Dedication

To soul of my Father

,To my Mother

Sisters and

,Brothers

My Wife and Daughters: Aasha & Afraa

Acknowledgment

First, of all I am grateful to Almighty Allah For his great blessing. My sincere thanks and gratitude to my Supervisor Dr. Elsadig Al-Mahdi, for encouragement help, guidance and continued support. More thanks to Co-Supervisor Professor. Sami Mohammed Tambal. Due thanks are extended to the staff of the Department of Agricultural Engineering, College of Agricultural Studies Sudan University of Science and Technology. Thanks are also due to the staff of College of Agricultural Science .Dongola University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Торіс | Pag | | |
|------|---|------|--|--|
| | | е | | |
| | Dedication | 1 | | |
| | Acknowledgment | Ш | | |
| | Table of contents | Ш | | |
| | List of tables | VI | | |
| | List of plates and figures | VIII | | |
| | List of abbreviations | IX | | |
| | English abstract | Χ | | |
| | Arabic abstract | XII | | |
| | (CHAPTER ONE (Introduction | | | |
| 1.1 | Introduction | 1 | | |
| | (CHAPTER TWO (Literature Review | | | |
| 2.1 | Introduction | 5 | | |
| 2.2 | Sunflower crop | 5 | | |
| 2.3 | Sunflower in the Sudan | 6 | | |
| 2.4 | Crop water requirement | 7 | | |
| 2.5 | Methods to calculate crop water requirement | | | |
| 2.5. | Direct measurement of crop | | | |
| 1 | evapotranspiration | | | |
| 2.5. | Estimated crop evapotranspiration ETc | 9 | | |
| 2 | | | | |
| 2.6 | Deficit irrigation | 10 | | |

| 2.7 | Effect of irrigation practices on sunflower yield | 11 | | | | |
|------|---|----|--|--|--|--|
| 2.8 | Definition of soil tillage | | | | | |
| 2.9 | Tillage objectives | | | | | |
| 2.1 | Tillage classes and systems | 18 | | | | |
| 0 | | | | | | |
| 2.1 | Effect of tillage on soil physical properties | 19 | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | | |
| 2.1 | Effect of tillage on soil infiltration rate | 21 | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | |
| 2.1 | Effect of tillage on soil moisture content | 22 | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | |
| 2.1 | Effect of tillage on crops yield | 22 | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | |
| 2.1 | Effect of tillage on sunflower yield | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | |
| 2.1 | Sowing methods | 24 | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | |
| | (CHAPTER THREE (Material & Methods | | | | | |
| 3.1 | The experimental site | 25 | | | | |
| 3.2 | Soil of the experimental site | 25 | | | | |
| 3.2. | Profile description | 25 | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | | |
| 3.3 | Experimental design and treatments | 26 | | | | |
| 3.4 | Cultural practices | 31 | | | | |
| 3.4. | The seed | 31 | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | | |
| 3.4. | Sowing | 31 | | | | |

| 2 | | | | | |
|------|-----------------------------|----|--|--|--|
| 3.4. | Sowing date | 31 | | | |
| 3 | | | | | |
| 3.4. | Irrigation water measured | 31 | | | |
| 4 | | | | | |
| 3.5 | Soil parameters | 31 | | | |
| 3.5. | Soil moisture contents | 31 | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| 3.5. | Infiltration characteristic | 32 | | | |
| 2 | | | | | |
| 3.5. | Bulk density | 32 | | | |
| 3 | | | | | |
| 3.5. | Particle density | 33 | | | |
| 4 | | | | | |
| 3.5. | Soil porosity | 33 | | | |
| 5 | | | | | |
| 3.6 | Vegetative plant parameters | 33 | | | |
| 3.6. | Plant height | 33 | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| 3.6. | Stem diameter | 33 | | | |
| 2 | | | | | |
| 3.6. | (Leaf area index (L.A.I | 34 | | | |
| 3 | | | | | |
| 3.7 | Yield parameters | 34 | | | |
| 3.7. | (Head diameters (cm | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | |
| 3.7. | Number of seed per head | | | | |

| | | 2 |
|----|--|------|
| 34 | Thousand seed weights | 3.7. |
| | | 3 |
| 34 | Seed yield per feddan | 3.7. |
| | | 4 |
| 34 | Statistical analysis | 3.8 |
| | (CHAPTER FOUR (Results and Discussion | |
| 36 | Effect of tillage on Soil parameters | 4.3 |
| 36 | Bulk density | 4.3. |
| | | 1 |
| 36 | Porosity percentage | 4.3. |
| | | 2 |
| 38 | Infiltration rate | 4.3. |
| | | 3 |
| 38 | Crop water requirement | 4.3. |
| | | 4 |
| 38 | Water demand | 4.3. |
| | | 5 |
| 40 | Moisture content | 4.3. |
| | | 6 |
| 44 | Effect of different treatments on Vegetative | 4.2 |
| | parameters | |
| 44 | Effect of Irrigation water levels | 4.2. |
| | | 1 |
| 46 | Effect of sowing methods | 4.2. |
| | | 2 |
| 46 | Effect of tillage types | 4.2. |

