



Comparative Performance Evaluation of Alternate and Convectional Furrow Irrigation under Different Water Application Level on Cabbage Water Use Efficiency and Economic Analysis

Jemal Nur Hassene^{1,*}, Mukerem Taha Seid²

¹\$romi %gricultur l &ese rch 'nstitute()e!is %gricultur l &ese rch *entre(%gricultur l +ngineering &ese rch ,rocess(- r r(+thiopi

²*ollege o. %griculture n! +n/ironment l Ocienes(Ochool o. &ur l le/elopment n! %gricultur l +2tension(- r m 3 4ni/ersit3(l ire l w (+thiopi

Email address:

5eminur 6 gm il.com (5. 7. - ssene)

⁸*orrespon!ing uthor

To cite this article:

5em l 7ur - ssene(9u:erem ; h 0ei!. *omp r ti/e ,er.orm nce +/ lu tion o. %ltern te n! *on/ection l)urrow 'rrig tion un!er l i..erent < ter %pplic tion =e/el on * bb ge < ter 4se +..icienc3 n! +conomic %n l3sis. . >ol. 2(7o. 4(2017(pp. 123-131. !oi: 10.11"4#/j. jere.20170204.12

Received: %pril 10(2017; Accepted: %pril 24(2017; Published: 5une 20(2017

Abstract: Ouit ble irrig tion metho! with pplic tion le/el is essenti l.or ! pt tion n! !option in the re s where w ter resources re limite!. ;here.ore(.iel! e2periment w s con!ucte! to test the per.orm nce o. ltern te .urrow irrig tion (%)' or))') n! con/ection l .urrow irrig tion (*)') with three w ter pplic tion le/el on crop(3iel! response(w ter use e..icienc3 n! cost bene.it n l3sis o. c bb ge. ;he e2periment h ! two .ctors(.ctori l !esign rr nge! in & n!omi?e! *omplete @loc: 1esign (&*@1) with nine tre tments o. three replic te. ;he tre tment n mel3 three .urrow 'rrig tion metho! ltern ti/e)urrow 'rrig tion (%)')()i2e!)urrow 'rrig tion ())) n! *on/ection l)urrow 'rrig tion metho!s (*)') n! three pplic tion le/els .ull (100A)(three .orth 7BA n! h l. B0A o. .ull +;c (crop w ter reCuirement). ;he result shows * < 4+(' < 4+ n! + < , were highl3 signi.ic ntl3 (,D0.01) ..ecte! b3 both '9s n! %=s. ;he highest n! the lowest me n crop n! irrig tion w ter use e..icienc3 (* < 4+ n! ' < 4+)(n! economic w ter pro!ucti/it3 (+ < ,) were recor!e! b3 %)') n! *)' irrig tion. < here s(un!er %=s the highest n! the lowest me n * < 4+(' < 4+ n! + < , were recor!e! b3 B0A n! 100A +;c %pplic tion !epth. 9 2imum w ter s /e! resulte! .rom %)') n!))'(with B0A(7BA n! 100A +;c pplic tion !epth w s eCu ll3 compute! s B#.33A(37.B0A n! 1".7A which coul! irrig te !!ition l re o. 0.20(0."0 n! 1.40 h .or e ch tre tment respecti/el3. *ontr ril3 3iel! re!uction w s higher in))' .ollowe! b3 %)') n! *)' with the s me %=s. 7& (net return) pro!uce! per hect re w s higher in *)' .ollowe! b3 %)') n!))'. 'n c se o. @*&(%)') with 7BA n! B0A +;c w s higher th n))' .ollowe! n! the sm llest b3 *)' o. B0A n! 7BA +;c !e.icit le/el. -ence 3iel! re!uction n! 7& incurre! b3 ltern te (%)') n!))') were compens te! .rom !!ition l irrig ble re b3 !i/erting the w ter n! l bour s /e!. Eener ll3 .rom o/er ll in/estig tion o. * < 4+(' < 4+(+ < , (7& n! @*& ltern ti/e .urrow irrig tion metho! (%)') w s better th n))' n! *)' .or the w ter sc rce re .

Keywords: %ltern te)urrow 'rrig tion(l e.icit =e/els(* bb ge *rop(< ter 4se +..icienc3(+conomic %n l3sis

1. Introduction

'rrig te! griculture e2ten!s o/er 270 million hect res F1G. %lthough it represents onl3 17A o. the worl! culti/ te! re (it pro/i!es 40A to 4BA o. the worl! .oo! n! .iber suppl3 F2G. 'rrig te! griculture is the m jor consumer o. / il ble .resh w ter worl!wi!e n! its consumption is estim te! t

H70A o. the e2isting .reshw ter supplies F2G. ;he competing uses .or w ter (!omestic(in!ustri l(n! en/ironment l) n! the incre sing !em n! .or .oo! !ue to r pi!l3 growing worl! popul tion reCuire n urgent impro/ement o. pro!ucti/it3 per unit o. w ter consume! in griculture F3G.

%bout 10A o. the irrig te! l n! o. the worl! is irrig te! using rel ti/el3 ine..icient sur. ce irrig tion metho!s F4G.

Similar to in +ster +thiopi tr !ition I sur. ce irrig tion metho!s (b sin(bor!er n! .urrow) re wi!el3 use! to irrig te crops(though cute w ter short ge. 7ow ! 3 the mo!ern(high-tech n! e..icient micro irrig tion metho!s (!rip(bubbler(sprin:ler etc.) re !/oc te! worl!wi!e(howe/er; in !e/elope countries li:e +thiopi is not ..or! ble(bec use o. high cost o. inst ll tion(oper tion n! m inten nce(n! reCuire! s:ille! m npower. ;hus see:ing .or e..icient irrig tion metho!s th t re economic l(e s3 to inst ll n! oper te(n! which re re !il3 ccept ble to the . rming communit3 is !em n!ing.

