



Effect of Moisture Conservation Practices on Productivity, Profitability and Water Use Efficiency in Rainfed Linseed (*Linum usitatissimum* L.) under Mid Hill Conditions of Himachal Pradesh

Chopra P^{a++*}, Paul S.^{b#}, Baghla K.^{c†} and Shivalika^{a‡}

^a Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, CSK Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishvavidyalaya, Palampur - 176 062, India.

^b Department of Genetics and Plant Breeding, CSK Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishvavidyalaya, Palampur - 176 062, India.

^c Department of Agricultural Engineering, CSK Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishvavidyalaya, Palampur - 176 062, 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/v36i74827>

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/119816>

Original Research Article

Received: 05/05/2024

Accepted: 08/07/2024

Published: 12/07/2024

⁺⁺ Scientist (Agronomy);

[#] Principal Scientist (Plant Breeding);

[†] Assistant Professor (Soil Science);

[‡] Ph. D. Scholar (Agronomy);

*Corresponding author: E-mail: pankuch@rediffmail.com;

Cite as: P, Chopra, Paul S., Baghla K., and Shivalika. 2024. "Effect of Moisture Conservation Practices on Productivity, Profitability and Water Use Efficiency in Rainfed Linseed (*Linum usitatissimum* L.) under Mid Hill Conditions of Himachal Pradesh". *International Journal of Plant & Soil Science* 36 (7):1112-19. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ijpss/2024/v36i74827>.

ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted at Chaudhary Sarwan Kumar Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishvavidyalaya (CSK HPKV), Palampur to find out the best moisture-conservation practices in linseed grown under rainfed conditions. The experiment consisting of seven treatments related to moisture conservation was conducted in Randomized Block Design with three replications. Results of the study revealed that applying farmyard manure (FYM) at 10 t/ha, either by spreading or incorporating, and using straw mulching at the same rate significantly enhanced plant height, yield attributes, seed yield, economic returns (in term of higher gross, net returns, B C ratio), production and economic efficiency in linseed. These treatments increased seed yield by 47.4 to 55.4% compared to no mulching. The higher production and economic efficiencies achieved by said respective treatments ranged from 6.03 to 6.32 kg/ha/day and 76.12 to 74.61 Rs./ha/day, respectively. Additionally, these treatments increased oil yield by 56.8, 53.4 and 49.1%, respectively, over no mulching, however, the increase in the oil content was not significant. Incorporation of FYM 10 t/ha was proved to be best for recording higher consumptive use and WUE over rest of the treatments.

Keywords: *Consumptive use; FYM; linseed; moisture; oil yield; production efficiency; straw mulching; WUE.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Linseed has an important position in Indian economy due to its wide industrial utility. Linseed is grown in various regions around the world and major linseed growing countries are Canada, the USA, India, China and Russia. Canada is the largest producer of flax seed in the world, representing about 40% of the world's production. India holds 5th position in the area after Russian Federation, Kazakhstan, Canada and China but ranks 6th in production after Russian Federation, Kazakhstan, Canada, China and the USA. Our national production of 1.26 lakh tones is realized from an area of 1.97 lakh ha with productivity of 642 kg/ha which is much lower than the global average productivity of 877 kg/ha [1].

In Himachal Pradesh, it is the second most important winter oilseed crop and stands next to rapeseed-mustard in area and production. Linseed is mostly grown on marginal and sub marginal soils under conserved moisture and limited nutrient conditions with poor management practices. Early cessation of monsoon in some years adversely affects the germination and establishment of winter season rainfed crops due to inadequate soil moisture in surface layers. Moreover, growing the crop under rainfed conditions creates water stress conditions due to uneven or erratic distribution of limited available rainfall. The plants of linseed are of short stature, having shallow taproot system which can draw moisture only from upper soil layers. Thus, plants are vulnerable to moisture stress during and after flowering stages. To enhance moisture-

