IMPROVED AGRONOMIC PRACTICES TO ENHANCE THE PRODUCTIVITY AND QUALITY OF CANOLA (*BRASSICA NAPUS* L.) UNDER THE ARID CLIMATE OF SOUTHERN PUNJAB, PAKISTAN

QURAT-UL-AIN¹, HASEEB-UR-REHMAN¹*, MUHAMMAD NADEEM SHAH¹,²*, MUHAMMAD SHAHERYAR¹, MUHAMMAD TANVEER ALTAF³, NASEEM SAJJAD⁴, ALI SHERYAR¹, SULAIMAN ALI ALHARBI⁵, SALEH ALFARRAJ⁶ AND MOHAMMAD JAVED ANSARI⁵

¹Institute of Agronomy, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan
²Department of Agriculture, Government College University, Lahore, Pakistan
³Department of Plant Breeding and Genetics, Faculty of Agricultural Sciences and Technologies, Bahauddin Zakariya
University, Multan, Pakistan

⁴Food Biotechnology Research Centre, Pakistan Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, Lahore, Pakistan

⁵Department of Botany and Microbiology, College of Science, King Saud University, Riyadh 11451, Saudi Arabia

⁶Zoology Department, College of Science, King Saud University, Riyadh 11451, Saudi Arabia

⁷Department of Botany, Hindu College Moradabad (Mahatma Jyotiba Phule Rohilkhand University Bareilly) 244001 India

*Corresponding author's: haseeburrehman@bzu.edu.pk; nadeemshah@gcu.edu.pk

Abstract

Canola is an oilseed crop with up to 48% oil content. The productivity of canola is affected by a lack of improved agronomic practices. For this purpose, a field trial with different agronomic practices was laid out to improve canola productivity in the arid climate of Southern Punjab. Treatments included the different sowing methods *i.e.* Conventional method (CM), Gap chat method (GM), Drill sowing (DS), Ridges sowing (RS), and Bed sowing (BS); and seed rates [So=recommended seed rate (2 kg per acre), S1= reduced seed rate (1.5 kg per acre), S2= highly reduced (1 kg per acre), S3= very high reduced (500 g per acre)]. The experiment was laid out in randomized complete block design (RCBD) with split-plot arrangement and was repeated three times. Sowing methods were adjusted in the main plot, while seed rates were placed in the sub-plot. The results showed that different sowing methods and seed rates had a significant interactive effect on growth and yield attributes. The conventional method with a reduced seed rate (CM×S1) took a maximum number of days to pod formation versus (vs.) bed sowing with a recommended seed rate (75.7 vs. 61.7) and days for maturity (143.7 vs. 120.7). The maximum plant height (158.3 cm), number of pods per plant (76.3), number of seeds per pod (40.3), pod length (4.93 cm) and 1000-grain weight (6.41 g) was noted in the bed sowing with reduced seed rate (BS×S1). The bed sowing with a very high reduced seed rate (CM×S3). The same result for canola oil contents was noted. It was concluded that bed sowing with reduced seed rate is the improved agronomic practice to enhance the productivity of canola under the arid climate of southern Punjab.

Key words: Canola, Conventional method, Agronomic practices, Grain yield, Oil quality.

Introduction

Canola (Brassica napus L.) is a major oilseed crop globally, cultivated on a large scale (Grant et al., 2016). Among the oilseed crops, Canola (Brassica napus L.) holds an important position in Pakistan's cropping system (Bano et al., 2010). In contrast to mono and polyunsaturated fatty acids, it is known for its low quantity of saturated fatty acids, making it a favorable choice in human and livestock diets (Iqbal et al., 2008). Canola residue after oil extraction is also a good feedstuff for dairy animals (Wanasundara et al., 2017). Edible oils are essential components of the human diet, providing the necessary energy and fulfilling daily calorie requirements (Anon., 2022). In the fiscal year 2023, spanning from July to March, a total of 2.681 million tonnes of edible oil, which includes oil extracted from imported oilseed, was imported. The estimated value of these imports amounted to Rs. 826.482 billion or approximately US\$ 3.562 billion (Govt. of Pakistan, 2023). Although canola is cultivated in Pakistan over an area of 0.03 million hectares, the yield per unit area is far less in comparison to other countries (Anon., 2022).

