | 3855           | 4499           | 4855           | 3974 |
| S <sub>5</sub> : Rice - Sesame           | 1673                                 | 2923           | 4113           | 4817           | 3382 | 181  | 407            | 566            | 721            | 468  |
| Mean                                     | 1720                                 | 3160           | 4430           | 5070           |      |  |                |                |                |      |
|  |                                      | S.E.m. ±       | C.D. at 0.05   |                |      | Not analysed                                       |                |                |                |      |
| For S                                    |                                      | 72             | 235            |                |      |  |                |                |                |      |
| For N                                    |                                      | 45             | 130            |                |      |  |                |                |                |      |
| For N at S                               |                                      | 101            | 290            |                |      |  |                |                |                |      |
| For S at N                               |                                      | 113            | 343            |                |      |  |                |                |                |      |

\* Data are mean of two years (1993-94 and 1994-95)

for rice and the rice-fallow crops (CPG, 1994).

The parameters like yield of component crops, Rice Yield Equivalent (RYE), per day productivity of cropping systems and economics were used for evaluating the systems. The RYE of the cropping systems were calculated as per the method suggested by De et. al (1978). Pooled analysis of the data was carried out.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Effect of N levels on yield of rice and rice-fallow crops

A positive relationship between rice yield and N level was observed in all the systems in both the experiments (Tables 1a and 1b). The mean grain yield was 202 per cent higher at 150 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> over control. The increased grain yield is attributed to the production of more number of productive tillers hill<sup>-1</sup> and grains panicle<sup>-1</sup> and higher test weight. In addition, the increase in N level increased the LAI which would have helped the plants in utilizing the solar light more efficiently resulting in higher yields. This falls in line with the findings of Wankhade and Pandrangi (1988) and Thiagarajan et. al (1994).

The increase in N level to rice increased not only the yield of rice but also the yield of rice-fallow crops. This may be attributed to the reason

that application of higher levels of N to rice increased the residue addition to soil by rice which upon mineralization would have released more nutrients for the rice-fallow crops.

### Rice Yield Equivalent

Due to the diversity in crop yields, the economic produce of the system was varied and hence it may not be a meaningful parameter to evaluate the performance of the cropping systems. The Rice Yield Equivalent (RYE) would be the ideal yardstick to compare the production potential of the cropping systems, since the yields of different crops are converted into yields equivalent that of rice. The RYE differed significantly due to systems and N levels to rice (Table 2). The system S<sub>2</sub> registered the maximum RYE (9576 to 11066 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) followed by S<sub>4</sub> (7154 to 8192 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and the increase in yield was 95 and 44 per cent over the conventional system (S<sub>1</sub>), respectively. This is due to higher economic value of cotton in S<sub>2</sub> and higher yield of *samba* rice and green pods in S<sub>4</sub>.

### Per day productivity of biomass

Significant and higher per day productivity of biomass (Table 3) was recorded in S<sub>4</sub> (76.29 to 90.42 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> day<sup>-1</sup>) followed by S<sub>2</sub> (62.19 to 72.08 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> day<sup>-1</sup>). The system S<sub>1</sub> recorded the lowest per day productivity which was on par with S<sub>5</sub>. An

Table 2. Rice Yield Equivalent (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) of cropping systems

| System                                   | Early sowing (September)* |                |                |                |       | Late sowing (October)* |                |                |                |      |
|--|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------|------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------|
|  | N <sub>0</sub>            | N <sub>1</sub> | N <sub>2</sub> | N <sub>3</sub> | Mean  | N <sub>0</sub>         | N <sub>1</sub> | N <sub>2</sub> | N <sub>3</sub> | Mean |
| S <sub>1</sub> : Rice - blackgram        | 2841                      | 5478           | 6419           | 8178           | 5729  | 2577                   | 4329           | 5876           | 6947           | 4932 |
| S <sub>2</sub> : Rice - cotton           | 7218                      | 10789          | 12631          | 13626          | 11066 | 6475                   | 8976           | 11440          | 12133          | 9756 |
| S <sub>3</sub> : Rice - Soybean          | 2695                      | 5899           | 7206           | 8113           | 5978  | 2313                   | 4319           | 5909           | 3734           | 4819 |
| S <sub>4</sub> : Rice - Vegetable cowpea | 4453                      | 7970           | 9656           | 10689          | 8192  | 4090                   | 6492           | 8529           | 9504           | 7154 |
| S <sub>5</sub> : Rice - Sesame           | 2764                      | 5813           | 8016           | 9365           | 6490  | 2554                   | 4893           | 6871           | 8314           | 5658 |
| Mean                                     | 3994                      | 7190           | 8786           | 9994           |       | 3602                   | 5802           | 7725           | 8727           |      |
|  |                           | S.Em. ±        | C.D. at 0.05   |                |       |                        | S.Em. ±        | C.D. at 0.05   |                |      |
| For S                                    |                           | 627            | 2043           |                |       |                        | 273            | 891            |                |      |
| For N                                    |                           | 467            | 1347           |                |       |                        | 226            | 652            |                |      |
| For N at S                               |                           | 209            | 603            |                |       |                        | 101            | 291            |                |      |
| For S at N                               |                           | 276            | 857            |                |       |                        | 126            | 389            |                |      |

