*International Journal of Plant & Soil Science*

***Volume 36, Issue 7, Page 711-719, 2024; Article no.IJPSS.117771***
***ISSN: 2320-7035***

# Suitability of Sprinkler and Drip Irrigation in Transplanted and Direct Seeded Rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) in Haryana, India

**Mangat Ram [a++*], B. R. Kamboj [b#] and Neeraj Sharma [c†]**

*[a] Rice Research Station (CCSHAU Hisar) Kaul, Haryana, India.*
*[b] Department of Agronomy, CCSHAU Hisar and Presently Vice Chancellor CCSHAU Hisar, India.*
*[c] Command Area Development Authority (CADA), Kurukshetra, Haryana, India.*

***Authors' contributions***

*This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.*

***Article Information***

DOI: https://doi.org/10.9734/ijpss/2024/v36i74783

**Open Peer Review History:**
This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/117771

***Original Research Article***

***Received: 18/04/2024***
***Accepted: 20/06/2024***
***Published: 26/06/2024***

## ABSTRACT

On-farm trials on rice crop were conducted at farmer field over a span of three years (2018, 2019 and 2020) to assess the effectiveness of micro-irrigation methods (specifically drip and sprinkler irrigation) on water usage and crop yield in rice cultivation. The aim was to compare these methods with the conventional surface irrigation (flooding) method both in transplanted (manually or mechanically) and direct seeded rice so as to determine the feasibility of micro-irrigation in rice to tackle the problem of groundwater depletion in Haryana. In transplanted rice (TPR), grain yield

*[++] Principal Scientist (Agronomy);*
*[#] Professor (Agronomy);*
*[†] Executive Engineer;*
**Corresponding author: E-mail: mangatram004@yahoo.com;*

***Cite as:*** *Ram, Mangat, B. R. Kamboj, and Neeraj Sharma. 2024. "Suitability of Sprinkler and Drip Irrigation in Transplanted and Direct Seeded Rice (Oryza Sativa L.) in Haryana, India". International Journal of Plant & Soil Science 36 (7):711-19. https://doi.org/10.9734/ijpss/2024/v36i74783.*

obtained with drip and sprinkler irrigation was statistically similar to that obtained with conventional method. But the yield of direct seeded rice (DSR) increased significantly (15.1- 21.1% increase) when it was irrigated by drip or sprinkler methods than by conventional method. The yield of DSR was significantly lower than that of TPR when it was irrigated by conventional surface flooding method but the DSR yielded at par with TPR when irrigated by drip or sprinkler method. The grain yield of the crop obtained with drip and sprinkler irrigation was at par, irrespective of the crop establishment techniques. Over the conventional irrigation, the drip and sprinkler irrigation saved 54.4-57.2% and 47.4-49.0% of irrigation water, respectively in TPR whereas the saving of irrigation water over the conventional method in DSR was 52.5-53.9% and 38.3-39.3%, respectively. Irrespective of establishment techniques, the highest water use efficiency was achieved with drip irrigation (6.73-9.46 kg/ha/mm), followed by sprinkler irrigation (5.66-7.85 kg/ha/mm) whereas it was the lowest with the conventional irrigation (3.28-3.55 kg/ha/mm). It is evident from the findings that it is feasible to adopt sprinkler irrigation in rice (both in TPR and DSR) as it saved substantial quantity of irrigation water without any penalty in yield and net profit in TPR and even increased the yield and net profit in DSR over the conventional irrigation method. Therefore, sprinkler irrigation can be an effective strategy to manage the depletion of groundwater in Haryana. On the other hand, the drip irrigation, despite saving more water and being comparable to the sprinkler irrigation in respect of its effect on yield, may not be economically viable due to its higher initial cost.

*Keywords: Drip; sprinkler; transplanting; direct seeding; water use efficiency; water saving.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) is the most important *Kharif* season food crop in the irrigated areas of north western Indo-Gangetic Plains of India, particularly Punjab and Haryana and plays a vital role in food security of the country. Rice in this region is grown conventionally by transplanting (usually manual) technique of crop establishment. Transplanting can also be done mechanically (by transplanter) which tackles the problem of labour scarcity besides ensuring the desired plant population per unit area [1]. But the transplanted (manually or mechanically) rice requires large quantity of water for field preparation (puddling) and maintenance of submergence for most part of the crop growing period. It has been reported that 1357-1666 mm of irrigation water in transplanted rice (TPR) is required to obtain higher yield [2]. The higher water requirement of the crop in Punjab and Haryana is met largely through the use of groundwater as it is the principal source of irrigation in the region. This has led to over-exploitation of groundwater resources as evident from the water table decline at an alarming rate of 0.33 m per year [3]. Apart from depleting the groundwater resources, it has resulted into higher cost of pumping water [4] due to high cost of installation and maintenance of large pump sets (deep tube wells) as well as high electricity consumption to operate them.