There are many constraints to the low yield of canola in Pakistan. Conventional methods of sowing and optimal seed rate are the factors that are responsible for low productivity. Planting strategies not only ensure fitting adjustment and perfect plant populace in the field next to but also engage the plants to utilize the land and other valuable contributions all the more adequately and consistently towards quickly development improvement (Gul et al., 2015). Tanveer et al., (2003) reasoned that planting strategy expects a basic part in the position of seed at fitting profundity, which finally impacts crop development. The decision of sensible planting strategies for a yield is subject to the planting season, soil water openness at planting time, and planting machine availability. Improved sowing methods not only help to maintain optimum plant population due to better germination but also enable the plants to utilize land, light, and other input resources uniformly and efficiently. Soomro et al., (2009) have reported a significant increase in wheat yield by adopting a new sowing technique. The planting method is one of the most important crop production factors that determines and influences the germination percentage as well as seedling establishment. Bed planting has been involved in improved drainage (Takeshima et al., 2023), reducing soil erosion (Garg et al., 2022), increased economic efficiency (Du et al., 2022), and nutrient management (Nkebiwe et al., 2016). Seed rate affects plant population, and it significantly

QURAT-UL-AIN ET AL.,

influences the growth and yield of canola and is highly dependent on the spatial arrangement of plants (Rathke *et al.*, 2006). The length of the main inflorescence is significantly reduced as plant density increases (Hosseini *et al.*, 2006; Mobasser *et al.*, 2008).

In the realm of agriculture, the need for continuous improvement in agronomic practices cannot be overstated. Enhanced practices, such as optimizing seed rates and refining sowing methods, hold the promise of substantially boosting crop yields and, subsequently, food security. Recognizing the importance of these advancements, this study embarks on a novel journey aimed at optimizing agronomic practices for the cultivation of canola within the challenging arid climate of south Punjab. While previous research has made significant strides, there remains a noticeable knowledge gap in the application of these practices in such a unique ecological context. The primary aims of this research endeavor include augmenting both the productivity and quality of canola crops under these specific conditions. It is hypothesized that by fine-tuning seed rates and sowing techniques tailored to the arid climate, we can achieve a substantial increase in canola vields, ultimately benefiting both farmers and consumers while addressing crucial agricultural challenges.

Material and Method

Experimental site, treatment, and design: A field experiment was conducted at the Agronomic Research Area, Department of Agronomy, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan. The experiments included the two factors, Factor A: different sowing methods, and Factor B: different seed rates. Different sowing methods included the i.e. Conventional method (CM), Gap chat method (GM), Drill sowing (DS), Ridges sowing (RS), and Bed sowing (BS); and different seed rates included the S_0 = recommended seed rate (2 kg per acre), S1=reduced seed rate (1.5 kg per acre), S_2 = highly reduced (1 kg per acre), S₃= very high reduced (500 g per acre). The experiment was laid out in randomized complete block design (RCBD) with split-plot arrangement and was repeated three times. Sowing methods were adjusted in the main plot, while seed rates were placed in the sub-plot.

Experimental soil and environmental condition: The soil was sandy clay loam in texture with 1.3% organic matter (O.M), pH 7.7, and EC 2.8 dSm⁻¹. Total available nitrogen (0.04%), phosphorous (9.50 mg kg⁻¹ and potassium (125 mg kg⁻¹). The environmental condition of the experimental area is given in (Fig. 1).




Fig. 1. Meteorological data for the crop growing session.

Crop husbandry: A registered variety of canola, "Canzola" was collected from an authorized dealer of Punjab Seed Corporation. A fine seedbed was prepared as per the experiment, and the seed was planted as per treatment. The conventional method (CM) of sowing is the broadcast method. Sowing of seed in the broadcast way in standing water is