\* Data are mean of two years (1993-94 and 1994-95)

increasing trend was observed in all the systems with increasing levels of N to rice.

The production potential of the system was higher when sown in september than in October. Delaying the sowing by one month lead to poor performance of samba rice as well as rice-fallow

crops which ultimately reduced the production potential of the system. The poor performance of rice as well as rice-fallow crops when sown in October as compared to September may be attributed to reduced solar radiation, higher relative humidity and low temperature prevailed during crop growth period. Similar results were also

Table 3. Per day productivity of biomass (kg ha<sup>-1</sup> day<sup>-1</sup>)

| System                                   | Early sowing (September)* |                 |                |                |                | Late sowing (October)* |                 |                |                |                |                |       |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------|
|  | Total duration (days)     | Nitrogen levels |                |                |                | Total duration (days)  | Nitrogen levels |                |                |                |                |       |
|  |                           | N <sub>0</sub>  | N <sub>1</sub> | N <sub>2</sub> | N <sub>3</sub> |                        | Mean            | N <sub>0</sub> | N <sub>1</sub> | N <sub>2</sub> | N <sub>3</sub> | Mean  |
| S <sub>1</sub> : Rice - blackgram        | 187                       | 32.17           | 58.93          | 72.45          | 79.21          | 60.69                  | 183             | 31.82          | 51.70          | 66.05          | 74.16          | 55.93 |
| S <sub>2</sub> : Rice - cotton           | 255                       | 42.41           | 69.13          | 78.92          | 83.63          | 68.52                  | 252             | 39.57          | 59.16          | 73.80          | 77.64          | 62.54 |
| S <sub>3</sub> : Rice - Soybean          | 206                       | 29.71           | 61.29          | 71.44          | 78.37          | 60.20                  | 205             | 25.97          | 47.25          | 61.28          | 68.53          | 50.76 |
| S <sub>4</sub> : Rice - Vegetable cowpea | 196                       | 48.25           | 85.77          | 100.18         | 107.77         | 85.49                  | 194             | 45.42          | 70.80          | 91.98          | 100.55         | 77.19 |
| S <sub>5</sub> : Rice - Sesame           | 210                       | 27.14           | 53.82          | 69.42          | 79.17          | 57.39                  | 207             | 26.09          | 45.72          | 60.95          | 72.18          | 51.23 |
| Mean                                     |                           | 35.94           | 65.79          | 78.48          | 85.63          |                        | 33.77           | 54.92          | 70.81          | 78.61          |                |       |
|  |                           | S.Ed            | C.D. at 0.005  |                |                |                        | S.Ed            | C.D. at 0.005  |                |                |                |       |
| For S                                    |                           | 4.37            | 14.26          |                |                |                        | 2.28            | 7.44           |                |                |                |       |
| For N                                    |                           | 2.53            | 7.32           |                |                |                        | 2.83            | 8.17           |                |                |                |       |
| For N at S                               |                           | 1.13            | 3.27           |                |                |                        | 1.27            | 3.65           |                |                |                |       |
| For S at N                               |                           | 1.76            | 5.53           |                |                |                        | 1.33            | 4.01           |                |                |                |       |

\* Data are mean of two years (1993-94 and 1994-95)