)urrow irrig tion(report32!w;8 6(n) 6(() - 3() - 100(r) - 5(e) - 2(p) - 6 or oic ois4(r) - 5(r 024) - oo t0 2iient wee - r7 - 5

$$= 0.810^{-3} \times 8 \sqrt{2g} \quad (1)$$

where; N is !isch rge .rom siphon tube (l s⁻¹) (is re o. cross section(insi!e o. tube (cm²) (g is cceleration !ue to gr /it3 (cm sec⁻¹ (I#1cm sec⁻²) n! - is e..ecti/e he ! c using .low (cm).

; he e..ecti/e he ! w s c libr te! to be 12 cm n! hence the resulting !isch rge out o. the siphon tube w s 1.1B liters per secon!.. ; his !isch rge w s selecte! in or!er to /oi! erosion(in ccor! nce e..ecti/e height n! llow ble m 2imum non erosi/e !isch rge s possible recommen!e! b3 F3G.

; he time reCuire! to !eli/er the !esire! !epth o. w ter in to e ch .urrow w s c lcul te! using the eCu tion recommen!e! b3 F1BG:

$$t = \frac{1_p 8 w 8 l}{3 " 0 8 C} \quad (2)$$

where; 1_p is !epth o. w ter pplie! (cm) (t is pplic tion time (hr) (l is .low length (m) C is .low r te (l s⁻¹) n! w is .urrow sp cing (m).

2.4. Net and Gross Irrigation Water Requirement

* bb ge () c n .lourish un!er irrig tion in the lower ltitu!es. 'rrig tion is st n! r! pr ctice in /eget ble crop li:e c bb ge. < ter nee!e! per irrig tion w s !etermine! s net !epth o. irrig tion w ter th t is reCuire! consumpti/el3 .or crop pro!uction. 't is the mount o. irrig tion w ter reCuire! to bring the soil moisture le/el in the e..ecti/e root ?one to .iel! c p cit3. ; hus it w s the !i..erence between the .iel! c p cit3 n! the soil moisture content in the root ?one be.ore st rting irrig tion. ; his is obt ine! b3 the rel tion gi/en below;

$$'_{net} = \frac{(0.c - 0i)P_{bs} 1_r}{100} \quad (3)$$

where; '_{net} is the net mount o. w ter to be pplie! !uring irrig tion (cm) (0_c is the moisture content t .iel! c p cit3 in the root ?one b3 /olume (A) (0_i is .iel! moisture content be.ore irrig tion in the root ?one b3 /olume (A) i.e. 0-30 n! 30-"0 cm !epth(1_r is the !epth o. the root ?one (cm) rQ "0 cm n! bul: !ensit3 o. the soil in the root ?one (g cm⁻³). Gross !epth o. irrig tion w ter ('_{gr}) eCu ls the net irrig tion !epth ('_n) !i/i!e! b3 the pplic tion e..icienc3 (+). ; he .ollowing eCu tion w s use! to compute gross irrig tion w ter reCuirement.

$$'_{gr} = \frac{'_n}{+} \quad (4)$$

; he .iel! w ter pplic tion e..icienc3 .or sur. ce .urrow irrig tion is norm l3 t :en s "0A.

< ter s /ing with %) ' n!))' comp re! to *)' w s c lcul te! s:

$$< 0(A) = \frac{(< *)' - <)' D))}{< *)'} 8100 \quad (B)$$

where < 0 is w ter s /e! < *)' is tot l w ter use! (mm) with the *)' metho! n! < % is tot l w ter use! (mm) with the %) ' n!))' metho! n! mount o. w ter pplie! .or %) ' n!))' w s eCu l.

,ercent o. 3iel! incre se!/ecre se in 3iel! (A) comp re! to the %) ' or))' metho! w s compute! s

$$R_{\%1}(A) = \frac{(R_{*})' - R_{(%)'1})}{R_{*}} 8100 \quad (")$$

where R_{%1} is percent 3iel! incre se or !ecre se(R_{(%)'1})' n! R_{)*} re 3iel!s (:gh ⁻¹) obt ine! with the %) ' /))' n! *)' metho!s(respecti/el3.

2.5. Water Productivity

- (1) *rop w ter use e..icienc3 (* < 4+): *rop w ter use e..icienc3 (* < 4+) or so-c lle! in other re.erences crop w ter pro!ucti/it3 (* < ,) w s compute! b3 !i/i!ing crop 3iel! b3 consumpti/e w ter use (net irrig tion).

$$* < 4+ = \frac{R}{*onsumti/e w ter pplie! to the .iel! (m^3)} \quad (7)$$

- (2) 'rrig tion w ter use e..icienc3 (' < 4+): ' < 4+ (:g m⁻³) w s !etermine! b3 !i/i!ing the 3iel! to se son l e/ potr nspir tion n! tot l se son l irrig tion w ter pplie!(n! c lcul te! b3 the .ollowing eCu tion:

$$' < 4+ = \frac{R}{;ot l w ter pplie! to the .iel! (m^3)} \quad (\#)$$

where < 4+ is w ter use e..icienc3 (:g m⁻³) (R is ctu l 3iel! (:g) (n! tot l (gross irrig tion) w ter pplie! to the .iel! (m³) w s !etermine .rom +; c is se son l crop e/ potr nspir tion .rom the crope! re .