availability period and reduction in evaporation losses, appropriate agronomical moisture-conservation practices particularly use of organic materials *viz.* crop residues/weeds, manures as mulching material are the best tools for enhancing crop productivity under rainfed condition. Organic mulches are poor conductors of heat, which effectively reduce soil temperature and retain soil moisture for longer periods [2,3,4,5]. This thermal property of organic mulches helps to maintain a cooler soil environment and prevents rapid water loss, thereby enhancing soil moisture retention [6,7]. Additionally, these mulches serve as a protective layer between soil and the atmosphere, prevent nutrient leaching, improve fertilizer utilization, resist erosion and suppress weed growth [8]. Thus, keeping in view the management of abiotic stress in linseed crop, this field experiment was conducted.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was conducted during three consecutive *rabi* seasons of 2010-11 to 2012-13 at Research Farm of Linseed Unit, Chaudhary Sarwan Kumar Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishvavidyalaya (CSK HPKV), Palampur to find out the best moisture conservation practices to combat abiotic stress management in linseed crop for higher productivity under rainfed conditions. The experiment comprising 7 treatments *viz.* no mulch; straw mulch 10 t/ha; spreading of FYM 10 t/ha as mulch; incorporation of FYM 10 t/ha in the soil; soil mulch at 30 days after sowing (DAS); soil mulch at 30 DAS + after

first rain shower and *in-situ* mulch with weeds was carried out in a randomized block design with 3 replications. The soil was silty clay, acidic (pH 5.4) with medium in available nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium. Linseed variety 'Himani' was sown at a row distance of 23 cm using seed rate of 40 kg/ha during the first fortnight of October by adopting standard package of practices. The treatment-wise moisture-conservation practices were done in earmarked plots. Soil mulching was done by breaking of capillaries with the help of wheel hoe at 30 DAS and after first rain shower if appeared, *in-situ* weed mulching at 30 DAS was done by uprooting of weeds and spreading in between the rows. Plant height, yield attributes were recorded from the randomly selected five plants in each net plot. After maturity, the crop harvested from the net plot area was sun dried, threshed with wooden mallet and the seed yield obtained was expressed in kg/ha. Economics of the treatments was computed based on prevalent market prices. The efficiency parameters related to production and economics were calculated using standard procedures. The water-use efficiency (WUE) of the crop was calculated by the method ($WUE=Y/ET$) described by Viets [9]. The consumptive use of water by the crop under different treatments was computed as per Dastane [10].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Plant Height

On pooled basis, all the moisture conservation treatments had recorded more plant height than no mulch. Spreading or incorporation of FYM 10 t/ha and straw mulching 10 t/ha being at par among themselves had recorded significantly more plant height over rest of all treatments. Results having enhanced growth and development in term of more height and dry matter of linseed with straw mulching have also been reported by Devedee et al. [11]. All these treatments significantly delayed the appearance of 75% flowering by 2-3 days and maturity by 3-4 days over no mulch (Table 1).

3.2 Yield Attributes

Pooled data presented in Table-1 revealed that all yield attributes were significantly influenced by different treatments. Spreading or incorporating FYM 10 t/ha and straw mulching 10 t/ha behaved statistically similar to each other in recording significantly higher yield attributes viz. number of primary branches/plant, capsules/plant,

seeds/capsule and 1000-seed weight. Similar results with the use of straw mulching at 5 t/ha in linseed were also reported by Janjal et al. [12]. Patel et al. [13] also recorded significantly higher, growth parameters, number of yield attributes and thereby seed yield of linseed with the application of RDF + FYM 5 t/ha placement in rows.

3.3 Seed Yield

Significantly higher yield attributes contributed to significantly higher seed yield by statistically alike treatments of spreading or incorporation of FYM 10 t/ha and straw mulching 10 t/ha as is evident from the Table-1. The percent increase in seed yield by these treatments ranged from 47.4 to 55.4% over no mulching. Soil mulching at 30 DAS and thereafter receiving the first rain shower and hand weeding, but no removal of weeded plants from the field (*in-situ* mulch with weeds), remained at par with each other and had 217.4 and 201.7 kg/ha higher production than no mulching. The results are in direct conformity with the findings of Tatarwal et al. [14]. Similarly, Devedee et al. [15] and Sarkar & Sarkar [16] also revealed the superiority of mulching over no mulching for enhancing seed, straw and biological yield of linseed.

Significantly lower yield was obtained in no mulched plots. This was due to the fact that absence of mulch might have caused a rapid loss of water from soil surface to prevailing dry micro environment. Consequently moisture deficit in the rhizosphere might have hindered uptake and the utilization of nutrients by the crop and thereby reduced seed yield. All the treatments except soil mulching at 30 DAS significantly have higher harvest index over no mulch treatment.

