

# INFLUENCE OF AGRONOMIC MANAGERMENTS ON GROWTH AND YIELD OF BORO RICE

J.C. Roy<sup>1\*</sup>, P.K. Biswas<sup>2</sup>, M.S. Islam<sup>2</sup> and M. H. Mahmud<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Japan Tobacco International, Kushtia, Bangladesh

<sup>2</sup>Department of Agronomy, Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University Dhaka-1207, Bangladesh,

<sup>3</sup>Project Implementation Unit-BARC, National Agricultural Technology Program-Phase-II Project, Dhaka, Bangladesh.

\*Corresponding author, Email: jibanroyjc05@gmail.com

(Received: 15 April 2023, Accepted: 24 September 2023)

**Keywords:** Agronomic management, *boro* rice, growth, yield

## Abstract

The study was carried out at Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University, Dhaka from December 2018 to April 2019, to find out the agronomic practices on the growth and yield of *Boro* rice. The trial was conducted with two rice varieties namely V<sub>1</sub> (BRRI dhan84) and V<sub>2</sub> (BRRI hybriddhan5), and 5 different agronomic practices such as M<sub>0</sub> (no management), where variety in main-plot and management practices in sub-plot. The results showed significant variations in weed severity, and yield of *Boro* rice. Specific observations included plants reaching heights of 24.81 cm, 51.56 cm, 86.71 cm, and 119.21 cm at 20, 45, 70 days after transplanting (DAT), and at harvest, respectively. V<sub>2</sub> exhibited a higher grain yield (5.36 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) but a reduced straw yield (4.97 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) compared to V<sub>1</sub>. Generally, regardless of the agronomic practices, BRRI dhan84 exhibited greater plant height, except under the 'no management' practice. The grain yield (6.70 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) was obtained with M<sub>6</sub>, and the maximum straw yield (6.55 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) to M<sub>4</sub>. The interaction effects showed that highest grain yield (7.35 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) from V<sub>2</sub>M<sub>6</sub>, while with V<sub>1</sub>M<sub>0</sub>. The most significant yield reduction for BRRI dhan84 was 84% with no management and 80% with no fertilizer, while BRRI hybriddhan5 showed a 71% reduction under similar conditions.

## Introduction

Rice is the primary crop in Bangladesh, occupying 75% of the total cropped area, with 92% of farmers cultivating it (Rekabder, 2004). Approximately 75% of all cropped regions and over 80% of irrigated zones are dedicated to rice (BRKB, 2017). While Bangladesh boasts an average rice yield of 3.26 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (BBS, 2022), its productivity lags behind countries like China, Japan, and Korea, all of which have average yields of t ha<sup>-1</sup> (FAO, 2009).

Different fertilization approaches can influence plant growth, maturation, size, phytochemical content, and seed properties (Mevi Schütz *et al.*, 2003).

Water management, particularly during the *Boro* season's flowering stage, affects water use efficiency (Maity and Sarkar, 1990). Water shortages at various growth stages can severely impact grain yield (Patel, 2000). Furthermore, weeds pose the most significant challenge to rice yield, with global yield losses to pests estimated at 40%. Of these losses, weeds are responsible for a staggering 32% (Rao *et al.*, 2007).

Effective agronomic strategies profoundly influence rice growth and yield. Yield decreases are often due to suboptimal weed, nutrient, and irrigation management. Consequently, comprehensive management techniques are crucial for optimal rice production in Bangladesh. However, many Bangladeshi farmers spend excessive time and effort on weed control while neglecting proper fertilization and irrigation. Its objectives encompass comparing two *Boro* rice

varieties, evaluating individual agronomic techniques on rice growth, and examining the combined impact of variety and agronomic practices on *Boro* rice performance.

## Materials and Methods

The experiment was carried out at Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University's field in Sher-e-Bangla Nagar, Dhaka. This site is positioned at a latitude of 23°74'N and a longitude of 90°35'E, and it stands 8.2 meters above sea level. The soil here originates from "The Modhupur Tract" or AEZ- 28, as categorized by FAO in 1988. This topsoil has an olive-gray, silty clay texture, dotted with distinct dark yellowish-brown spots. It has a pH of 5.6 and contains 0.45% organic carbon. The trial was carried out in a split-plot design with three replications where variety (BRRI dhan84 and BRRI hybriddhan5) in main-plot and management practices in sub-plot. on variety, and seven different management i.e., no managements (M<sub>0</sub>), No weeding, (M<sub>1</sub>), No fertilizer application, but all other managements (M<sub>2</sub>), no irrigation in reproductive and ripening stage, but all other managements (M<sub>3</sub>), No insecticides, but all other managements (M<sub>4</sub>), no Fungicides/bactericides, but all other managements (M<sub>5</sub>), complete managements (M<sub>6</sub>)