| 3 | | | | | | |
|------|--|-------------|--|--|--|--|
| 4.2. | Effect of treatments Combination on | ition on 48 | | | | |
| 4 | Vegetative parameters | | | | | |
| 4.1 | Effect of different treatments on yield | 55 | | | | |
| | parameter | | | | | |
| 4.1. | Effect of Irrigation water levels | 55 | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | | |
| 4.1. | Effect of sowing methods | 56 | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | |
| 4.1. | . Effect of tillage types | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | |
| 4.1. | 1. Effect of treatments Combination on yield | | | | | |
| 4 | parameters | | | | | |
| | CHAPTER FIVE | | | | | |
| | Conclusions | 70 | | | | |
| | Recommendations | 17 | | | | |
| | References | 73 | | | | |
| | Appendices | 85 | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

LIST OF TABLES

| | Topic | Pag e |
|-----|---|----------|
| 4.1 | Mean values of bulk density in g/cm³ at 0.0 – 0.25m depth | 37 |
| | for the 2011 and 2012 seasons for the four tillage | |
| | treatment | |
| 4.2 | Mean values of porosity % at 0.0 - 0.25m depth for the | 37 |

| | 2011 and 2012 seasons for the four tillage treatment | |
|----|---|-----|
| 41 | F values from ANOVA table for soil moisture contents in | 4.3 |
| | both seasons | |
| 42 | Effect of tillage treatment on soil moisture content for both | 4.4 |
| | seasons | |
| 42 | Effect of sowing method (Ridge and Flat) treatment on soil | 4.5 |
| | moisture content for both seasons | |
| 43 | Effect of applied water amount treatment on soil moisture | 4.6 |
| | content | |
| 45 | F value for vegetative parameters in both seasons | 4.7 |
| 45 | Effect of irrigation water levels treatments on vegetative | 4.8 |
| | parameters of sunflower (Helianthus annuus L) for both | |
| | seasons | |
| 47 | Effect of sowing methods treatments on vegetative | 4.9 |
| | parameters of sunflower (Helianthus annuus L) for both | |
| | seasons | |
| 47 | Effect of tillage treatments on vegetative parameters of | 4.1 |
| | sunflower (Helianthus annuus L) for both seasons | 0 |
| 50 | Interaction effect of (tillage and sowing methods) on | 4.1 |
| | vegetative parameters | 1 |
| 51 | Interaction effect of (tillage and irrigation water levels) on | 4.1 |
| | vegetative parameters | 2 |
| 52 | Interaction effect between (sowing methods X irrigation water amount) | 4.1 |
| | on vegetative parameters | 3 |
| 53 | Effect of interaction between tillage, sowing methods and | 4.1 |
| | irrigation water levels on vegetative parameters | 4 |
| 63 | Interaction effect between (tillage X sowing methods) on | 4 1 |

| | yield parameters | 5 |
|----|--|-----|
| 64 | Interaction effect between (tillage X irrigation water levels) | 4.1 |
| | on yield parameters | 6 |
| 66 | Interaction effect between (Sowing methods X Irrigation | 4.1 |
| | water levels) on yield parameters | 7 |
| 67 | Interaction effect between tillage X sowing methods X | 4.1 |
| | irrigation water levels on yield parameters | 8 |
| 69 | F value for yield parameters in both seasons | 4.1 |
| | | 9 |

LIST OF PLATES AND FIGURES

| | Topic | Pag |
|-----|--|-----|
| | | e |
| | PLATES | |
| 1 | Experimental layout | 28 |
| 2 | Three-body disc plow | 29 |
| 3 | Heavy disc harrow | 29 |
| 4 | Chisel plow | 29 |
| 5 | Ridge plot | 30 |
| 6 | Flat plot | 30 |
| 7 | Parshall flume 2inch | 35 |
| 8 | Double ring cylinder infiltrometer | 35 |
| | FIGURES | |
| 4.1 | Infiltration rate in cm for the different tillage | 39 |
| | treatments | |
| 4.2 | cumulative infiltration (cm) for the different tillage | 39 |
| | treatments | |
| 4.3 | Effect of different treatments on head diameters | 58 |
| | ((cm | |
| 4.4 | Effect of different treatments on number of | 58 |
| | seed/head | |
| 4.5 | Effect of different treatments on thousand seed | 59 |
| | (weight (gm | |

| 4.6 | | ET | rect or aim | erent treatme | ents | on yieid | кд/теа | 59 |
|-----|--------|----|-------------|---------------|------|----------|--------|----|
| 4.7 | Effect | of | different | treatments | on | Empty | seeds | 60 |
| | | | | | | perc | entage | |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| Agricultural Research Service | ARS |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| Before century | B.C |
| Beginning flower stage | BF |
| Conventional tillage | CT |
| Crop water requirement | CWR |
| Day after sowing | DAS |
| Actual evapotranspiration | ET_a |
| Crop evapotranspiration | ET_c |
| Food and agriculture organization | FAO |
| Flower bud stage | FB |
| Hectares | На |
| Harvesting index | HI |
| High yield varieties | HYV_{S} |
| | |

| Initial stage | I |
|----------------------------------|---------|
| Crop coefficient | K_{C} |
| Kilograms | Kg |
| Leaf area index | LAI |
| Middle season growth stage | MG |
| National Endowment for the | NEH |
| Humanities | |
| Net irrigation water requirement | NIWR |
| Strip tillage | ST |
| Soil Conservation Servece | SCS |
| Final growth stage | Т |
| Water use efficiency | WUE |