- (3) +conomic l w ter pro!ucti/it3: (+; @ m⁻³) rel tes the economic bene.its per unit o. w ter use!. 't w s c lcul te! b3:

$$= \frac{\$utput (/ lue)}{;ot l mount o. w ter consume! (m^3)} \quad (I)$$

where; < p is the economic w ter pro!ucti/it3 in +; @ m⁻³ (out-put is the pro!uct o. m r:et ble 3iel! n! m r:et price in +; @ (n! w ter consume! in m³. +; @ is +thiopi n +; @

2.6. Cost Benefit Ratio and Net Return Analysis

; he cost n! bene.it o. e ch tre tment w s n l3?e! p rti l3 3iel! n! economic ! t were compute! to comp re the !/ nt ge o. !i..erent .urrow irrig tion metho!s n! pplic tion le/els o. e ch tre tment. ; he tot l cost m inl3 inclu!es oper ting n! / ri ble costs. \$per ting costs (l bor(l n! prep r tion(see!s(n! .ertili?ers n! implement costs) were b se! on the pl nte! re . > ri ble costs !epen!e! on the number o. irrig tion e/ents(l bour n! w ter unit price. ; he in!igenous . rmers in the stu!3 re !o not p 3 .or irrig tion w ter o. their . rms. ; here.ore ssumption w s

127 5em l 7ur - ssene n! 9u:erem ; h 0ei!: *omp r ti/e ,er.orm nce +/ lu tion o.%ltern te n! *on/ection l)urrow
'rrig tion un!er li..erent < ter %pplic tion =e/el on * bb ge < ter 4se +..ienci3 n! +onomic %n l3sis

Table 3. *EI* *R* *PP*

3.2.2. Effect of Irrigation Methods and Application Levels on Water and Land Productivity

The result indicates that the water use efficiency from the treatment combination (%) of ()' with 100A +; c 7BA n! B0A +; c le/els were 1".7 A(37.BA n! B#.33A o. tot l net /olume o. irrigation water applied. < here s *)' with 7BA n! B0A application obtained 2BA n! B0A respectively.

)' with 100A +; c application depth recorded! m 2imum 3iel! because this treatment received! full crop water requirement (hence no 3iel! reduction observed! < here s %) ' n!))' with 100A +; c 3iel! reduction was less than 10A(which was indicated! s I.4 n! 7.BA(respectivel3 when compared! with no water stress! ()' with 100A +; c). - owe/er %) ' n!))' with 100A %s were s /e! 1".7A water from the treatment (; ble B)(which could! irrigate about 0.2 h (; ble ").

At the plot of 7BA +; c application depth or 2BA stress! treatment o. (%) ()' n! *)' were indicated! that significant 3iel! reduction s 1".3A(21.2A n! I.7A respectivel3. %s present! in ; ble B tot l mount o. net /olume o. irrigation water s 37.BA (1BB3.40 m³) from (%) ()' o. e ch

treatment n! 2BA (103B."0 m³) from *)' w s s /e!. -ence water s /e! from %) ()' n! *)' with 7BA %s could! irrigate 27A (1.B3 h) o. tot l ! ! ition l re (; ble "). ; he result indicates c bb ge performance under this !e.icit le/el w s better in conjunction l .urrow irrigation (*)') .ollowe! b3 %) ' n!))' with 7BA %s correspond!ngl3.

%ccor!ngl3 .or treatments with B0A +; c application le/el (3iel! reduction w s higher when compared! to 7BA +; c s present! in (; ble B). ; he 3iel! reduction in ccor! nce to application le/el w s increased! s 22.0(24.3 n! 2".1A b3 *)' (%) ' n!))' with B0A +; c respectivel3. ; his is because the c bb ge stress! b3 h l. (B0A) net crop water requirement which results! in m 2imum 3iel! reduction compared! to normal or full water application. - owe/er "" A o. water s /e! could! irrigate tot l ! ! ition l re o. 3.# h . ; his clearl3 shows that 3iel! reduction results! from both irrigation methods n! application le/els could! be compensated! b3 ! ! ition l irrigable re to be cultivated!)rom economic point o. /iew 3iel! obtained! from tot l ! ! ition l irrigable re (B.73 h) could! produce 32B.I tons o. m r:et ble c bb ge 3iel! (; ble ").

Table 5.

Treatment combination	Marketable yield (kg ha ⁻¹)	Yield reduction (kg ha ⁻¹)	Yield eduction (%)	I _n (m ³ ha ⁻¹)	Water saved from I _n (m ³ ha ⁻¹)	Water save in (%)
%)' 100A +; c	"B304.4	"7"2.2	1.4	34B2.0	"10.40	1".7
%)' 7BA +; c	"0333.3	11733.3	1".3	2B#I.0	1BB3.40	37.B0
%)' B0A +; c	B4BBB."	17B11.1	24.3	172".0	241".40	B#.33
))' 100A +; c	""""BB."	B411.1	7.B	34B2.0	"10.40	1".7
))' 7BA +; c	B"#11.1	1B2BB."	21.2	2B#I.0	1BB3.40	37.B0
))' B0A +; c	B32BB."	1##11.1	2".1	172".0	241".40	B#.33
*)' 100A +; c	720""."7	0.0	0.0	4142.4	0.00	0.00
*)' 7BA +; c	""377.#	B""#.I	7.1	310" .#	103B."0	2B.00
*)' B0A +; c	B"200.0	1B#"."7	22.0	2071.2	2071.20	B0.00

3.3. Cost Benefit and Economic Analysis

Net return from ! ! ition l irrigable re !ue to water s /e! from irrigation methods n! application le/els o. c bb ge production estimate! ccor!ng to water applied! .or e ch treatment. ; ble " indicates that the net return (7&) compute! from the water n! l bor s /e! o. e ch treatment n! !et il c lcul tion o. net income or return g ine! .rom ! ! ition l irrigable re o. e ch treatment represente!. ; he result indicates that the highest net return observed! in ltern ti/e irrigation method! with B0A +; c application le/el n! the lowest net return was obtained! from *)' with 7BA +; c application le/el. < ith the s me /ein(*)' with 7BA +; c application le/el results! in lowest water s /e! n! irrigable re compared! to %) ' n!))' o. the s me %s. 't clearl3

seen that the / lue o. net return generated! w s influence! not only b3 water applied! but also .urrow irrigation methods.