3.4 Economics

On pooled basis, incorporation, spreading of FYM 10 t/ha and straw mulching 10 t/ha being at par with each other had recorded significantly higher gross, net returns and BC ratio over rest of the treatments. There was an increase of Rs. 10435, 9953 and 8945/ha for gross returns, Rs. 6442, 6323 and 6671/ha for net returns and 0.22, 0.24 and 0.38 in BC ratio by these respective treatments as compared to no mulching. Hand weeding but no removal of weeded plants from the field was also equally good to these said treatments in obtaining higher BC ratio of 0.96 (Table2).

Table 1. Effect of treatments on growth, yield attributes and yield of linseed (Pooled data of three years)

Sl. No.	Treatments	Plant height at harvest (cm)	Days to flower initiation	Days taken to 75% maturity	Primary branches/plant	Capsules/plant	Seeds/capsules	1000-seed wt. (g)	Seed yield (kg/ha)	HI (%)
1.	No Mulching	54.6	133.68	192.55	5.07	23.0	6.67	4.85	799.00	27.30
2.	Straw mulching @ 10 t/ha	62.1	136.12	195.78	6.00	31.0	8.09	5.44	1177.86	29.23
3.	Spreading FYM @ 10 t/ha as mulch	64.3	136.43	195.67	6.00	31.9	8.13	5.49	1221.05	29.99
4.	Incorporation of FYM in the soil @ 10 t/ha	63.4	137.21	196.88	6.07	32.3	8.29	5.23	1241.26	29.51
5.	Soil mulching at 30 DAS	59.6	133.54	193.68	5.53	27.2	7.49	5.13	949.79	28.12
6.	Soil mulching at 30 DAS and thereafter receiving first rain shower	60.7	134.32	193.45	5.67	27.5	7.71	5.22	1016.40	28.88
7.	Hand weeding but no removal of weeded plants from the field	60.5	134.68	193.45	5.80	27.8	7.82	5.28	1000.73	28.85
	CD (P=0.05)	2.3	1.41	0.98	0.35	2.49	0.36		112.24	1.55

Although cost of cultivation involved in these treatments is more but due to significantly higher production of produce, higher returns were obtained by these respective treatments as compared to rest of the treatments and resulted in higher BC ratio. The higher monetary returns were owing to higher values of yield attributes and yield of linseed under these treatments. Similarly, Singh et al. and Yadav et al. [17,18] reported that higher net return and BC ratio in linseed were obtained with straw mulching done @ 10t/ha. Ram et al. [19] also found that straw mulch applied @ 20 t/ha and spreading of FYM 10 t/ha as mulch were equally good for achieving higher net returns and BC ratio in wheat.

3.5 Production and Economic Efficiency

Pooled data presented in Table-2 revealed that the application of straw mulch 10 t/ha, incorporation and spreading of FYM 10 t/ha being at par among themselves were significantly superior over rest of the treatments for having higher production (6.03 to 6.32 kg/ha/day) and economic efficiency (76.12 to 74.61 Rs./ha/day). The magnitude of increase of production efficiency ranged from 2.16 kg/ha/day with incorporation of FYM 10 t/ha to 1.87 kg/ha/day with straw mulching 10 t/ha as compared to no mulch treatment, while, it was 33.48 Rs./ha/day with straw mulching 10 t/ha to 31.91 Rs./ha/day with spreading of FYM 10 t/ha in case of economic efficiency.

3.6 Water Use Efficiency

Incorporation of FYM 10 t/ha was proved to be significantly best for recoding higher consumptive use and WUE over rest of the treatments and respective increase was 3.4 and 4.5% over

unmulched plots. Spreading of FYM 10 t/ha and straw mulching 10 t/ha also behaved statistically similar to it for recording significantly higher water use efficiency. However, in respect of higher consumptive use, spreading of FYM 10 t/ha and straw mulching 10 t/ha were at par to each other (Table-3). Similarly, Gaat et al. [20] reported that in Papaya, 100% of crop water requirement was met through application of straw mulch as compared to 50% of crop water requirement met without mulch condition.