Therefore, there is urgent need to adopt water saving techniques to sustain the rice production while preserving the precious groundwater resources. Direct seeding, a water saving establishment technique of growing rice under unpuddled and unflooded (aerobic) conditions, offers a good alternative to transplanting as it saves extra water required for puddling and maintenance of submerged conditions besides avoiding labour for transplanting. The direct seeded rice (DSR) has been reported to save about 20% of irrigation water over the conventional TPR [5]. However, possible reduction in the yield of direct seeded high yielding rice cultivars irrigated by conventional flood irrigation [4,6] is one of the main obstacles to wide adoption of direct seeding. Moreover, extent of water saved by DSR seems to be insufficient to arrest the depletion of the groundwater to the desired extent.

Therefore, adoption of highly efficient irrigation methods may be the best option to save adequate amount of groundwater used for rice irrigation without sacrificing the crop yield. Use of micro-irrigation methods like sprinkler and drip irrigation in rice can be a pragmatic approach to address the aforesaid concerns as reports from other parts of the country have shown that micro-irrigation can save 40% water over the conventional flooding method in rice [7]. But there is inadequate information on performance of the sprinkler and drip irrigation in rice in Haryana. The current field experiment was carried out to assess the effectiveness of drip and sprinkler irrigation methods in rice cultivation (both in TPR and DSR) in terms of yield, water use efficiency, and economic viability. The objective was to determine the suitability of these irrigation techniques for rice cultivation in Haryana.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The field experiment was conducted during *kharif* (hot-rainy) season of 2018, 2019 and 2020 at a farmer's field in village Dera Fateh Singh situated near Pehowa town ($30^0$ 04' N, $76^0$ 78' E, 247 m above mean sea level) in Kurukshetra district, Haryana with facilities of micro-irrigation established by CADA (Command Area Development Authority), Haryana. The soil of the experimental site was clay loam in texture, alkaline in reaction (pH 7.9), low in organic carbon (0.38%), low in available N (140 kg/ha), medium in available phosphorus (15 kg P/ha) and high in available potassium (290 kg K/ha). Bulk density of the soil was 1.55 g/cc with infiltration rate of 2.8 mm/hr. The experimental site experiences a typical subtropical and semi-arid climate with more than 70% of the total annual rainfall occurring during July to September with August being the wettest month. The mean maximum temperature peaks in June at around 43°C, then decreases to about 33°C in October during the rice crop's maturation. Conversely, the mean minimum temperature is usually 22°C in October and 32°C in June. Rainfall during growing period of the experimental crop was measured using a rain gauge at the site, resulting in 328 mm, 222 mm, and 314 mm in 2018, 2019, and 2020, respectively.

The experiment included three different techniques for establishing rice, namely direct seeding (DS), mechanical transplanting (MT) and conventional manual transplanting (CMT) and three irrigation methods viz. sprinkler (SRL), drip (DRP) and conventional surface flooding (CSF). The treatments were laid out in split plot design keeping the establishment techniques in main plots (of size 10500 $m^2$ each) and the irrigation methods in sub-plots (3500 $m^2$ each). The experimental area underwent precise levelling using a laser leveller prior to the commencement of the experiment. This was done to ensure the uniform distribution of water throughout the area. The plots for direct seeding were prepared by ploughing twice with disc harrow and once with power tiller followed by planking while the plots for transplanting (manual or mechanical) were prepared by ploughing twice with disc harrow followed by puddling (twice) and planking (once). Popular high yielding rice varieties of different duration (days taken from sowing to maturity) viz. PR 114 (135 days), PR 126 (124 days) and PR 121 (129 days) were used in the study during 2018, 2019 and 2020, respectively. The direct seeded rice was sown on May 27, May 30 and June 1 during 2018, 2019 and 2020, respectively by seed cum fertilizer drill in rows 20 cm apart utilizing a seed rate of 20 kg/ha and irrigated with 60 mm water immediately after sowing to provide moisture for germination of seeds. Nursery for manual and mechanical transplanting was sown on the same day (day of DSR sowing) and 10 days later, respectively. In manual transplanting, 30 days old rice seedlings raised in conventional nursery were transplanted in puddled field as per the farmers' practice (18-20 plants or hills/$m^2$). In mechanical transplanting, 20 days old seedlings (grown on mat type nursery) were transplanted in puddled field by self-propelled paddy transplanter at a spacing of 23.5 x 14 cm (30 hills/$m^2$).