\$n the other h n! (*)' with 100A +; c w s use! s control .or ll treatment. ; he result shows the water s /e! from %) ' n!))' with 100A +; c or with full irrigation only .oun! out from the two other .urrows remain !r3 until the ne2t irrigation schedule .or %) ' n!))' with their application. %ccor!ngl3 the ! ! ition l re to be irrigated! o. e ch treatment w s c lcul ted! b se! on the mount o. water applied! n! the ratio o. tot l water applied! .or non-stress! treatment (*)' with 100A +; c) to stress! treatments. =i:ewise(the tot l ! ! ition l re obtained! w s con/erte! to hect re .rom e ch treatment s bout B.73 h (which could! be irrigated! b3 tot l water s /e! o. 20712.02 m³ per hect re with tot l l bor s /e! show in ; ble ").

Table 6.

Treatment	MHY *100	I _g (*100)	WS (m ³) *100	A. A irrig. by WS	YG of A. A (*100)	G* LS (*100)	C*W S (*100)	TC(*100)	TR(*100)	NR due to AA *100
; 1	"B.30	B7.B3	11.B1	0.20	130."1	B.#	143.#	1"7.7	32".B	1B#.#
; 2	"0.33	43.1B	2B.#I	0."0	3"2.00	13.1	323."	311.0	10B.0	B14.0
; 3	B4.B"	2#.77	40.27	1.40	7"3.7#	20.4	B03.4	"B0.4	1101.4	12B1.1
; 4	"".""	B7.B3	11.B1	0.20	133.31	B.#	143.#	1"7.7	333.3	1"B.B
; B	B".#1	43.1B	2B.#I	0."0	340.#7	13.1	323."	311.0	#B2.2	4"1.2
; -	B3.2"	2#.77	40.27	1.40	74B.B#	20.4	B03.4	"B0.4	1#"3.I	1213."

Treatment	MHY *100	I _g (*100)	WS (m ³) *100	A. A irrig. by WS	YG of A. A (*100)	G* LS (*100)	C*WS (*100)	TC(*100)	TR(*100)	NR due to AA *100
;7	72.07	"1.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
;#	""3#	B1.7#	17.2"	0.33	221.2"	#.7	21B.#	2B4."	BB3.1	21#B
;1	B".20	34.B2	34.B2	1.00	B"2.00	17.B	431.B	B31.4	140B.0	#"B."
;ot l			207.12	B.73	32B1.40	104.I	2B#1.0	3212.2	#14#B	413".3

7ote: 'g: Eross irrig tion per h in m³(%.%: %!!ition l re irrig te!(9 -R: 9 r:et ble he ! 3iel! in ton h ⁻¹(=0: = bor s /e! .rom irrig tion s3stem(<0: >olume o. w ter s /e! in m³ per h (RE: Riel! g ine! .rom %.% in :g h ⁻¹(*: 4nit price per m³ o. w ter (*Q12B +; @) n! ,: 4nit price per :g o. c bb ge he ! (,Q2.B +; @ :g⁻¹) (E = bor per irrig tion per h (EQB0 +; @ ! 3⁻¹) (;&: ;ot l return in +; @ h ⁻¹(;*: ;ot l cost in +; @ h ⁻¹ n! 7&: 7et return in +; @ per hect re o. !!ition l re .(-int: ll / lues re multiple o. 100 e2cept !!ition l re to be irrig te!)

)in ll3 ; ble 7 in!ic te! th t @*& (bene.it cost r tio) o. c bb ge w s compute! .or e ch tre tment combin tion s the r tio o. 3iel! e rne! to the cost e2pen!e!. %ccor!ngl3(tre tments))' (%)' n! *)' with 100A +;c w ter pplic tion le/el h ! the lowest @*& s 0.II(0.I n! 0.#2 respecti/el3. @ec use those tre tments cost o. pro!uction higher s comp re! to 3iel! obt ine!.

9 oreo/er tre tment combin tion o. 7BA %=(the highest @*& w s tt ine! b3 %)' n! the lowest w s recor!e! un!er *)' (s presente! in ; ble 7. ;he other rem ining tre tments were occupie! in between l rgest n! the sm llest / lue o.

@*&. ;his implie! th t the w ter s /e! with incorpor tion o. both combine! . ctor o. ('9s n! %=) h ! n in!ic tor .or n l3sis o. @*& .rom !!ition ll n! / il ble.

;here.ore the net re!uction in bene.it !ue to 3iel! re!uction o. e ch tre tment w s compens te! b3 net bene.it g ine! .rom 3iel! obt ine! b3 !!ition l re culti/ te! with l bour n! w ter s /e! with the s me criteri n! con!ition !etermine!. %mong !i..erent irrig tion tre tments(ltern te .urrow irrig tion (%)' with 7BA) h ! the better 3iel! n! the optimum @*& when comp re! with))' n! *)' with the s me pplic tion.