ABSTRACT

Afield study was conducted to known the effect of three tillage types (harrowing, disking, chiseling and control (zero tillage)) and two sowing methods (Ridge and flat) and irrigation water levels (100%ETc, 85% ETc and 75% ETc) on sunflower crop (*Helianthus annuus L.*) hybrid hysun33 in summer season during (2011- 2012) in Faculty of Agricultural Science farm, University of Dongola, .Northern State by

A two-year field experiment was carried out using a stripsplit plot arranged in randomized complete block design with four replications in two seasons 2011 – 2012. Recognized standard methods were used for assessing yield, vegetative growth, soil physical properties and field :water regimes. Results can be summarizing as follows

Significant differences in yields were obtained at 100%ETc irrigation water levels. This indicates the sensitivity of the crop to water stress. Analysis of variance, in both seasons, showed significant differences due to tillage treatments. The highest values in yield were obtained under harrowing treatments and lowest values were obtained under notillage treatment. This may be attributed to the fact that sunflower plant is a tap rooted plant that penetrates well in tilled soils. The number of seed per head was not affected by tillage treatments, water stress and sowing methods. It seems that these characters are genetically .control rather than environmentally affected

Sunflower is well known for its empty seeds problem. 100% ET_c irrigation water level showed no improvement in the reduction of the number of empty seeds, but, on the reverse the number of empty increased. This implies that the number of empty seeds phenomenon is associated with level of irrigation at a certain growth stages of the plant life duration. On the other hand there was no .significant difference due to sowing methods

Full 100%ETc should be given to the crop to get maximum yield. Empty seeds should be studied under different .deficit irrigation levels at mid stage of plant growth

الخلاصة

أجريت هذه الدراسة لمعرفة تأثير ثلاثة عمليات حراثة مختلفة (المشط القرصي الثقيل، محراث قرصي ومحراث حفار) بالإضافة الي ارض غير محروثة كشاهد وطريقتين للزراعة (احواض مسربة واحواض مسطحة) وثلاثة مستويات مياه مختلفة (الري بالعجز ،100%) (Deficit irrigation)

85% و 75%) مـن الاحتيـاج المـائي للمحصـول علـي محصـول زهـرة الشمس (Helianthus annuus L) الصنف هاي صن 33 في الموسم الصيفي لموسـميين متتـاليين (2011 - 2012)م بمزرعـة كليـة العلـوم الزراعيـة - جامعـة دنقلا - الولايـة الشـمالية بتصـميم القطـع المنشـقة - المنشقة بتوزيع القطاعات العشوائية الكاملة مع 4 مكررات لموسمين. تم استخدام طرق قياسية لأخذ قياسات الانتاجية، تطور النمـو، التربـة وكميـة مياه الري ويمكن تلخيص النتائج فيما يلي.

أظهرت النتائج فروقات معنوية في الانتاجية بمستوي مياه ري 100% من الاحتياج المائي للمحصول وكان ذلك مؤشر واضح لحساسية المحصول للشد الرطوبي. ايضاً تحليل التباين في الموسمين اظهر فروقات معنوية نتيجة لعمليات الحراثة المختلفة وقد حققت الحراثة بالمشط القرصي الثقيل اعلي قيمة للإنتاجية وكانت الإنتاجية بالارض الغير محروثة متدنية وهذا يرجع الي ان محصول زهرة الشمس له جذوره وتدية تخترق التربة المحروثة بسهولة. بينما نجد ان عدد البذور في القرص لم يتأثر المعاملات المختلفة ويبدو ان هذه خاصية محكومة وراثياً ليس للعوامل البيئية أي تأثير فيها.

معروف ان محصول زهرة الشمس به مشكلة البذور الفارغة واشارت النتائج الي ان معاملة مياه الري %ETc100 لم تظهر أي تحسن في تقليل نسبة البذور الفارغة بل علي العكس فقد اعطت نسبة اكبر مقارنة مع معاملات الري الاخرى. وهذا يشير الي ان مشكلة نسبة البذور الفارغة مرتبط بكمية مياه الري في مرحلة محددة من دورة حياة المحصول. علي صعيد آخر لم تظهر أي فروقات معنوية بين الزراعة بالاحواض المسربة والاحواض المسطحة. معاملة مياه الري %ETc100 من الاحتياج المائي للمحصول اعطي انتاجية عالية ويمكن معالجة مشكلة البذور الفارغة وذلك بدراسة اثر الري بالعجز لمراحل النمو الوسطي المحصول.