



**Menoufia University
Faculty of Agriculture
Agricultural and Bio-systems
Engineering Department**

**EVALUATION OF PARTIAL ROOT ZONE DRYING
IRRIGATION UNDER GATED PIPE FOR CORN
CROP**

By

Hend Mahmoud Helmy Sharaf

B.Sc. Agric. Sciences (Agric. Engineering), 2011

Thesis

**Submitted to the Department of Agricultural Engineering,
Faculty of Agriculture, Menoufia University**

In Partial Fulfillment

of

The requirements for the degree

of

MASTER of Sciences (M.Sc)

in

Agricultural Sciences

(Agricultural Engineering)

to

Department of Agricultural and Bio-systems Engineering

Faculty of Agriculture

Menoufia University

Shibin El-Kom

Egypt

2019

CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	I
ABSTRACT	II
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	4
2.1. Water scarcity in Egypt.....	4
2.2. Surface irrigation.....	5
2.2.1. Surface irrigation efficiency.....	7
2.2.2. Advantage and disadvantage of surface irrigation.....	7
2.2.3. Stages of surface irrigation.....	10
2.2.4. Water infiltration rate	11
2.3. Partial root zone drying irrigation regime	12
2.3.1. Partial root zone drying definition	12
2.3.2. Alternate partial root zone drying (APRD) and fixed partial root zone drying (FPRD).....	17
2.4. Partial root zone and deficit irrigation.....	18
2.5. Effect of PRD on crop yield.....	20
2.6. PRD in arid and semi- arid	22
2.7. Gated pipe system and description.....	24
2.8. Water use efficiency (WUE)	27
2.9. Corn crop	28
2.10. Land leveling	31
3. MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	33

3.1. Materials.....	33
3.1.6. Irrigation system (Gated pipe).....	34
3.1.7. Soil analysis.....	34
3.2. Methods.....	35
3.2.1. Experiment Site.....	35
3.2.3. Experimental deign.....	36
3.2.3.1. Treatments.....	36
3.2.3.2. Experimental set up.....	37
3.2.4. Measurements.....	39
3.2.4.1. Soil moisture distribution.....	39
3.2.4.2. Advance and recession time.....	39
3.2.4.3. Irrigation evaluation parameters.....	41
3.2.4.4. Irrigation application efficiency.....	42
3.2.4.5. Water distribution efficiency.....	42
3.2.4.6. Water use efficiency.....	43
3.2.4.7. Yield and yield components.....	43
3.3. Statistical analysis.....	44
4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	45
4.1. Water advance, recession times, and infiltrated depth after the first irrigation.....	45
4.1.1. Control treatment.....	45
4.1.2. Alternate partial root zone drying (APRD) treatment under slopes 0.05% and 0.1%	47

4.1.3. Fixed partial root zone drying (FPRD) under slopes 0.05% and 0.1%.....	50
4.1.4. Conventional irrigation (CI) treatment under slopes 0.05% and 0.1%.....	54
4.2. Water advance, recession times, and infiltrated depth after Fourth irrigation.....	57
4.2.1. Control treatment.....	57
4.2.2. Alternate partial root zone drying (APRD) treatment under slopes 0.05% and 0.1%	59
4.2.3. Fixed partial root zone drying (FPRD) under slopes 0.05% and 0.1%.....	62
4.2.4. Conventional irrigation (CI) treatment under slopes 0.05% and 0.1%.....	65
4.3. Water irrigation amounts affected by irrigation treatments....	68
4.4. Corn yield.....	70
4.5. Properties of corn crop.....	73
4.6. Water distribution efficiency, water application efficiency and Water use efficiency.....	75
4.6.1. Water distribution efficiency.....	75
4.6.2. Water application efficiency.....	78
4.6.3: Water use efficiency.....	80
4.7. Water saving percent.....	82
5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.....	84
6. REFERENCES.....	88
7. الملخص العربى.....	١

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 3.1: The specifications of the pump.....	34
Table 3.2: Soil physical properties of the experimental site.....	35
Table 3.3: Chemical properties of the experimental site.....	35
Table 4.1: Total water amount and corn yield under the different irrigation treatments.....	72
Table 4.2: Properties of corn crop under all treatment.....	73
Table 4.3: Water distribution efficiency, water application efficiency water use efficiency, and water saving percent.....	75

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Fig.2.1: Infiltrated water depth by surface irrigation using water advance and recession.....	10
Fig.3.1: Experimental setup and treatments arrangements.....	38
Fig.4.1: Water advance time, recession time and infiltrated water depth under control treatment for (a) Q_1 , (b) Q_2 and (c) Q_3	46
Fig.4.2: Water advance time, recession time and infiltrated water depth of APRD treatment under Q_1 of water application for (a) 0.05% and (b) 0.1% soil slope.....	48
Fig.4.3: Water advance time, recession time and infiltrated water depth of APRD treatment under Q_2 of water application for (a) 0.05% and (b) 0.1% soil slope.....	49
Fig.4.4: Water advance time, recession time and infiltrated water depth of APRD under Q_3 of water application for (a) 0.05% and (b) 0.1% soil slope.....	50
Fig.4.5: Water advance time, recession time and infiltrated water depth of FPRD treatment under Q_1 of water application for (a) 0.05% and (b) 0.1% soil slope.....	51
Fig.4.6: Water advance time, recession time and infiltrated water depth of FPRD treatment under Q_2 of water application for (a) 0.05% and (b) 0.1% soil slope.....	52
Fig.4.7: Water advance time, recession time and infiltrated water depth of FPRD treatment under Q_3 of water application for (a) 0.05% and (b) 0.1% soil slope.....	53