Table 7.

Treatment	Water applied m ³ ha ⁻¹	Cost of labor and water (VC)	Operation cost (FC)	Total cost (TC) in ETB ha ⁻¹	Marketable yield(kg ha ⁻¹)	Gross Revenues (GR) in ETB	Net Return (NR) in ETB	BCR
;1	B7B3.3	74#30.03	I040.0	#3#70.0	"B304.44	1"32"1.1	71311.1	0.14
;2	431B.0	B"122.B2	I040.0	"B1"2.B	"0333.33	1B0#33.3	#B"70.#	1.31
;3	2#7".7	3741B.01	I040.0	4"4BB.0	B4BBB.B"	13"3##.I	#1133.I	1.14
;4	B7B3.3	74#30.03	I040.0	#3#70.0	""BB.B"	1""3#.I	#27"#.I	0.11
;B	431B.0	B"122.B2	I040.0	"B1"2.B	B"#11.11	142027.#	7"#B.3	1.1#
;.	2#7".7	3741B.01	I040.0	4"4BB.0	B32BB.B"	13313#.I	#""3#.I	1.#7
;7	"I04.0	#171".04	I040.0	I##3".0	720""."7	1#01""."7	#1330."	0.#2
;#	B17#.0	"7347.03	I040.0	7"3#7.0	""377.7#	1"B144.4	#1BB7.4	1.17
;1	34B2.0	44#1#.02	I040.0	B313#.0	B"200.00	140B00	#"B"2.0	1."0

@*&: @ene.it cost r tio(>*: > ri ble cost (+; @ h ⁻¹) n!)*:)i2e! cost (+; @ h ⁻¹) (;1(;2 n! ;3 .or pplic tion le/el o. (%)' with 100A(7BA n! B0A +;c respecti/el3(;4(;B n! ;. .or pplic tion le/el o. ())' with 100A(7BA n! B0A +;c respecti/el3: ;7(;# n! ;1 .or pplic tion le/el o. (*)' with 100A(7BA n! B0A +;c respecti/el3(+; @: +thiopi n @irr (-int the home currenc3 up to the p per o. completion is 1 +; @ Q 0.04B 40 T)

4. Discussion

4.1. Water Productivity

rop w ter use e..icienc3 (< 4+): *omp ring the results o. the three irrig tion metho!s .rom the point o. crop w ter use e..icienc3(it cle rl3 con.irme! th t ltern te .urrow irrig tion .ollowe! b3 i2e! .urrow irrig tion n! con/ention l .urrow irrig tion h ! more bene.ici l use o. w ter respecti/el3. ;his result re/e le! th t incre sing w ter pplic tion !ecre ses w ter use e..icienc3 o. crop. ;he results gree with F1#G F1IG who reporte! th t * < 4+ / lues !ecre se! with incre sing w ter use. \$n the other h n! (.or ll irrig tion metho!s(s pplic tion le/els incre se! the * < 4+ !ecre ses(this pro/e th t s !epte o. pplic tion incre se w ter lose b3 lee percol tion(sur. ce runo.. n! e/ por tion incre se r ther th n w ter utili?e! b3 crop. %ccor!ngl3 F20G reporte!(th t crop w ter use e..icienc3 .or ltern te .urrow irrig tion subst nti ll3 incre se! s comp re! with con/ention l .urrow irrig tion .or corn.

'rrig tion w ter use e..icienc3 (' < 4+): ;he result reporte!

b3 F21G un!er controle! en/ironment stu!3 with m i?e(p rti l root ?one irrig tion pplie! t the jointing st ge re!uce! w ter consumption b3 12A n! enh nce! < 4+ b3 12A. Oome uthor con.irme! th t signi.ic nt impro/ements in '< 4+ h /e been ssoci te! with %)' F22G n! F23G. Oimil rl3 F24G !emonstr te! th t '< 4+ incre se! with !ecre se in irrig tion w ter. 9 oreo/er F2BG .or Uel! grown pot to showe! th t comp re! with)' (.ull irrig tion)(,&1 (p rti l root !r3ing) tre tment s /e! 30A o. w ter n! incre se! w ter use e..icienc3. 'n contr st to this stu!3 F2"G .oun! th t '< 4+ w s highest in the .ull irrig te! tre tment. 'n gener l(!i..erences between this stu!3 n! bo/e cite! stu!ies m 3 be !ue to !i..erences in the pl nt / riet3 use!(gro-clim tic con!itions o. the region n! culti/ tion perio!s.

+conomic w ter pro!ucti/it3 (+< ,): ;he re son behin! this result is th t(economic w ter pro!ucti/it3 relies on the r tio o. 3iel! con/erte! to / lue (c sh) o. m r:et ble 3iel! obt ine! b3 the mount o. w ter pplie! on /olume b sis. ;hus B0A +;c h ! le st w ter pplic tion !epte n! lso rel ti/el3 lower 3iel! pro!uce!(this resulte! in superior

economic water productivity; however, literature also confirms the same idea. Water productivity is considered to be increased by using a (Itern ti/e p rti l root !r3ing) on !i..erent crops F2BG F27G. F2#G Iso reporte! th t ,&1 signi.ic ntl3 re!uce! 3iel! b3 24A(while < , (w ter pro!ucti/it3) incre se! b3 B2A comp re! with the)' (.ull irrig tion). F21G reporte! th t < , un!er !e.icit irrig tion r nge! .rom minimum o. 1" :g m⁻³ in)' to m 2imum o. 21.B :g m⁻³ in ,&1 with B0A pplic tion le/el tre tments.