Water for irrigation in micro-irrigation systems was transported through PVC pipes after filtering through the screen filter by 7.5 HP motor from the bore well. In drip irrigation system, polyethylene laterals having in-line emitters (40 cm apart with a discharge rate of 2.4 lph) were laid in the field in rows 60 cm apart and the pressure maintained in the system was 1.2 kg/$cm^2$. In sprinkler irrigation system, mini-sprinklers with a wetted radius of 10 m and flow rate of 434 lph were placed in the field at 10 x 10 m spacing with their nozzles mounted at 1.3 m height and were operated at a pressure of 2.5 kg/$cm^2$. In plots to be irrigated with drip and sprinkler methods, the drip and sprinkler systems were laid in the crop field at 15 days after sowing (DAS) in DSR and 15 days after transplanting (DAT) in TPR (manual or mechanical) and thereafter, such plots were irrigated by drip and sprinkler systems. Before start of the drip and sprinkler irrigation at 15 DAS or 15 DAT, all the plots under DSR received two irrigations (50 mm each) at 5 and 10 DAS through the conventional surface flooding method, while all the plots under TPR received frequent light irrigation (also with conventional method) to maintain shallow submergence (3-5 cm water) in the field. In conventional surface flooding method, the plots of DSR, after receiving irrigation at 5 and 10 DAS, were irrigated (50 mm each) at 5 days after disappearance of ponded water (DADPW). The plots of conventionally irrigated TPR, after getting frequent light irrigation for maintaining shallow submergence up to 15 DAT, received irrigations (50 mm each) at 1 DADPW up to panicle initiation stage and at 2 DADPW thereafter. In addition, irrigation through the drip and sprinkler systems was applied at 1 DADPW to the extent that soil got saturated with water and shallow water ponding (1-2 cm) appeared on the soil surface. Irrigation in all the plots was stopped at least a week before the crop maturity.

Fertilizer dose at the rate of 150 kg N (through urea), 60 kg $P_2O_5$ (through single superphosphate), 60 kg $K_2O$ (through muriate of potash) and 5 kg Zn (through 25 kg zinc sulphate containing 21% Zn) per ha was applied to the crop each year. In both DSR and TPR, full dose of P, K and Zn was applied as basal (at sowing or transplanting). In TPR, N was applied in three equal splits at transplanting, 21 DAT and 42 DAT. In DSR, N was also applied in 3 equal splits at 3, 6 and 9 weeks after sowing. Weeds in TPR were controlled by applying butachlor 1.5 kg/ha at 2-3 DAT but weeds in DSR were controlled by sequential application (spray) of pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha as pre-emergence and bispyribac sodium 25 g/ha at 25 DAS.

The crop parameters, including number of effective tillers/$m^2$, grain weight/panicle and grain yield (kg/ha) were recorded at the crop maturity from seven replications or plots (500 $m^2$ each) of each sub-plot. Number of effective tillers were recorded with a quadrate (0.5 x 0.4 m) placed randomly in each plot. At the same time, ten panicles were also taken randomly from each plot and their grains (obtained after threshing the panicles) were weighed (after drying to 14% moisture) to determine grain weight/panicle. The matured crop from each plot was manually harvested and threshed to record the grain yield/plot and expressed in kg/ha at 14% moisture content. Data on various parameters were analyzed statistically to determine the critical difference (CD) at 5% level of significance (p=0.05) to compare the treatment effects. Quantity of water applied to sub-plots was measured by water meter. The calculation of water use efficiency (WUE) involved determining grain yield per total water received through irrigation and rainfall [4]. Production cost of different treatments was worked out with the assumption that salvage value of different components of drip and sprinkler systems will be zero after their useful life (assumed as 10 years). Fixed cost of the micro-irrigation systems per ha per season (assuming two crop seasons per year for 10 years) was determined by the approach of James and Lee [8] as also used by Singh et al. [9] considering interest rate as 7%. Net return (Rs./ha) was estimated by the difference of gross return (estimated by multiplying grain yield with its minimum support price) and cost of cultivation and was averaged over the period of three years.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 3.1 Grain Yield and Its Attributes

