Short communication

Thermal time indices for some mustard genotypes in the Jammu region

M.K.KHUSHU, NASEER-U-RAHMAN, MAHENDER SINGH, ARVIND PRAKASH, A.K.TIKU 1 and A.S.BALI 2

¹Department of Plant Physiology & Biochemistry, ²Department of Agronomy, AICRP on Agrometeorology, Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences & Technology of Jammu, Chatha-180 009.

Email: naseer_kashmir@yahoo.co.in

Prevailing weather conditions during the whole crop growing season have direct bearing upon the phenological events of the crop which ultimately affect the crop yield. The effect of temperature, determining the phenological behavior of the crop, can be assessed by accumulated heat units. The duration of each growth phase is a result of crop response to external environmental factors. The concept of heat units has been applied to correlate the phenological development of different crops to predict grain yield and physiological maturity (Swan et al., 1989) of the crop. Thermal time effect has been described as the independent variable to delineate plant growth and development (Dwyer and Stewart, 1986.) Temperature based agrometeorological indices such as growing degree days (GDD), heliothermal units (HTU) and photothermal units (PTU) are based on the concept that real time to attain the phenological stage is linearly related to temperature in the range between base temperature and optimum temperature (Monteith, 1981).

Mustard is an important oil seed crop grown in Jammu. Information on heat unit requirements is helpful to crop modeler for calibration and sensitivity analysis of several crop growth simulation models. Therefore, the present investigation was carried out to study the phenological development of two mustard genotypes in relation to growing environment under field conditions.

Field experiment was conducted during *rabi* 2004 on the research farm under the All India Coordinated Research Project on Agrometeorology at Chatha, Jammu (32^{0} 40' N, 74^{0} 58' E, 332 meters above mean sea level). The main plot treatments consisted of three dates of sowing, *viz.*, October 06 (D_1), October 21 (D_2) and November 05 (D_3) and subplot treatments included

two genotypes *viz.*, Varuna (V₁) and Pusa Bahar (V₂), were sown in randomized block design with four replications. The soil was sandy loam in texture. The crop was raised following the recommended package of practices of the Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology of Jammu. The above ground biomass observations were taken at ten days interval. Five plants were randomly selected from each plot and separated into leaves, shoot and reproductive parts which were sundried for two days and then oven dried at 60 °C for 24 hours. The dry weight was taken with the help of electronic balance.

Daily weather data were recorded from the Agrometeorological Observatory situated at about 100 meters away from the experimental site. Observations on different phenophases (Table 1) were recorded at an interval of 3-4 days. Growing degree days (GDD) were calculated for each phenophase using a base temperature of 5°C (Nuttonson, 1955). Heliothermal units (HTU) are the product of GDD and corresponding actual sunshine hours for that day. Photothermal units (PTU) are the product of GDD and corresponding daylength for that day (Nuttonson, 1948). GDD, HTU and PTU were accumulated from the date of sowing to each phenophase.

Heat use efficiency (HUE) was computed to compare the relative performance of the mustard crop under different treatments using the formula:

The investigations on crop development were examined by considering different phenophases and the number of days taken for completing each phenophase. The duration (days taken) for different phenological

Table 1: Effect of sowing dates on duration and growth environment of mustard genotypes

			Mustard g				
	Phenophase	DOS	Varuna		na (V ₁)		
			DAS	∑GDD	∑HTU	∑PTU	
		D_1	5	118	510	1342	
	P_0 to P_1	D_2	4	80	717	872	
		D_3	6	92	758	962	
		D_1	8	164	726	1855	
	P_0 to P_2	D_2	6	110	841	1189	
		D_3	10	142	1090	1478	
		\mathbf{D}_1	11	213	1148	2398	
	P_0 to P_3	D_2	11	176	1377	1896	
P_0 = sowing, P_1 = emergence, P_2 =cotyledon above ground, P_3 =	both cotyledon u	nfol D ed a	nd green.	193	1447	1996	
P_4 =fifth true leaf exposed, P_5 = flower bud visible from above,	P_6 = first flower o	$pen, D_{l_7} = 1$	lowes 22 00	l more389 2	963	4316	
cm long, P_8 = most seeds green, P_9 = most seeds brown) and P_1	$_{0}$ = fully trop Paed.	D_2	21	308	2476	3278	
DOS = Date of sowing and DAS = Days after sowing		D_3	30	379	2225	3856	

events i.e. P₁ to P₁₀ under different treatments (Table 1) revealed that the crop had maturity periods ranging from 139 to 146 and 136 to 143 days in Varuna (V₁) and Pusa Bahar (V₂) respectively. The duration of each phenophase as well as days to maturity in general were shortened as the sowing was delayed from D₁ to D₂ and D₃. Similar results were also reported by Mallick et al., (2006) in wheat crop.