4.2. Significance of Irrigation Method and Application Levels on Cabbage Yield Optimization and Net Return

Originality of results: This study presents explicit results on the water productivity of cabbage under different furrow irrigation methods and application levels. Hence, this study is an attempt to evaluate the best furrow irrigation systems while providing a framework for assessing potential future transitions of furrow irrigation methods (scheduling water requirement in view of producing optimum yield to meet increasing income! !em n! t w ter sc rce re especi ll3 .or !e/eloing countr3. Eener ll3(it h s been ssume! th t economic n! gronomic control or w ter m n gements b3 impro/ing existing surface irrigation methods including optimum application levels with moisture yield! re!uction c n impro/e net returns .rom !lition l irrig ble re .

From sustainability perspective (the primary objective of this study whether furrow irrigation over!r t the re!uction o. irrig tion w ter consumption to m 2imi?e culti/ tion l n! with little 3iel! loses when comp re! with cultur l or norm l pr ctice n! optimi?e w ter pro!ucti/it3. < ter s /e! through impro/e! irrig tion s3stems coul! llow .or n e2p nsion o. culti/ tion l n! n! incre se crop pro!uction in w ter limite! re .) rmers' !ecisions re o ten !ri/en b3 m 2imi?ing their return n! r rel3 b3 en/ironment l concerns; i. the3 pursue e..orts to s /e w ter !o the3 o ten use it to e2p n! their irrig te! re s or shi.t to higher / lue crops(r ther th n losing w ter lloc tion F30G F31G.

ost benefit n! +conomic n l3sis: -ence b3 using o. ppropri te irrig tion methods n! pplic tion le/els were better .or higher 3iel! n! coul! be economic ll3 ttr cti/e to incre se crop pro!uction n! pro!ucti/it3 t w ter sc rce or limite! w ter n! !rought susceptible re s. Oumming up in terms o. 7& n! @& ltern ti/e .urrow irrig tion show better when comp re! with))' n! *)' with s3non3mous pplic tion le/el. ;he report gree! n! sh re! with F3"G F37G F3#G whom recommen! th t mongst the &1' (regul te! !e.icit irrig tion) ppro ches(ltern te p rti l root?one irrig tion h s been .oun! to be most e..ecti/e n! e..icient in s /ing w ter n! impro/ing < 4+ while m int ining crop pro!ucti/it3.

5. Conclusion

This study !/oc tes th t the technicue o. ltern te .urrow irrig tions were subst ntl ll3 s /e! w ter th n con/ection l .urrow irrig tion metho! in .iel! con!itions un!er w ter pplic tion le/el.)rom the result w ter s /e! ltern te .urrow (%)' n!))') irrig tion with B0A +;c

%s coul! s /e B#.33A o. tot l net /olume o. irrig tion w ter pplie!. <ith respect to ph3sic l w ter use e..icienc3 n! economic w ter pro!ucti/it3(summ ri?e! s .ollow: 9e n m 2imum n! minimum * < 4+(' < 4+ n! +, < were recor!e! b3 %) ' n! *)' respecti/el3.)or %s crop n! irrig tion w ter use e..icienc3 n! +< , were incre sing .rom 100A +;c (.ull irrig tion) to B0A +;c. 'n the c se o. net return (7&) n! benefit cost r tio (@*&) inter ction o. (n! *)')(un!er 100A +;c (the highest w s pro!uce! b3 ltern te .urrow (%)' n!))') irrig tion higher th n *)')(un!er ll w ter pplic tion !epth.)in ll3 the .in!ing in!orses th t .rmers c n pr ctice either ltern te .urrow irrig tion (%)' n!))') with o. 100A pplic tion le/el or *)' with 7BA +;c s best option(this w s !enti.ie! s negligible 3iel! re!uction o. less th n 10A s comp re! to e/er3 or con/ection l .urrow irrig tion with .ull w ter pplic tion. %nother ltern ti/e option w s obser/e! %) ' metho! in!ic tes best @*& which pre.erenti ll3 selecte! t 100A n! 7BA !e.icit le/el o/er))' with the s me !e.icit le/el.

References

- F1G 9 orison(5. '. =(7. &. @ :er(. 9. 9 ulline u2(n! <. 5. 1 /ies. 200#. 'mpro/ing w ter use in crop pro!uction. ,hil. ;r ns. &o3 l ooc. @ 3"3: "3IM"B#.
- F2G +/ ns(&. E. n! +. 5. 0 !ler. 200#. 9 etho!s n! technologies to impro/e e..icienc3 o. w ter use. < ter &esources &s. 44: 1M1B.
- F3G)oo! n! %gricuture \$rg ni? tion o. the 4nite! 7 tions. 2002. *rops n! !rops: 9 :ing the best use o. w ter .or griculture 7 tur l &esources +n/iron. 1ept.()%\$(&om.
- F4G ;iercelin(5. &.(>i! l(%.(200". ;r ite! !'rrig tion(X 2n! +!. , ris()r nce.
- FBG @urt(*. 9.(*lemmens(%. 5.(Otre! :o..(;. 0.(Oolomon(J. -. (@liesner(&. 1.(- r!3(=. %.(- owell(;. %.(+isenh uer(1. +.(1117. 'rrig tion per.orm nce me sures: e..icienc3 n! uni.ormit3. 5. 'rrig. 1r in. +ng. 123(423M442.
- F"G %mp s(>.(@ lt s(+(2001. \$ptimi? tion o. the .urrow irrig tion e..icienc3. Elob. 7+0; 5. 11 (4)(B""MB74.
- F7G 1u(;. 0.(J ng(0. Y.(Oun(5. 0.(Yh ng(Z. R.(Yh ng(5. -. (2010. %n impro/e! w ter use e..icienc3 o. cere ls un!er tempor l n! sp ti l !e.icit irrig tion in north *hin . %gric. < ter 9 n g. 17 (1)(""M74.
- F#G -orst(9. E.(Oh mut lo/(0. 0.(ereir (=. 0.(Eonc l/es(5. 9.(200B.)iel! sssessment o. the w ter s /ing potenti l with .urrow irrig tion in)erg n (%r l Oe b sin. %gric. < ter 9 n g. 77 (1M3)(210M231.
- FIG 9 shori(%. 0.(2013. +/ lu tion o. the per.orm nce o. the ltern te .urrow irrig tion un!er clim tic con!itions o. Oin!h. 'n: 9. +. ;hesis. Oin!h %griculture 4ni/ersit3(; n!oj m(, :ist n 9 itchell(5. .(Ohenn n(*. (Er tt n(0. &. [9 3(1. 9.(;om to .ruit 3iel!s n! Cu lit3 un!er w ter !e.icit n! s linit3. 5 %mer Ooc -ort Oci(11"(pp. 21B-221(1111.
- F10G 9 itchell(5. .(Ohenn n(*. (Er tt n(0. &. [9 3(1. 9.(;om to .ruit 3iel!s n! Cu lit3 un!er w ter !e.icit n! s linit3. 5 %mer Ooc -ort Oci(11"(pp. 21B-221(1111.