Throughout the study period (as shown in Table 1), the average grain yield of rice crop was consistently higher when using transplanting technique (either manual or mechanical) compared to direct seeding. This can be attributed to more effective tillers or panicles/$m^2$ in mechanical transplanting and higher grain weight/panicle in both mechanical and manual transplanting than in direct seeding. The manual transplanting, despite having fewer panicles/$m^2$ than mechanical transplanting, yielded at par with the latter as it had significantly higher grain weight/panicle. Kumar and Ladha [10] as well as Singh et al. [9] have also documented a decrease in grain yield of high yielding rice cultivars when grown under direct seeded conventionally irrigated conditions. Mean number of effective tillers/$m^2$ (averaged over establishment techniques) and consequently the mean grain yield was significantly higher with micro-irrigation than with conventional irrigation while the drip and sprinkler irrigation yielded at par with each other during all the years.

Interaction between the crop establishment techniques and irrigation methods was found to be significant in respect of grain yield (Table 2). The findings indicated that the grain yield of DSR was significantly higher (15.5-21.1%) when it was irrigated by drip or sprinkler method than by conventional method during all the years of investigation. This might be due to the fact that micro-irrigation supplied water to the plants at the required interval and in desired quantity [11] whereas the plants irrigated by the conventional method might have suffered due to moisture stress during the period between two irrigations as the water applied by conventional irrigation was subjected to percolation and other application losses in the field. Parthasarthy et al [12] also reported higher yield of drip irrigated DSR compared to conventionally irrigated DSR. However, the yield of drip and sprinkler irrigated TPR (manual or mechanical) was at par with that of the conventionally irrigated TPR which might be the consequence of higher frequency of irrigation both in conventional and micro-irrigation methods in TPR which avoided water stress to the crop. Moreover, the DSR irrigated with drip or sprinkler methods yielded statistically at par with TPR (manual or mechanical) irrigated by conventional or micro-irrigation methods, indicating that regular supply of moisture through micro-irrigation is needed to prevent the yield penalty in DSR. The lowest grain yield was obtained with DSR when it was irrigated by conventional method. The results are also in agreement with that reported by Sharda et al. [7] and Singh et al. [11].

### 3.2 Water Requirement and Water Use Efficiency

The irrigation water quantity applied and total water requirement of the crop (Table 3) varied widely during various years of experimentation, depending upon the varieties or their duration and climatic factors viz. rainfall. The manually transplanted crop was comparable with mechanically transplanted crop in respect of the water applied for irrigation and total water requirement. When averaged over the irrigation methods, quantity of irrigation water applied and total water requirement of the crop was reduced by 11.2-13.8% and 9.0-10.6%, respectively in direct seeding as compared to that in transplanting (CMT or MT) during the three years. Irrespective of the establishment methods, quantity of irrigation water applied as well as total water requirement of the crop was minimum with drip irrigation, followed by that with sprinkler irrigation and maximum with conventional irrigation during all the years of experimentation.

The drip irrigated DSR exhibited the lowest irrigation (556-632 mm) and water requirement (778-946 mm) when examined across the years. In transplanted (manual or mechanical) rice, drip and sprinkler irrigation required 631-727 mm and 727-853 mm of irrigation water, respectively as against 1403-1651 mm applied in conventional flooding irrigation during various years of experimentation, thus saving 54.4-57.2% and 47.4-49.0% of irrigation water, respectively over the conventional irrigation (Table 3). The saving of applied irrigation water was, however, comparatively less in DSR with drip and sprinkler irrigation requiring 556-632 mm (52.5-53.9% saving) and 723-820 mm (38.3-39.3% saving) of irrigation water against 1171-1352 mm applied in conventional irrigation. Accordingly, total water requirement of TPR with drip and sprinkler irrigation was 853-1041 mm and 949-1167 mm, respectively as compared to 1142-1391 mm with conventional irrigation which revealed that the total water requirement of TPR was reduced by 46.2-47.5% and 39.0-41.6% under drip and sprinkler irrigation, respectively. However, the reduction in the total water requirement of DSR was 42.8-44.1% and 30.8-32.1% under drip and sprinkler irrigation, respectively. Total water requirement of both the transplanting techniques was at par obviously due to similar quantity of water applied.