The var. BRRI dhan84, on average, stands between 90-96 cm tall during its ripening stage, bearing medium fine, white grains. It completes its life cycle in approximately 140-145 days and produces an average grain yield of 6.0-6.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, as reported by BRKB in 2017. The experiment area received fertilization as per recommended methods: 200 kg N, 80 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, 125 kg K<sub>2</sub>O, 20 kg S, and 10 kg Zn. Urea was applied in three portions while other fertilizers were added during the final land preparation. Crop management was based as per need.

Various metrics such as plant height, leaf area index (LAI), number effective non-effective tillers hill<sup>-1</sup> and panicle length were measured. Leaf area index calculated by foliage from 5 hills canopy, measuring the leaf area per plot and dividing it by the plot land surface area. Grains were categorized as filled or unfilled, counted the data from 10 panicles per plot. The weight of 1000 - grains were measured at 12% moisture content. Both grain and straw yields were calculated from each plot's converted to as t ha<sup>-1</sup>. Biological yield was calculated with the following formula: Biological yield = Grain yield + Straw yield. Harvest index was calculated as:

$$HI = \frac{\text{Economic yield (grain weight)}}{\text{Biological yield (Total dry weight)}} \times 100$$

Finally, the data was analyzed for any significant variations between the treatments. by using Duncan's Multiple Range Test at a 5% probability level Gomez and Gomez (1984).

## Results and Discussion

### Plant height

Plant height showed numeric differences at 20, 45, and 70 DAT, and significant differences at harvest for both BRRI dhan84 and BRRI hybriddhan5 (Table 1). The tallest plants at 45, 70 DAT and at harvest were from V<sub>1</sub> (BRRI dhan84) with heights of 24.81 cm, 51.56 cm, 86.71 cm, and 119.21 cm respectively. Conversely, the shortest plants were from V<sub>1</sub> (BRRI hybriddhan5) with heights of 25.28 cm, 49.53 cm, 79.61 cm, and 104.08 cm. The variations in plant height were attributed to the inherent varietal characteristics. At 20, 45, 70 DAT, and at harvest, the tallest plants were observed under M<sub>6</sub> (recommended management) with heights of 25.65 cm, 53.713 cm, 87.26 cm, and 118.15 cm respectively. In contrast, the shortest plants, with heights of 22.73 cm, 39.76 cm, 66.95 cm, and 93.88 cm respectively, were recorded under M<sub>0</sub> (no management). Considering the interaction between variety and management, the tallest plants at 20, 45, 70 DAT, and at harvest were from V<sub>1</sub>M<sub>6</sub> (BRRI dhan84 + recommended

management) with respective heights of 25.89 cm, 55.6 cm, 89.32 cm, and 127.4 cm. The shortest plants, on the other hand, were from V1M0 (BRRI hybriddhan5 + no management) with heights of 22.92 cm, 36.93 cm, 61.28 cm, and 90.6 cm, respectively.

### Leaf area index

The leaf area index (LAI) showed numeric variation at 20 and 45 DAT and significant variation at 70 DAT for both BRRI dhan84 and BRRI hybriddhan5 (Table 1).

Table 1. Effect of variety, agronomic managements, and treatment interaction on plant height (cm) and leaf area index (LAI) of *Boro* rice