Fig.4.8: Water advance time, recession time and infiltrated water depth of CI treatment under Q_1 of water application for (a) 0.05% and (b) 0.1% soil slope.....	54
Fig.4.9: Water advance time, recession time and infiltrated water depth of CI treatment under Q_2 of water application for (a) 0.05% and (b) 0.1% soil slope.....	55
Fig.4.10: Water advance time, recession time and infiltrated water depth of CI treatment under Q_3 of water application for (a) 0.05% and (b) 0.1% soil slope.....	56
Fig.4.11: Water advance time, recession time and infiltrated water depth under control treatment for (a) Q_1 , (b) Q_2 and (c) Q_3	58
Fig.4.12: Water advance time, recession time and infiltrated water depth of APRD treatment under Q_1 of water application for (a) 0.05% and (b) 0.1% soil slope	59
Fig.4.13: Water advance time, recession time and infiltrated water depth of APRD treatment under Q_2 of water application for (a) 0.05% and (b) 0.1% soil slope.....	60
Fig.4.14: Water advance time, recession time and infiltrated water depth of APRD treatment under Q_3 of water application for (a) 0.05% and (b) 0.1% soil slope.....	61
Fig.4.15: Water advance time, recession time and infiltrated water depth of FPRD treatment under Q_1 of water application for (a) 0.05% and (b) 0.1% soil slope	62
Fig.4.16: Water advance time, recession time and infiltrated water depth of FPRD treatment under Q_2 of water application for (a) 0.05% and (b) 0.1% soil slope	63

Fig.4.17: Water advance time, recession time and infiltrated water depth of FPRD treatment under Q_3 of water application for (a) 0.05% and (b) 0.1% soil slope	64
Fig.4.18: Water advance time, recession time and infiltrated water depth of CI treatment under Q_1 of water application for (a) 0.05% and (b) 0.1% soil slope	65
Fig.4.19: Water advance time, recession time and infiltrated water depth of CI treatment under Q_2 of water application for (a) 0.05% and (b) 0.1% soil slope.....	66
Fig.4.20: Water advance time, recession time and infiltrated water depth of CI treatment under Q_3 of water application for (a) 0.05% and (b) 0.1% soil slope.....	67
Fig.4.21: Effect of applying water $m^3 \cdot ha^{-1}$ on irrigation regime at slopes of 0.05% and 0.1% for (a) Q_1 , (b) Q_2 and (c) Q_3	69
Fig.4.22: Effect of irrigation regime and amount of water on yield of corn under slopes of 0.05% and 0.1% for (a) Q_1 , (b) Q_2 and (c) Q_3	71
Fig.4.23: Effect of irrigation regime and land slopes 0.05% and 0.1% on water distribution efficiency for (a) Q_1 , (b) Q_2 and (c) Q_3	77
Fig.4.24: Effect of irrigation regime and land slopes 0.05% and 0.1% on water application efficiency for (a) Q_1 , (b) Q_2 and (c) Q_3	79
Fig.4.25: Effect of Irrigation regime and amount of water on water use efficiency for (a) Q_1 , (b) Q_2 and (c) Q_3	81
Fig.4.26: Effect of irrigation regime and land slopes of 0.05% and 0.1% on water saving percent for (a) Q_1 , (b) Q_2 and (c) Q_3	83

ABSTRACT

ABSTRACT

Now days, Egypt is suffering from the scarcity of fresh water. Egypt is one of the event states under the water poverty line, who is identified as less than 1000 m³ per capita per year due to the existence of dry climatic conditions in most parts of the country and limited available water resources, optimization and saving of water consumption have vital importance. Partial root-zone drying (PRD) has been proved to be an optimal water-saving irrigation technology, the aim of this study is to access to the effect of partial root zone drying (Alternate and fixed) on corn yield, water distribution efficiency and water use efficiency comparing with control irrigation and conventional irrigation.

Field experiment was conducted during the summer season, 2017 at the Agricultural research station, Etay-El-Baroud, El-Behera Governorate. Corn crop of triple hybrid, Giza- 310 was planted under irrigation regimes partial root zone drying (PRD) alternate partial root zone drying (APRD) and fixed partial root zone drying (FPRD) and conventional irrigation (CI) comparing with control irrigation .With two levels of land leveling (0.05% - 0.1%), and with three water cutting time. The experimental area was irrigated by 6 inch PVC gated pipes.

The results indicated that the APRD achieved the highest value of corn production (about 7.85 Mg. ha⁻¹) at water applied of Q₃ under slope 0.1% and improving water use efficiency (WUE) at applied water of Q₂ (1.73kg. m⁻³) under slope 0.1%. Also, the APRD saved about 37.16% of applied water (Q₂) at slope 0.1%.

Key words

Gated pipe system -Conventional irrigation – Partial root zone irrigation (Alternate –Fixed) –Corn - Water use efficiency.