 D_1 43 662 3063 7157 P_0 to P_5 555 3722 D_2 5785 It was observed that for different sowing dates 5302 GDD for sowing to maturity varie 1/2 between 1/2/69 to 7962 1476 Cpdays (Table 1). GDD was trigher in Agtober 6744 06 sowing in both, the genotypes. This was due to the 5538 availability of longer growth period for garly some crop. 8650 For the genotyper Varuna, SDD received for attaining 6940 maturity was more due to its longer station (275 wami 5721 et al., 2003). 1085 6707 11371 D_1 86 P₀ to P₈ 85 896 5391 9155 D_2 D_3 754 4065 7590 83

141

135

 D_1

 D_2

P₀ to P₉

1424

1274

8090

6889

14910

13233

Table 2: Heat use efficiency	(HUE)) of mustard u	nder different	treatments	(<i>rabi</i> 2004-05))
-------------------------------------	-------	----------------	----------------	------------	------------------------	---

Treatments	AGDD	Total dry matter (kg ha ⁻¹)	Grain yield (kg ha ⁻¹)	HUE (kg ha ⁻¹ °C ⁻¹)
$\overline{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{1}}}$	1460	7419.6	1533.2	5.08
D_2	1350	4738.0	1014.8	3.51
D_3	1287	2971.3	593.9	2.31
V_1	1381	5150.4	1093.1	3.73
V_2	1350	4935.5	1001.5	3.66

The accumulated heliothermal units ranged between 6103 and 8298 °C days. The cumulative heliothermal units were higher in October 06 followed by October 21 and November 05 sown crop respectively. The photothermal units ranged between 13395 and 15488 °C day hours. The maximum PTU was accumulated in October 06 sowing followed by October 21 and November 05 sowings respectively. The accumulated photothermal units in genotypes also differed significantly.

Total dry matter accumulation, grain yield and HUE

Accumulated GDD, total dry matter accumulated at the time of physiological maturity, grain yield and HUE of mustard for different treatments are given in Table 2. It was observed that grain and biomass yield was more in October 06 sown crop followed by October 21 and November 05 sown crops which may be attributed to the more radiation absorbed by October 06 sown crop. Similar results were reported by Mani *et al.*, (2007). Among the two cultivars the highest grain and biomass yield of 1093 and 5150 kg ha⁻¹ respectively was recorded in Varuna.

Heat use efficiency (HUE) was computed to determine the biomass yield per unit of growing degree day for mustard cultivars. Highest HUE was recorded in October 06 sown crop followed by October 21 and November 05 sown crops. This was because of less biomass production and less accumulated thermal time in delayed sown crop. Similar results were obtained by Singh (2001) in wheat crop.

Predictive models

Regression models were developed for grain yield

(kg ha⁻¹) and total dry matter (kg ha⁻¹). The linear regression relationships obtained between grain yield (GY) and GDD; total dry matter (TDM) and GDD are shown below.

$$GY = 5.28(GDD) - 6160.22,$$
 (R² = 0.98)

$$TDM = 25.01(GDD) - 29106.58,$$
 (R² = 0.98)

The study shows that growing degree days explained the 98% variation in grain yield and total dry matter of mustard genotypes under varied thermal regimes. Similar works on developing Agroclimatic models based on temperature, photoperiod and day length for mustard (Hundal *et al.*, 2003) and for wheat (Hundal *et al.*, 1997) have been reported under Punjab conditions.

REFERENCES

Dwyer, L.M. and Steward, D.W. (1986). Leaf area development in field grown maize. *Agron.J.*, 78: 334-348.

Goswami, B., Mahi, G.S., Hundal, S.S. and Saikia, U.S. (2003). Growing degree days for rice and wheat in Ludhiana region. *J. Agrometeorol.*, 5 (1): 117-119.

Hundal, S.S., Prabhjyot-Kaur and Malikpuri, S.D.S. (2003). Agroclimatic models for prediction of growth and yield of Indian Mustard (*Brassica juncea*). *Indian J. Agric. Sci.*, 73 (3): 142-144.

Hundal, S.S., Singh, R. and Dhaliwal, L.K. (1997). Agro-climatic indices for predicting phenology of wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) in Punjab. *Indian J. Agric. Sci.*, 67 (6): 265-268.

- Mallick, K., Sarkar, C., Bhattacharya, B.K., Nigam, R. and Hundal, S.S. (2006). Thermal indices for some wheat genotypes in Ludhiana region. *J. Agrometeorol.*, 8(1): 133-136.
- Mani, J.K., Singh, R. and Singh, D. (2007). Study on agrometeorological indices for barley crop under different growing environments. *J. Agrometeorol.*, 9(1): 86-91.
- Monteith, J.L. (1981). Climate variation and growth of crops. *Quart. J. Royal Meteorol Soc.*, 107: 602-07.
- Nuttonson, M.Y. (1948). Some preliminary observations of phenological data as a tool in the study of photoperiod and thermal requirements of various plant materials. In: Proceedings of a symposium on vernalization and photoperiodism

- (A.E. Murnee and P.R. Whyte. Eds.). Chronica Botanica Publishing Co. Walthani, M.A., U.S.A.
- Nuttonson, M.Y. (1955). Wheat climate relationship and use of phenology in ascertaining the thermal and photothermal requirements of wheat. *American Insti. Crop Ecology*, Washington DC. 388.
- Singh, Mahender Ghanghas (2001). Development of response functions and yield model in wheat under environmental stress by using ground truth radiometer. Ph.D. Thesis, CCSHAU, Hisar (India).
- Swan, J.B., Schneider, E.C., Moncrief, J.E., Paulson, W.H. and Peterson, A.E. (1989). Estimating crop growth yields and grain moisture from air growing degree days and residue cover. *Agron. J.*, 79: 53-60.

Received: October 2007; Accepted: August 2008