Treatments	Plant height (cm)				Leaf Area Index (LAI)			
	20 DAT	45 DAT	70 DAT	At harvest	20 DAT	45 DAT	70 DAT	At harvest
<b>Variety</b>								
V1	24.81	51.56	86.71	119.22	0.09 b	3.30 a	6.86 a	7.06 a
V2	25.29	49.54	79.61	104.08	0.10 a	2.35 b	6.44 b	5.20 b
SE	0.45	0.97	1.21	1.69	0.01	0.2	0.18	1.52
CV (%)	17.00	16.29	8.97	8.26	33.41	22.85	8.78	80.43
<b>Agronomic managements</b>								
M0	22.74b	39.76c	66.95b	93.88c	0.09 a	1.30 b	1.67 c	2.08 d
M1	23.22b	41.96c	71.25b	105.17b	0.09 a	1.37 b	3.25 c	3.74 cd
M2	26.27a	58.87a	88.44a	116.27a	0.12 a	3.81 a	5.91 b	4.67 bc
M3	25.56ab	52.52b	90.18a	115.83a	0.10 a	3.28 a	9.30 a	8.98 a
M4	26.02ab	53.98b	86.85a	114.62a	0.09 a	3.27 a	8.70 a	7.68 a
M5	25.88ab	53.05b	91.19a	117.63a	0.10 a	3.33 a	8.34 a	6.76 ab
M6	25.66	53.71	87.26a	118.15a	0.11 a	3.43 a	9.40 a	9.00 a
SE	1.03	1.12	1.40	1.69	0.01	0.26	0.51	0.61
CV (%)	11.48	5.49	6.12	5.46	31.48	33.66	27.48	35.98
<b>Combined influence of variety and agronomic managements</b>								
V1M0	22.54 b	42.58 de	72.61 d	97.16 de	0.08 abc	1.72 cde	2.13ef	2.95 ef
V1M1	22.87 b	38.94 ef	70.94 d	111.20 b	0.07 c	1.11 de	2.51ef	3.17 ef
V1M2	26.50 ab	60.04 a	92.60 ab	125.90 a	0.11 abc	4.83 a	6.68bcd	5.54 cde
V1M3	27.16 ab	53.92 bc	94.82 a	123.53 a	0.10 abc	3.61 ab	8.6ab	9.12 abc
V1M4	24.94 ab	54.79 bc	91.46 ab	124.80 a	0.08 abc	3.71 ab	9.62ab	9.64 ab
V1M5	23.75 ab	55.04 bc	95.22 a	124.53 a	0.07 bc	3.95 ab	8.65ab	8.05 abc
V1M6	25.89 ab	55.60 abc	89.32 abc	127.40 a	0.12 ab	4.15 ab	9.84a	10.98 a
V2M0	22.92 b	36.93 f	61.28 e	90.60 e	0.09 abc	0.87 e	1.22f	1.21 f
V2M1	23.56 ab	44.98 d	71.56 d	99.13 cde	0.11 abc	1.62 cde	3.99def	4.31 def
V2M2	26.03 ab	57.70 ab	84.28 bc	106.63 bcd	0.12 ab	2.78 bc	5.14cde	3.80 def
V2M3	23.95 ab	51.11 c	85.53 bc	108.13 bc	0.10 abc	2.94 bc	10a	8.85 abc
V2M4	27.10 ab	53.16 bc	82.23 c	104.43 bcd	0.08 abc	2.82 bc	7.77abc	5.72 cde
V2M5	28.01 a	51.04 c	87.16 abc	110.73 b	0.13 a	2.72 bc	8.02abc	5.47 cde
V2M6	25.42 ab	51.82 c	85.20 bc	108.90 bc	0.10 abc	2.71 bcd	8.96ab	7.02 bcd
SE=	1.13	1.09	1.99	2.39	0.01	0.37	0.72	0.86
CV (%)	11.48	5.49	6.12	5.46	31.48	33.66	27.48	35.98

In a column mean values having similar letter(s) are statistically similar and those having dissimilar letter(s) differ significantly as per 0.05 level of probability by DMRT Test. V1: BRRI dhan84, V2: BRRI hybriddhan5; M0: No management, M1: No weeding, but all other managements, M2: No fertilizer application, but all other managements, M3: No Irrigation in reproductive and; ripening stage, but all other managements, M4: No Insecticides, but all other managements, M5: No Fungicides/bactericides, but all other managements, M6: Complete Managements.

The highest LAI values at 20, 45, and 70 DAT were 0.09, 3.3, and 6.9 respectively, was recorded from V1 (BRRI dhan84). On the other hand, the lowest values were 0.1, 2.35, and 6.44 respectively from V2 (BRRI hybriddhan5). Different agronomic managements showed significant impacts on the LAI at 20, 45, and 70 DAT. Specifically, the highest LAI values were observed under M6 (recommended management) with values of 0.11, 3.43, 9.40, and 9.00 respectively. Conversely, the lowest LAI values 0.09, 1.30, 1.67, and 2.08 respectively, were recorded under M0 (no management). The interaction between variety and management revealed the highest LAI values at 20, 45, 70 DAT, and harvest from V1M6 (BRRI dhan84 + recommended management) with 0.12, 4.15, 9.84, and 10.98 respectively. The lowest values were from V2M0 (BRRI hybriddhan5 + no management) with values of 0.09, 0.87, 1.22, and 1.21, respectively.