- 131 Sem I 7ur - ssene n! 9u:erem ; h Oei!: *omp r ti/e ,er.orm nce +/ lu tion o.%ltern te n! *on/ection l)urrow
'rrig tion un!er li..erent < ter %pplic tion =e/el on * bb ge < ter 4se +..icienc3 n! +conomic %n l3sis
- F11G @ehbou!i n(9. -. [9ills(;. 9.(1e.icit irrig tion in
!eci!uous orch r!s. -ort &e/(21(pp. 10B-131(11I7.
- F12G Ol tni(%.(Y 3 nib(J.(Y iri (%.(R coubi (O.(O l/ !orc(&.
[,l 3\nc(+.(%ssessing ltern te .urrow str tegies .or pot to
t the *her.ech irrig tion !istrict o. ;unisi . @ios3stems
+ngineering(10#(2)(pp. 1B4-1"3(2011.
- F13G 7elson(1. 5. [%l-J isi(9. 9.(%gronomic n! economic
e/ lu tion o. / rious .urrow irrig tion str tegies .or corn
pro!uction un!er limite! w ter suppl3. 5ourn l o. Oil n!
< ter *onser/ tion(""(2)(pp. 114-120(2011.
- F14G 9ich el(%. 9. 11I7. 'rrig tion ;heor3 n! ,r ctice.
, shur ti ,rinters(1elhi.
- F1BG 'sr elsen(\$. <.(n! >. +. - nsen. 1I#0. 'rrig tion ,rinciples
n! ,r ctices. 5onsen <ile3 n! Oons('nc. 7ew Ror:(=on!on
- F1"G =i(%.(+. +neji(=. 1u n(O. 'n n g (n! Y. =i. 200B. 0 /ing
irrig tion w ter .or winter whe t.
- F17G -orton 1.(1I#2. , rti l bu!get n l3sis .or on . rm pot to
rese rch. ;echnic l in.orm tion bulletin 1". 'ntern tion l
pot to center. =im (,eru with phosphorus pplic tion the
north *hin pl in. 5ourn l o. ,l nt 7utrition 2#: 2001-2010.
- F1#G Een]ogl n(*. (n! %. R ? r. 1III. ;he e..ects o. !e.icit
irrig tions on corn 3iel! n! w ter use e..icienc3. ;ur:ish 5.
%gric.)orest. 23: pp 233M241.
- F11G Yel lem shelemew. 201B. &esponse o. m i?e to !e.icit
irrig tion un!er three .urrow irrig tion s3stems in ! mi tulu
ri.t / lle3 *entr l +thiopi . 9. 0*. ;hesis. %lem 3
4ni/ersit3(+thiopi .
- F20G %w ! %b! +l- lim. 2013. 'mp ct o. ltern te .urrow
irrig tion with !i..erent irrig tion inter/ ls on 3iel!(w ter use
e..icienc3(n! economic return o. corn. *hile n 5ourn l o.
%gricltur l &ese rch 73(2) %pril-5une 2013. ; nt
4ni/ersit3() cult3 o. %griclture(; nt (+g3pt.
- F21G =i) (*. <ei(). Yh ng(5. Yh ng(9. 7ong(O. J ng. 2010 .
< ter-use e..icienc3 n! ph3siologic l responses o. m i?e
un!er p rti l root-?one irrig tion. %grc(< ter 9 n g 17:
11B"M11"4. !oi:10.101"/j. gw t.2010.01.024.
- F22G Yh ng(5.(O. J ng(Y. =i ng.(R. Y. , n(,. Ohi(R. -. , n(Y.
O. =i ng(Z. ;. -u(2000. Oil w ter !istribution(uni.ormit3
n! w ter use e..icienc3 un!er ltern te .urrow irrig tion in
ri! re s. 'rrig. Oci. 1I: 1#1-1I0.
- F23G J ss w @esh w. 2011. +/ lu tion o. ltern te n! surge .low
.urrow irrig tion metho!s .or onion pro!uction t humbo(
southern +thiopi . 9sc.thesis(- r m 3 4ni/ersit3(- r m 3
- F24G Jirn : -(O. 1emir(' . ; s(9. * :m :li. 2002. &esponse o.
!i..erent irrig tion w ter pplic tions on 3iel! n! growth o.
lettuce grown in greenhouse. 5 %gric) c - rr n 4ni. "(1-2)(
47-B4.
- F2BG Oh hn ? ri(%.(=iu().(%n!ersen(9. 7.(5 cobsen(O. +.(
Sensen(*. &.(2007. +..ects o. p rti l root-?one !r3ing on
3iel!(tuber si?e n! w ter use e..icienc3 in pot to un!er .iel!
con!itions.)iel! *rops &ese rch(100: 117-124.
- F2"G J ! 3%.c%(E'. ;u3lu(R. 4] r(@. ^ :m :. 2004. +..ects o.
mulch n! irrig tion w ter mounts on lettuce s 3iel!(