3.7 Oil Content and Yield

The data presented in Table 3 revealed that although different moisture conservation practices failed to influence oil content of linseed significantly, but had higher oil content than no mulching. Straw mulching 10 t/ha had resulted in higher oil content of 34.05% followed by soil mulching at 30 DAS and after first rain shower (34.0 %) and incorporation of FYM 10 t/ha (33.9%), which was 1.34, 1.16 and 1.01 % more than no mulch treatment, respectively. Similarly, no significant influence on oil content of linseed by different moisture conservation practices was reported by Awasthi et al. [21].

Since oil yield is a function of oil content and seed yield, all moisture-conservation practices were significantly superior over no mulch. Incorporation and spreading of FYM 10 t/ha being at par with straw mulching 10 t/ha had recorded significantly higher oil yield over rest of the treatments. The respective increase in oil yield due to these treatments was 56.8, 53.4 and 49.1%, respectively over no mulching. Mulching has resulted in increasing oil yield in linseed as reported by Devedee et al. [22].

Table 2. Effect of treatments on economics and production & economic efficiency (Pooled data three years)

Sl. No.	Treatment	GMR (Rs/ha)	NMR (Rs./ha)	BC ratio	Production efficacy (kg/ha/day)	Economic efficiency (Rs./ha/day)
1.	No Mulching	18878	8195	0.77	4.16	42.64
2.	Straw mulching @ 10 t/ha	27823	14866	1.15	6.03	76.12
3.	Spreading FYM @ 10 t/ha as mulch	28831	14518	1.01	6.26	74.55
4.	Incorporation of FYM in the soil @ 10 t/ha	29313	14637	0.99	6.32	74.61
5.	Soil mulching at 30 DAS	22402	10496	0.88	4.92	54.51
6.	Soil mulching at 30 DAS and thereafter receiving first rain shower	24042	11501	0.91	5.27	59.64
7.	Hand weeding but no removal of weeded plants from the field	23635	11558	0.96	5.18	59.91
	CD at 5%	2568	2633	0.20	0.59	13.72

Table 3. Effect of treatments on water use efficiency, consumptive use and quality of linseed (Pooled data of three years)

Sl. No.	Treatment	WUE (kg/ha-mm)	Consumptive use (mm)	Oil content (%)	Oil yield (kg/ha)
1.	No Mulching	1.53	530	33.60	268.97
2.	Straw mulching @ 10 t/ha	2.22	542	34.05	401.10
3.	Spreading FYM @ 10 t/ha as mulch	2.30	543	33.73	412.48
4.	Incorporation of FYM in the soil @ 10 t/ha	2.32	548	33.94	421.84
5.	Soil mulching at 30 DAS	1.82	533	33.63	320.68
6.	Soil mulching at 30 DAS and thereafter receiving first rain shower	1.97	531	33.99	344.52
7.	Hand weeding but no removal of weeded plants from the field	1.92	531	33.82	339.26
	CD at 5%	0.25	4.0	NS	40.93

4. CONCLUSION

The study concluded that depending upon the availability of organic material, farmyard manure (FYM) 10 t/ha can be applied either through incorporation or spreading and straw mulching @ 10 t/ha can also be used for getting significantly higher productivity and profitability in linseed grown under rainfed conditions of Himachal Pradesh.