### Effective tillers hill<sup>-1</sup>

For BRRI dhan84 and BRRI hybriddhan5, the number of effective tillers per hill at harvest showed notable variation (Table 2).

Table 2. Effect of variety, agronomic managements, and interaction on number of effective tillers, non-effective tillers hill<sup>-1</sup>, panicle length, number of filled grains panicle<sup>-1</sup> and number of unfilled grains panicle<sup>-1</sup> of *Boro rice*

Treatments	Number of effective tillers hill <sup>-1</sup>	Number of non-effective tillers hill <sup>-1</sup>	Panicle length (cm)	Number of filled grains panicle <sup>-1</sup>	Number of unfilled grains panicle <sup>-1</sup>
<b>Variety</b>					
V1	10.83 a	0.26 b	25.91a	123.81	26.00
V2	7.33 b	0.54 a	24.36a	161.24	16.29
SE	0.44	0.02	1.59	51.86	14.64
CV (%)	3.87	4.63	20.49	12.05	3.40
<b>Agronomic managements</b>					
M0	5.60 d	0.17 a	22.43b	101.17c	8.50d
M1	8.20 bc	0.50 a	24.68b	146.50ab	15.17cd
M2	7.27 cd	0.50 a	24.04b	125.50bc	20.50bc
M3	10.90 a	0.37 a	24.77b	143.17ab	26.17ab
M4	10.90 a	0.53 a	25.94ab	165.17a	22.67ab
M5	9.90 b	0.40 a	28.65a	155.50a	28.17a
M6	10.80 a	0.33 a	25.44ab	160.67a	26.83ab
SE	0.59	0.09	0.87	101.17c	8.50d
CV (%)	4.21	14.58	12.45	146.50ab	15.17cd
<b>Combined influence of variety and agronomic managements</b>					
V1M0	7.53 de	0.02 cde	22.86 b	93.00f	7.67f
V1M1	8.93 cd	0.60 bc	24.98 b	134.67cde	15.67def
V1M2	8.80 cd	0.40 b-e	23.76 b	98.00f	20.00cd
V1M3	12.33 ab	0.20 de	25.02 b	123.67def	36.33ab
V1M4	14.00 a	0.07 e	26.37 b	143.00bcde	27.33bc
V1M5	11.20 bc	0.13 e	32.52 a	135.00cde	39.33a
V1M6	13.00 ab	0.13 e	25.86 b	139.33cde	35.67ab
V2M0	3.67 f	0.07 e	21.99 b	109.33ef	9.33ef
V2M1	7.47 de	0.40 b-e	24.39 b	158.33abcd	14.67def
V2M2	5.73 ef	0.6 bc	24.31 b	153.00abcd	21.00cd
V2M3	9.47 cd	0.53 bcd	24.52 b	162.67abc	16.00def
V2M4	7.80 de	1.00 a	25.50 b	187.33a	18.00cde
V2M5	8.60 d	0.67 ab	24.79 b	176.00ab	17.00def
V2M6	8.60 d	0.53 bcd	25.02 b	182.00a	18.00cde
SE	0.95	0.09	0.87	8.12	2.22
CV (%)	4.21	14.58	12.45	14.55	26.83

In a column mean values having similar letter(s) are statistically similar and those having dissimilar letter(s) differ significantly as per 0.05 level of probability. Additional details are as Table 1.

BRR1 dhan84 (V<sub>1</sub>) had a higher with averaging 10.83, while BRR1 hybriddhan5 (V<sub>2</sub>) averaged at 7.33. Various agronomic practices and their interaction with different varieties caused significant differences. The highest average (10.90) from M<sub>4</sub> (all managements except insecticides), with the least (5.60) under M<sub>0</sub> (no management). The combined practice of BRR1 dhan84 and M<sub>4</sub> showed the highest of 14.00, but when BRR1 hybriddhan5 was combined with M<sub>0</sub>, (3.65).