e/ potr nspir tion(tr nspir tion n! soil e/ por tion in
- 'sp rt loc tion(;ur:e3. 5ourn l o. @iologic l Ociencie l 4("):
7B1-7BB.
- F27G %hm !i(O. -(9. 7(%n!ersen().(, l uborg(&.(;(,oulsen(
*. &.(%.(5ensen(Oep s:h h(O.(- nsen(2010b. +..ects o.
irrig tion str tegies n! soils on .iel! grown pot toes: Riel!
n! < ter ,ro!ucti/it3. %gricltur l < ter 9 n gement(1 \$'
10.1"01"/j. gw t.2010.07.007.
- F2#G Eu ng-*heng(O.(Yh n-Ru (Y.(7 c(=(Ohu ng-+n (R.(
<eng-E ng (Z.(200#. *omp r ti/e e..ects o. !e.icit
irrig tion (1') n! p rti l root ?one !r3ing (,&1) on soil
w ter !istribution(w ter use(growth n! 3iel! in greenhouse
grown hot pepper. Ocienti - orticltur e(11I: 11-1".
- F2IG 9 n!e.ro *h l n! Jo:obe </Roh nnes. 201B. +..ect o.
irrig tion pplic tion le/els on 3iel! n! w ter pro!ucti/it3 o.
!rip irrig te! lettuce (= ctuc s ti/ l.)(Ee!io ?one(southern
+thiopi . 'ntern tion l journ l o. b sic n! pplic! sciences
/ol. 4. 7o. 4 201B. ,p. 221-234 (online /ersion / il ble t:
www.cr!eep.com)
- F30G ,.ei..er =. n! R. *. =in. 2014. 1oes e..icient irrig tion
technolog3 le ! to re!uce! groun!w ter e2tr ctiona +mpiric l
e/i!ence(5. +n/iron. +con. 9 n g. "7(1#IM20#(&oi:
10.101"/j.jeem.2013.12.002(3BI"(3"1B.
- F31G Oh h(;. 2014. Eroun!w ter go/ern nce n! irrig te! griculture(
;* b c:groun! p pers no. 1I(;ech. &ep. 1I(Elob l < ter
, rtnership ;echnic l *ommittee(Otoc:holm(Owe!en. ,p. 3"1B.
- F32G =i-Oong ; ng(R n =i(5i nhu Yh ng. 200B. ,h3siologic l
n! 3iel! responses o. cotton un!er p rti l root ?one
irrig tion.)iel! crop rese rch rticle in press.
www.else/ier.com/loc te/cr.)u: ng Ot tion o. 1esert
+colog3(Zinji ng 'nstitute o. +colog3 n! Eeogr ph3(
*hinese %c !em3 o. Ociences(40-3 Oouth @eijing &o !(
4rumCi(Zinji ng #30011(*hin .
- F33G ,r /u: l3 n , nigr hi(7 ren!r 7 th 0 hu. 0 n t n
,r !h n. (2011). +/ lu ting p rti l root-?one irrig tion n!
mulching in o:r (%belmoschus esculentus =.) un!er sub-
humi! tropic l clim te. 5ourn l o. %griclture n! &ur l
le/elopment in the ;ropics n! Oubtropics. >ol. 112 7o. 2
(2011) 1"IM17B.
- F34G Oi3 l %. %.(9 shori %. O(@ristow(J. =(> n Eenuchten 9.
;h. 201". %ltern te .urrow irrig tion c n r !ic l3 impro/e
w ter pro!ucti/it3 o. o:r . %gricltur l < ter 9 n gement.
5ourn l homep ge: www.else/ier.com/loc te/ gw t
- F3BG 1oorenbos(5. n! %. -. J ss m(1I7I. Riel! response to
w ter. 'rrig tion n! 1r in ge p per 33()%\$(&ome.
- F3"G -utton &5(=o/e3s @& (2011). % p rti l root ?one !r3ing
irrig tion str teg3 .or citrus b..ects on w ter use e..icienc3
n! .ruit ch r cteristics. %grc < ter 9 n g. I#: 14#BM14I".
!oi:10.101"/j. gw t.2011.04.010.
- F37G R ct 3o <(1. %. & mere?(&.(Eutidrr?(>.(9 res(%.(
,os ! s! &.(Nuiro?((2013) +..ect o. p rti l root-?one !r3ing
irrig tion timing on pot to tuber 3iel! n! w ter use
e..icienc3. %grc. < ter 9 n g. 123: "BM70.
!oi:10.101"/j. gw t.2013.03.001.
- F3#G R ng N=(). *. (Yh ng(Z. E.(=iu(Y. R.(Ee. (2012b). +..ects
o. controle! ltern te p rti l root-?one !rip irrig tion on
pple see!ling morphologic l ch r cteristics n! root
h3!r ulic con!ucti/it3. *hin 5 %ppl +co 23: 1233M123I.