Table 4. Economics of cropping systems

| System                                   | Early sowing (September)*                  |                                      |                                    |        | Late sowing (October)*               |                                    |        |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|
|  | Cost of cultivation (Rs ha <sup>-1</sup> ) | Gross Returns (Rs ha <sup>-1</sup> ) | Net Returns (Rs ha <sup>-1</sup> ) | C:B    | Gross Returns (Rs ha <sup>-1</sup> ) | Net Returns (Rs ha <sup>-1</sup> ) | C:B    |
| S <sub>1</sub> : Rice - blackgram        | 14494                                      | 25206                                | 10712                              | 1:1.74 | 21447                                | 6953                               | 1:1.48 |
| S <sub>2</sub> : Rice - cotton           | 22443                                      | 45377                                | 22934                              | 1:2.02 | 40198                                | 17755                              | 1:1.79 |
| S <sub>3</sub> : Rice - Soybean          | 14869                                      | 25186                                | 10317                              | 1:1.69 | 20857                                | 5988                               | 1:1.40 |
| S <sub>4</sub> : Rice - Vegetable cowpea | 18508                                      | 33662                                | 15154                              | 1:1.82 | 29945                                | 11437                              | 1:1.62 |
| S <sub>5</sub> : Rice - Sesame           | 16376                                      | 27569                                | 11193                              | 1:1.68 | 23992                                | 7616                               | 1:1.47 |

(Not analysed)

\* Data are mean of two years (1993-94 and 1994-95)

obtained at Tamil Nadu Rice Research Institute, Aduthurai, Tamil Nadu (Anon. 1996).

### Economics

Among the systems, S<sub>2</sub> required the highest investment which was 55 per cent higher than the conventional system (Table 4) owing to higher fertiliser and labour requirement. It resulted in maximum gross and net returns which were 84 and 135 per cent higher than the conventional system, respectively with a C:B ratio of 1:1.79 to 1:2.02. This may be attributed to the higher potential of the system and higher market value of cotton. This is in line with the findings of Ram et al. (1991) who also recorded the highest net profit in rice-cotton system. The next best system was S<sub>4</sub> which recorded a net returns of Rs. 11,437 to Rs. 15,154 and 53 per cent higher than S<sub>1</sub> with a C:B ratio of 1:1.62 to 1:1.82. Jayakumar and Alagappan (1994) had reported a C:B ratio of 1:2.76 in rice-cowpea system. The systems S<sub>3</sub> and S<sub>5</sub> recorded lower C:B ratio than S<sub>1</sub> due to higher added cost and lesser added returns.

Cognizing the several parameters in unison, the system S<sub>2</sub> (rice-cotton) is brought into limelight as a preferable alternative for the single rice based lowland situation in both early (September) and late (October) sowings, when water is not a constraint / irrigation is supplemented to give 10 irrigations during rice-fallow period. The next system characterized by favourable economic incentives was S<sub>4</sub> (rice-vegetable cowpea) which can be preferred when water is available for five irrigations during rice-fallow period. The system S<sub>5</sub> (rice-sesame) performed well over the

conventional system S<sub>1</sub> (rice-blackgram) and is preferable in areas of limited water supply with two irrigations during rice-fallow period. It was also found that application of 150 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> to rice increased not only the rice yield but also the total yield potential of the cropping system in single rice based lowland situation.

### REFERENCES

- ANONYMOUS. (1996). Influence of planting time on grain yield of rice varieties in samba/thaladi seasons. *IRRI Report*, Tamil Nadu Rice Research Institute, Tamil Nadu Agric. Univ., Aduthurai, Tamil Nadu, India.
- CPG. (1994). Crop Production Guide. Dept. of Agriculture and Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.
- DE. R.S. GUPTA, S.P. SINGH, M. PAL, S.N. SINGH, R.N. SHARMA and S.K. KAUSHIK (1978). intercropping maize, sorghum and pearl millet with short duration grain legumes. *Indian J. Agric. Sci.*, 48: 132-137.
- JAYAKUMAR, K. AND RM. ALAGAPPAN. (1994). Studies on rice-based cropping system. *Madras Agric. J.* 81(3): 152-153.
- RAM, G., B.S. JOSHI and K.S. PANDYA. (1991). An economic analysis of rice-based rabi crops under assured irrigation. *Indian J. Agric. Res.*, 25(4): 206 - 210.
- TJHAGARAJAN, T.M., R. SIVASAMY and H.F.M. TEN BERGE. (1994). Nitrogen and Rice: Influence of nitrogen application levels and strategy on growth, leaf nitrogen content and nitrogen use efficiency. In: *SARP Res. Proc.* Los Banos, Philippines. pp 56-69.
- WANKHADE, S.G. AND R.B. PANDRANGI. (1988) Growth and nutrient uptake behaviour of upland paddy as influenced by N and P fertilization. *Ann. Rev. Physiol.* 2: 30-36.

(Received : August 1998 Revised : September 1999)