### Non-effective tillers hill<sup>-1</sup>

The number of non-effective tillers per hill at harvest also varied between BRR1 dhan84 and BRR1 hybriddhan5, influenced by agronomic practices and rice varieties (Table 2). BRR1 hybriddhan5 (V<sub>2</sub>) recorded a higher of 0.54, in contrast to BRR1 dhan84's (V<sub>1</sub>) 0.26. M<sub>4</sub> practice led to the highest average of 0.53, while M<sub>0</sub> resulted in the least at 0.17. The combination of BRR1 dhan84 with M<sub>4</sub> resulted in the peak count of 1.00. Conversely, BRR1 hybriddhan5 combined with M<sub>0</sub> marked the lowest at 0.07 in BRR1 dhan84 combinations.

### Length of panicle

The length of the panicle varied between BRR1 dhan84 and BRR1 hybriddhan5 where BRR1 dhan84 (V<sub>1</sub>) had a longer panicle length of 25.91 cm, while BRR1 hybriddhan5 (V<sub>2</sub>) had a shorter length of 24.36 cm (Table 2). Uzzaman *et al.*, (2015) was also found significant differences in panicle length of 16 rice varieties under SRI. Different agronomic practices also influenced panicle length, with the longest (28.65 cm) observed under M<sub>5</sub> and the shortest (24.03 cm) in M<sub>2</sub> (Table 2). The longest panicle in the interaction effect of variety and agronomic management was 32.52 cm from V<sub>1</sub>M<sub>5</sub> and the shortest (21.99 cm) from V<sub>2</sub>M<sub>0</sub> (Table 2).

### Number of filled grains per panicle

There was a numerical variation in the number of filled grains per panicle where BRR1 hybriddhan5 (V<sub>2</sub>) had a higher (161.24), whereas BRR1 dhan84 (V<sub>1</sub>) had 123.81 (Table 2). Ahmed *et al.*, (1997) and Uzzaman *et al.*, (2015) reported varying percentages of filled grains among different rice varieties. Agronomic practices also led to significant differences, with the highest no. (165.17) was observed under M<sub>4</sub> and the lowest (101.17) IN M<sub>0</sub> (Table 2). For the interaction of variety and agronomic practices, the highest and lowest counts were observed from V<sub>2</sub>M<sub>4</sub> (174.67) and V<sub>1</sub>M<sub>0</sub> (93.00) respectively (Table 2).

### Number of unfilled grains per panicle

The number of unfilled grains per panicle also varied between the two varieties. BRR1 dhan84 (V<sub>1</sub>) had a higher (26.00), while BRR1 hybriddhan5 (V<sub>2</sub>) recorded 16.29 (Table 2). Uzzaman *et al.*, (2015) was found significant differences in panicle length 16 rice varieties under SRI. Agronomic practices influenced this count, with the highest (28.17) observed under M<sub>5</sub> and the lowest (8.50) in M<sub>0</sub> (Table 2). For the interaction between variety and agronomic practices, counts ranged from a high of 39.33 (V<sub>1</sub>M<sub>5</sub>) to a low of 7.65 (V<sub>1</sub>M<sub>0</sub>) (Table 2).

The highest number of unfilled grains per panicle (39.33) was noted in V<sub>1</sub>M<sub>5</sub> (BRR1 dhan84 without fungicides/bactericides) followed by V<sub>1</sub>M<sub>6</sub> (35.67). Conversely, V<sub>1</sub>M<sub>0</sub> (BRR1 dhan84 with no management) registered the lowest (7.65) followed by V<sub>1</sub>M<sub>1</sub>, V<sub>2</sub>M<sub>1</sub>, V<sub>2</sub>M<sub>3</sub>, and V<sub>2</sub>M<sub>5</sub> (Table 2).

### Weight of 1000- grains

The weight of 1000- grains didn't show much variation between BRR1 dhan84 and BRR1 hybriddhan5, but there were significant differences among the various agronomic managements and their interactions (Table 3). The higher t weight for 1000 grains (26.70 g) from M<sub>6</sub>

(recommended management), closely followed by M<sub>5</sub>, M<sub>4</sub>, and M<sub>3</sub>. The V<sub>2</sub>M<sub>6</sub> combination (BRRI hybrid dhan5 + recommended management) had the maximum 1000-grains (31.97 g) close to V<sub>2</sub>M<sub>4</sub>(31.88 g) whereas V<sub>1</sub>M<sub>0</sub> recorded the lightest at 20.17 g.