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. Anonymous. FAO Stat. Available: <http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/QCL>.
2. Krishnababu ME, Singh RK, Upadhyay PK, Manjunatha MA and Harendra C. Effects of tillage, mulching and site-specific nutrient management on soil temperature, flowering, bulk density and soil organic carbon in wheat. *Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition*. 2024;10(1):82-87. Available: <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajsspn/2024/v10i1213>.
3. Mohanty, Kumar L, Singh NK, Raj P, Prakash A, Tiwari AK, Singh V and Sachan P. Nurturing crops, enhancing soil health, and sustaining agricultural prosperity worldwide through agronomy. *Journal of Experimental Agriculture International* 2024;46(2): 46-67. Available: <https://doi.org/10.9734/jeai/2024/v46i22308>.
4. Sharma AR, Singh R, Dhyani SK and Dube RK. Moisture conservation and nitrogen recycling through legume mulching in rainfed maize (*Zea mays*)–wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) cropping system. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems*. 2010;87:187-97.
5. Yadav GS, Saha P, Babu S, Das A, Layek J and Debnath C. Effect of no-till and raised-bed planting on soil moisture conservation and productivity of summer maize (*Zea mays*) in Eastern Himalayas. *Agricultural Research*. 2018;7:300-310.
6. Danish M, Kumar R and Sahu RK. Effect of rate of organic mulch on soil moisture conservation. *International Journal of Chemical Studies*. 2020;8(3):631-635. Available: <https://doi.org/10.22271/chemi.2020.v8.i3g.9277>
7. Kumar P and Usadadiya VP. Mulching: An efficient technology for sustainable agriculture production. *International Journal of Plant & Soil Science*. 2023;35(20):887-896. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.9734/ijpss/2023/v35i203880>
8. Bhargavi K. and Anusha O. Significance of mulching on soil conservation. *International Journal of Plant & Soil Science*. 2023;35(20):1156-1164. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.9734/ijpss/2023/v35i203913>
9. Viets FG. Fertilizer and efficient use of water. *Advances of Agronomy*. 1962;14:231–61. Available: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2113\(08\)60439-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2113(08)60439-3)
10. Dastane NG. A practical manual for water use research in agriculture. NavbharatPrakashan, Poona, Maharashtra. 1972;120.
11. Devedee K, Singh RK, Meena RN and Choudhary K. Effect of moisture conservation on growth and yield of linseed under varying fertility levels. *Journal of Crop and Weed*. 2019;15(1):198-200.
12. Janjal SS, Aglave BN, Nirpal RS, Shelke RA, Khupse SM, Gadekar BW and Dambale AS. Studies on moisture conservation practices in linseed (*Linum usitatissimum* L.). *International Journal of Research in Agronomy*. 2024;7(4):168-172. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.33545/2618060X.2024.v7.i4c.554>
13. Patel RK, Dwivedi SK and Patel RK. Effect of agro-input management practices on yield of linseed (*Linum usitatissimum* L.) under vertisols of Chhattisgarh, India. *Journal of Applied and Natural Science*. 2017;9(2):1072-1076. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.31018/jans.v9i2.1323>

14. Tetarwal J P, Ram B, Meena B S and Singh P. Effect of moisture conservation practices on productivity, profitability and moisture-use pattern of rainfed linseed (*Linum usitatissimum*). Indian Journal of Agronomy. 2015;60(4):589-593. Available:<http://dx.doi.org/10.59797/ija.v60i4.4498>
15. Devedee AP, Singh RK, Singh H and Kumar V. Effect of mulching, cumulative pan evaporation ratio and nutrient levels on yield, nutrient content and uptake of linseed. International Journal of Plant & Soil Science. 2017;20(03):1-7. Available:<http://dx.doi.org/10.9734/IJPSS/2017/37404>
16. Sarkar S and Sarkar A. Improving growth and productivity of linseed (*Linum usitatissimum*) using mulches under different levels of irrigation. Journal of Crop and Weed. 2017;13(1):01-06.
17. Singh RK, Singh A and Singh K. Effect of moisture conservation practices on linseed (*Linum usitatissimum* L.) under rainfed conditions. Environment and Ecology. 2014;32(2):425-427.
18. Yadav M, Kumar K, Tripathy AK and Verma SK. Effect of different moisture conservation practices on growth and yield of linseed varieties under rainfed condition of central Uttar Pradesh. Current Advances in Agricultural Sciences. 2020;12(2):84-87. Available:<http://dx.doi.org/10.5958/2394-4471.2020.00017.9>
19. Ram R, Dadhwal V, Vashist KK and Kaur H. Grain yield and water use efficiency of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) in relation to irrigation levels and rice straw mulching in North West India. Agricultural Water Management. 2015;28:92-101. Available:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2013.06.011>
20. Gaat BS, Kumar M, Naresh R, Kumar S, Kapil, Kumar R, Vijay and Anshul. Effect of different irrigation levels and mulching methods on performance of organically cultivated and drip irrigated papaya. International Journal of Plant & Soil Science. 2023;35(16):46-55. Available:<http://dx.doi.org/10.9734/ijpss/2023/v35i163129>
21. Awasthi P, Sharma R and Verma S. Effect of moisture conservation practices on oil content in linseed. Journal of Oilseed Research. 2011;28(2):112-115.
22. Devedee AP, Singh RK, Jakhar DS, Choudhary K and Mehjabeen. Effect of moisture conservation on yield, quality and economics of linseed under varying fertility levels Journal of Biotechnology and Crop Science. 2018;7(10):63-67.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the publisher and/or the editor(s). This publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/119816>