**Table 1. Effect of crop establishment techniques and irrigation methods on yield attributes and grain yield of rice crop**

| Treatment | Number of effective tillers/m$^2$ | | | Weight of grains/ panicle (g) | | | Grain yield (kg/ha) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| **Establishment techniques** | | | | | | | | | |
| DS | 263 | 250 | 240 | 3.18 | 3.68 | 3.61 | 5901 | 6940 | 6250 |
| MT | 301 | 291 | 274 | 2.80 | 3.41 | 3.28 | 6615 | 7487 | 6939 |
| CMT | 283 | 274 | 259 | 2.64 | 3.24 | 3.05 | 6612 | 7469 | 6962 |
| CD (p=0.05) | 7 | 9 | 12 | 0.10 | 0.13 | 0.08 | 395 | 331 | 286 |
| **Irrigation methods** | | | | | | | | | |
| SRL | 288 | 279 | 261 | 2.86 | 3.48 | 3.34 | 6466 | 7441 | 6860 |
| DRP | 285 | 276 | 264 | 2.93 | 3.41 | 3.34 | 6550 | 7476 | 6878 |
| CSF | 274 | 260 | 247 | 2.83 | 3.43 | 3.27 | 6111 | 6980 | 6414 |
| CD (p=0.05) | 10 | 9 | 10 | NS | NS | NS | 292 | 234 | 288 |

*CMT: DS: direct seeding; MT: mechanical transplanting; CMT: conventional manual transplanting; SKL: sprinkler; DRP: drip; CSF: conventional surface flooding*

**Table 2. Effect of various irrigation methods on grain yield (kg/ha) of rice under different crop establishment techniques**

| Establishment techniques (E) | Irrigation methods (I) | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2018 | | | 2019 | | | 2020 | | |
| | SRL | DRP | CSF | SRL | DRP | CSF | SRL | DRP | CSF |
| DS | 6244 | 6276 | 5184 | 7215 | 7358 | 6248 | 6572 | 6664 | 5516 |
| MT | 6599 | 6715 | 6530 | 7530 | 7563 | 7368 | 6971 | 6968 | 6878 |
| CMT | 6556 | 6660 | 6620 | 7577 | 7507 | 7324 | 7035 | 7003 | 6848 |

*CD (p=0.05) for interaction (E x I) 524 (2018), 420 (2019), 510 (2020)*

**Table 3. Irrigation water applied, total water requirement and water use efficiency of rice as influenced by irrigation methods under different crop establishment techniques**

| Establishment techniques (E) | Irrigation methods (I) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2018 | | | | 2019 | | | | 2020 | | | |
| | Irrigation water applied (mm) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | SRL | DRP | CSF | Mean | SRL | DRP | CSF | Mean | SRL | DRP | CSF | Mean |
| DS | 766 (38.9) | 577 (53.9) | 1253 | 865 | 723 (38.3) | 556 (52.5) | 1171 | 817 | 820 (39.3) | 632 (53.3) | 1352 | 935 |
| MT | 793 (47.4) | 660 (56.3) | 1509 | 987 | 727 (47.5) | 631(54.4) | 1403 | 920 | 836 (49.0) | 711 (56.5) | 1636 | 1061 |
| CMT | 800 (48.3) | 662 (57.2) | 1548 | 1003 | 743 (48.0) | 646(54.8) | 1430 | 940 | 853 (48.3) | 727 (56.0) | 1651 | 1077 |
| Mean | 786 | 633 | 1437 | | 731 | 611 | 1335 | | 836 | 690 | 1546 | |
| | Total water requirement (mm) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DS | 1094 (30.8) | 905 (42.8) | 1581 | 1193 | 945 (32.1) | 778 (44.1) | 1393 | 1039 | 1134 (31.9) | 946 (43.2) | 1666 | 1249 |
| MT | 1121 (39.0) | 988 (46.2) | 1837 | 1315 | 949 (41.6) | 853 (47.5) | 1625 | 1142 | 1150 (41.0) | 1025 (47.4) | 1950 | 1375 |
| CMT | 1128 (39.9) | 990 (47.2) | 1876 | 1331 | 965 (41.6) | 868 (47.5) | 1652 | 1162 | 1167 (40.6) | 1041 (47.0) | 1965 | 1391 |
| Mean | 1114 | 961 | 1765 | | 953 | 833 | 1557 | | 1150 | 1004 | 1860 | |
| | Water use efficiency (kg/ha/mm) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DS | 5.81 | 6.73 | 3.53 | 5.36 | 7.85 | 8.65 | 4.43 | 6.98 | 6.03 | 6.73 | 3.48 | 5.41 |
| MT | 5.93 | 6.80 | 3.55 | 5.43 | 7.94 | 8.87 | 4.53 | 7.11 | 6.06 | 6.80 | 3.53 | 5.46 |
| CMT | 5.66 | 6.94 | 3.28 | 5.29 | 7.63 | 9.46 | 4.48 | 7.19 | 5.80 | 7.05 | 3.31 | 5.38 |
| Mean | 5.80 | 6.82 | 3.45 | | 7.81 | 8.99 | 4.48 | | 5.96 | 6.86 | 3.44 | |