Table 3. Effect of variety, agronomic managements, and interaction on Weight of 1000 grains (g), Grain yield (t ha<sup>-1</sup>), Straw yield (t ha<sup>-1</sup>), Biological yield (t ha<sup>-1</sup>) and Harvest index of *Boro rice*

Treatments	Weight of 1000-grains (g)	Grain yield (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Straw yield (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Biological yield (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Harvest index (%)
<b>Variety</b>					
V <sub>1</sub>	21.71b	4.31	5.22	9.85	45.41
V <sub>2</sub>	31.10a	5.36	4.97	10.01	48.62
SE	1.41	0.37	0.22	0.63	5.08
CV (%)	0.33	24.69	9.31	20.64	34.99
<b>Agronomic managements</b>					
M <sub>0</sub>	25.68b	1.68b	2.22 c	3.90 c	43.02 b
M <sub>1</sub>	25.70b	1.85b	4.02 bc	8.57 b	52.15 ab
M <sub>2</sub>	25.88b	1.98b	4.31 bc	6.29 bc	29.52 c
M <sub>3</sub>	26.01ab	6.28a	6.50 a	12.78 a	49.20 ab
M <sub>4</sub>	26.14ab	6.02a	6.55 a	12.57 a	49.78 ab
M <sub>5</sub>	26.57ab	6.69a	5.47 ab	12.16 a	55.16 a
M <sub>6</sub>	26.70a	6.70a	6.53 a	13.23 a	50.26 ab
SE	0.37	0.28	0.50	0.64	2.77
CV (%)	3.61	20.73	31.94	20.92	19.09
<b>Combined influence of variety and agronomic managements</b>					
V <sub>1</sub> M <sub>0</sub>	20.17d	1.00f	2.36 ef	4.35 ef	44.34 ab
V <sub>1</sub> M <sub>1</sub>	23.55c	3.71cd	3.62 def	7.92 cd	53.84 a
V <sub>1</sub> M <sub>2</sub>	21.60d	1.85ef	4.77 bcd	5.81 def	17.99 c
V <sub>1</sub> M <sub>3</sub>	21.65d	5.53b	6.36 abc	12.52 a	49.13 ab
V <sub>1</sub> M <sub>4</sub>	23.62c	5.67ab	7.37 a	13.24 a	47.41 ab
V <sub>1</sub> M <sub>5</sub>	23.66c	6.05ab	5.21 bcd	11.62 ab	55.62 a
V <sub>1</sub> M <sub>6</sub>	23.75c	6.34ab	6.87 ab	13.50 a	49.50 ab
V <sub>2</sub> M <sub>0</sub>	30.18b	1.51ef	2.07 f	3.44 f	41.69 b
V <sub>2</sub> M <sub>1</sub>	30.60ab	3.39cd	4.43 cd	9.22 bc	50.46 ab
V <sub>2</sub> M <sub>2</sub>	30.16b	2.97de	3.85 def	6.78 cde	41.04 b
V <sub>2</sub> M <sub>3</sub>	31.45ab	7.04ab	6.64 ab	13.04 a	49.26 ab
V <sub>2</sub> M <sub>4</sub>	31.88a	6.36ab	5.74 bcd	11.90 ab	52.15 ab
V <sub>2</sub> M <sub>5</sub>	31.47ab	7.33a	5.73 bcd	12.70 a	54.69 a
V <sub>2</sub> M <sub>6</sub>	31.97a	7.35a	6.34 abc	12.96 a	51.02 ab
SE	0.37	0.39	0.50	0.64	2.77
CV (%)	3.61	20.73	31.94	20.92	19.09

In a column mean values having similar letter(s) are statistically similar and those having dissimilar letter(s) differ significantly as per 0.05 level of probability. Additional details are as Table 1.

### Grain yield

The grain yield didn't show any significant differences between BRRI dhan84 and BRRI hybrid dhan5 but varied significantly among the different agronomic managements and their interactions (Table 3). M<sub>6</sub> (recommended management) yielded the highest grain yield, 6.70 t ha<sup>-1</sup>,

comparable to M<sub>5</sub>, M<sub>4</sub>, and M<sub>3</sub> while M<sub>0</sub> had the least yield. The combination V<sub>2</sub>M<sub>6</sub> resulted in the highest grain yield, while V<sub>1</sub>M<sub>0</sub> recorded the lowest.

### Straw yield

Straw yield showed variations between BRRI dhan84 and BRRI hybriddhan5, with significant differences appearing in different agronomic managements and their interactions (Table 3). V<sub>1</sub> (BRRI dhan84) produced a higher straw yield of 5.22 t ha<sup>-1</sup> compared to V<sub>2</sub> (4.97 t ha<sup>-1</sup>). The highest straw yield was recorded from M<sub>4</sub>, a management strategy without insecticides but including all other management practices. The V<sub>1</sub>M<sub>4</sub> combination recorded the highest straw yield, while V<sub>2</sub>M<sub>0</sub> noted the lowest.

### Biological yield

Biological yield per hectare varied slightly between BRRI dhan84 and BRRI hybriddhan5 but showed significant changes depending on agronomic managements and interaction effects (Table 3). V<sub>2</sub> recorded the highest biological yield of 10.01 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, followed by V<sub>1</sub> (9.85 t ha<sup>-1</sup>). The combination V<sub>1</sub>M<sub>4</sub> yielded the highest biological yield, whereas V<sub>2</sub>M<sub>0</sub> had the least.

### Harvest index

The harvest index showed significant differences based on variety, agronomic managements, and their interaction (Table 3). V<sub>2</sub> (BRRI hybriddhan5) had the maximum harvest index (48.62%), followed by V<sub>1</sub>(45.91%). Among management strategies, M<sub>5</sub> recorded the highest harvest index, while M<sub>2</sub> had the lowest. When considering combinations, V<sub>1</sub>M<sub>5</sub> produced the maximum harvest index, with V<sub>1</sub>M<sub>2</sub> registering the minimum.

## Conclusion

Based on the results presented, it's evident that agronomic management, the absence of fertilization, and lack of weeding have a substantial negative impact on grain yield. In particular, rice var. BRRI dhan84 exhibited a yield reduction of 84% with no management, 72% without fertilizer, and 43% without weeding. Similarly, BRRI hybriddhan5 showed a decrease of 83% in yield without management, 67% without fertilizer, and 62% without weeding. However, further studies need to be conducted across different agro-ecological zones, incorporating more varieties, and varying agronomic practices.

## References

- Ahmed, M. R., M.A. Rashid, M.S. Alam, K.A. Billah and F. Jameel. 1997. Performance of Eight Transplant Aman Rice Varieties under Irrigated Conditions. *Bangladesh Rice J.* 8(1 &2): 43-44.
- BBS. 2022. Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics. Statistical Year book of Bangladesh. Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics. Ministry of planning Govt. People's Republic of Bangladesh, Dhaka, Bangladesh pp.133-135.
- BRKB. 2017. Bangladesh Rice Knowledge Bank. Retrieved from <http://knowledgebank-brii.org/brii-rice-varieties/aus-rice-varieties.php>
- BRRI. 1998. Bangladesh Rice Research Institute. Bangladesh Rice Res. Inst. Joydebpur, Gazipur.
- FAO. 1988. Food and Agriculture Organization. Production Year book. Food and Agricultural of the United Nations Rome, Italy, p.42: 190-193.
- FAO. 2009. Food and Agriculture Organization. FAO Production Yearbook, Food and Agriculture Organization, Rome, Italy, p.56-77.

- Gomez, K.A. and A.A. Gomez. 1984. *Statistical Procedures for Agricultural Research*. John Wiley Pub. New York.
- Maity, S. P and M. K. Sarkar. 1990. Influence of different water management practices on the yield and total evapotranspiration of paddy under different atmospheric evaporative demand. *Oryza*. 27(3): 279-281.
- Mevi Schütz J., M. Goverde and A. Erhardt. 2003. Effects of fertilization and elevated CO<sub>2</sub> on larval food and butterfly nectar amino acid preference in *Coenonympha pamphilus* L. *Behavioral Ecol. and Sociobiol.* 54: 36–43.
- Patel, J.R. 2000. Effect of water regimes, variety and blue-green algae on rice (*Oryza sativa*). *Indian J. Agron.* 45(1): 103-106.
- Rao, A.N., D.E. Johnson, B. Sivaprasad, J.K. Ladha and A.M. Mortimer. 2007. Weed management in direct seeded rice. *Adv. Agron.* 93: 153-255.
- Rekabder, M.F.H. 2004. Dhan chaser nana katha. *Krihikatha*. 64(2): 3940.
- Uzzaman, T., R. K. Sikder, M. I. Asif, H. Mehraj and A. F.M. J. Uddin. 2015. Growth and Yield Trial of Sixteen Rice Varieties under System of Rice Intensification. *Sci. Agric.* 11(2): 81-89.