*CD (p=0.05) for E: NS (for all the years); CD (p=0.05) for I: 0.24 (2018), 0.23 (2019), 0.24 (2020); CD (p=0.05) for E x I: NS (for all the years)*
*Figures in parentheses show the water saved (%) by drip and sprinkler irrigation over conventional irrigation in the same establishment technique*

**Table 4. Effect of irrigation methods on average (over 3 years) net profit (Rs./ha) under different crop establishment techniques (Rs./ha)**

| Establishment techniques (E) | Irrigation methods (I) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | SRL | DRP | CSF | Mean |
| DS | 50875 | 42902 | 40433 | 44737 |
| MT | 47513 | 38189 | 53304 | 46335 |
| CMT | 46816 | 36914 | 52596 | 45442 |
| Mean | 48401 | 39335 | 48778 | |

*CD (p=0.05) for E: NS; CD (p=0.05) for I: 3293; CD (p=0.05) for interaction (E x I): 5858*

Water use efficiency varied widely in various years due to variation in yield and water requirement (Table 3). Water use efficiency differed little due to crop establishment techniques but it improved significantly due to micro-irrigation methods. The highest WUE (6.82-9.02 kg/ha/mm) was obtained with drip irrigation, followed by that with sprinkler irrigation (5.80-7.75 kg/ha/mm). The drip irrigation improved the WUE by 196-200% over the conventional flood irrigation whereas improvement in WUE with sprinkler irrigation was 168-171%. The higher WUE in drip and sprinkler irrigation could mainly be attributed to reduced water loss through percolation, seepage and evaporation than in surface flooding method [13]. However, the WUE obtained with sprinkler irrigation was lesser than that with drip irrigation because of lower efficiency of sprinkler irrigation as the water sprinkled over the crop was subjected to evaporation losses from air and plant surface. Higher WUE with drip [7,13] and sprinkler [9] irrigation compared to conventional irrigation in rice has also been reported earlier [14-16].

### 3.3 Economical Analysis

In DSR, the net profit increased when using sprinkler irrigation compared to conventional irrigation (Table 4) which could be attributed to higher yield obtained with sprinkler irrigation which compensated well for cost of the sprinkler system. But in TPR (both manual and mechanical), the net return obtained with sprinkler irrigation was statistically similar to that with conventional irrigation. The suitability of sprinkler irrigation in DSR and in TPR might be attributed to its comparatively lower cost, which was well compensated by the additional yield or profit obtained due to sprinkler system. Drip irrigation, however, proved to be the least profitable both in DSR and TPR obviously due to its higher cost which could not compensate for the yield advantage.

## 4. CONCLUSION

It can be concluded from the results of the present investigations that adopting sprinkler irrigation for rice cultivation in Haryana is a feasible option. This method not only saves a significant amount of irrigation water (38.3–39.3% in DSR and 47.4–49.0% in TPR), but also caused no significant reduction in yield and net profit in TPR and even gave higher yield and net profit in DSR as compared to the conventional irrigation. Therefore, implementing sprinkler irrigation for rice could be a viable strategy to address the depletion of groundwater resources in Haryana. On the other hand, although drip irrigation saves more water and has a similar impact on rice yield as sprinkler irrigation, it may not be economically viable due to its higher initial cost. However, considering the substantial savings in irrigation water (52.5–53.9% in DSR and 54.4–57.2% in TPR) and its greater effectiveness in managing groundwater depletion, drip irrigation should also be promoted in Haryana. This can be achieved by providing incentives to farmers to offset the higher cost associated with drip irrigation.

## DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc) and text-to-image generators have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts.

## COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

## REFERENCES

1. Aggarwal, N and Singh A. Crop performance, nutrient uptake vis-à-vis weed suppressive ability of mechanically transplanted rice (*Oryza sativa*) as influenced by age of seedlings and planting density. Indian Journal of Agronomy. 2015;60 (2):255-260.
2. Brar A S, Buttar G S, Jhanji D, Sharma N, Vashist K K, Mahal S S, Deol J S and Singh G. Water productivity, energy and economic analysis of transplanting methods with different irrigation regimes in Basmati rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) under north-western India. Agricultural Water Management. 2015;158: 189–195.
3. Narjary B, Kumar S, Kamra SK, Bundela DS, Sharma DK. Impact of rainfall availability on groundwater resources and opportunities of artificial recharge structure to reduce its exploitation in fresh groundwater zones of Haryana. Current Science. 2014;107:1305-1312.
4. Mahajan G, Timsina J and Singh K. Performance and water-use efficiency of rice relative to establishment methods in

northwestern Indo-Gangetic Plains. Journal of Crop Improvement. 2011; 25:597-617.
5. Gupta RK, Naresh RK, Hobbs PR, Jiaguo Z, Ladha JK. Sustainability of post-green revolution agriculture. The rice–wheat cropping systems of the Indo-Gangetic Plains and China. In: Improving the productivity and sustainability of rice–wheat systems: issues and impacts, ASA special publication 65, Wisconsin; 2003.
6. Joshi R, Singh B, Shukla A. Evaluation of elite rice genotypes for physiological and yield attributes under aerobic and irrigated conditions in tarai areas of western Himalayan region. Current Plant Biology. 2018;13:45-52.
7. Sharda R, Mahajan G, Siag M, Singh A and Chauhan BS. Performance of drip-irrigated dry-seeded rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) in South Asia. Paddy and Water Environment. 2017;15:93-100.
8. James LD, Lee RR. Economics of water resources planning, McGraw-Hill: New Delhi. 1971;20.
9. Singh R, Singh A, Kumar S, Rai AK, Rani S, Sharma DK, Joshi PK, Chaudhari SK, Dey P, Thimmappa K, Tripathi RS. Feasibility of mini-sprinkler irrigation system in direct seeded rice (*Oryza sativa*) in Indo-Gangetic plains of India. Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2020; 90(10):1946-51.
10. Kumar V, Ladha JK. Direct seeding of rice: Recent developments and future research needs. Advances in Agronomy. 2011;111: 299-391.
11. Singh PK, Srivastava PC, Sangavi R, Gunjan P, Sharma V. Rice water management under drip irrigation: an effective option for high water productivity and efficient zinc applicability. Pantnagar Journal of Research. 2019; 17(1): 19-26.
12. Parthasarthi T, Vanitha K, Mohandass S, Vered E. Evaluation of drip irrigation system for water productivity and yield of rice. Agronomy Journal. 2018;110:2378-2389.
13. Fukai S, Mitchell J. Factors determining water use efficiency in aerobic rice. Crop and Environment. 2022;1(1):24-40.
14. Kumar R, Kumar C, Singh P, Pal R, Mishra DK, Singh PK, Myint TT. Effect of Silicon (Si) and Surface Irrigation on Rice Crop in the Ramganga Region of Western India. Journal of Experimental Agriculture International. 2023;45(10):262–271. Available:https://doi.org/10.9734/jeai/2023/v45i102218
15. Kannan SV, Ravikumar V. Development of Crop Geometry for Drip Irrigated Rice Cultivation. International Journal of Environment and Climate Change. 2021; 11(4):97–105. Available:https://doi.org/10.9734/ijecc/2021/v11i430397
16. Pinto MAB, Parfitt JMB, Timm LC, Faria LC, Concenço G, Stumpf L, Nörenberg BG. Sprinkler irrigation in lowland rice: Crop yield and its components as a function of water availability in different phenological phases. Field Crops Research. 2020;248: 107714.



*Peer-review history:*
*The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:*
*https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/117771*