the Gap Shat method (GM). In drill sowing (DS), the seed was drilled by the manual drill at a distance of 24 inches. In ridges sowing (RS), ridges were raised at a distance of 24 inches, and seed was sown on the top of the ridges. In bed sowing (BS), the seed was planted on a raised bed in a broadcast method. The size of each experimental unit was 3×4 m². A recommended dose of N:P:K was applied at 35:34:25 kg per acre. Urea (46% N) fertilizer was used as a source of nitrogen, Di-ammonium phosphate (DAP) fertilizer (46% P and 18% N) was used as a source of phosphorus, and Murate of potash (MOP) fertilizer (60% K) was used as a source of potassium. The total dose of P and K was applied at the time of sowing, while nitrogen was applied in two splits. Half was applied at the time of

sowing, and half of the remaining was applied at the second irrigation at the flowering stage. The crop was irrigated when needed. Thiophanate Methyl" was used as a fungicide for seed treatment. All other plant protection measures, like weed control and insect pest control, were kept constants for all the experiment units. Ten plants from each experimental unit were tagged for data collection. The crop was harvested at its physiological maturity.

Statistical analysis

Data recorded was analyzed statistically using the least significant difference (LSD) test at 5% probability (Steel *et al.*, 1960). Graphs were prepared in Microsoft Excel software.

Results

Analysis of variance showed that different sowing methods, seed rate, and their interactive effect significantly affected the growth and yield attributes of canola (Table 1). Phonological attributes like the number of days to pod formation and the number of days to maturity are significantly affected by the different sowing methods and seed rates. The maximum number of days to pod formation (75.7 vs. 61.7 days) was counted in the conventional method with the reduced seed rate (CM×S1) vs. the bed sowing with the reduced seed rate (BS×S1). Concerning the number of days to maturity, the maximum number of days to maturity (143.7 vs. 120.7 days) was counted in the conventional method with a reduced seed rate (CM×S1) versus the bed sowing with the recommended seed rate (BS×S0). The conventional method with a reduced seed rate increased the 14 days for pod formation as compared to the bed sowing with the recommended seed rate. Hence, bed sowing with the recommended seed rate was delayed 23 days for its maturity.

Growth attributes of canola were also significantly affected by the different sowing methods and seed rates. The maximum plant height (158.3 cm) was measured in the bed sowing with the reduced seed rate (BS×S1). The minimum plant height (104.7 cm) was measured in the conventional method with the very high reduced seed rate (CM×S3). The interactive effect of different methods and seed rate for the number of leaves per plant was found to be non-significant. Results for the number of branches per plant showed that bed sowing with the reduced seed rate (BS×S1) attained the maximum number of branches per plant (10.7 vs. 4.3) versus conventional methods with reduced seed rate (CM×S1). The number of pods per plant, number of seeds per pod, pod length, and 1000-grain weight are yield attributes that are important for the yield

of canola crops. The maximum number of pods per plant and number of seeds per pod (76.3 and 40.3) were counted in the bed sowing with the reduced seed rate (BS×S1), while the minimum values (42.0 and 16.3) were noted in the conventional method with highly reduced seed rate (CM×S3), respectively. The same results for pod length and 1000-grain weight were noted. Bed sowing with reduced seed rate (BS×S1) attained the maximum pod length (4.93 cm) and 1000-grain weight (6.41 g). The minimum pod length (3.10 cm) and 1000-grain weight (3.31g) were observed in the conventional method with a very high reduced seed rate (CM×S3) and recommended seed rate (CM×S0).

Statistical results for grain yield and biological yield were also significant for different sowing methods and seed rates (Fig. 2). Results showed that different sowing methods and seed rates influenced the grain yield and biological yield of canola significantly. The maximum grain yield and biological yield were attained in bed sowing with a reduced seed rate (BS×S1), while the minimum grain yield and biological yield were attained in the conventional method with a very high reduced seed rate (CM×S3).

Quality attributes: Results for quality attributes like oil contents and protein contents of canola were significantly affected by the different sowing methods and seed rate. The interactive effect of different sowing methods and seed rate was also found to be significant except for protein contents, which showed a non-significant effect (Fig. 3). The bed sowing with a reduced seed rate (BS×S1) produced the maximum oil contents when it was compared with the conventional method with a high reduced seed rate (CM×S2). The same trend for protein contents was noticed, but their interactive effect was non-significant (Fig. 3).

Table 1. Influence of different sowing methods and seed rate on phenology, growth and yield attributes of canola.

Table 1. Influence of different sowing methods and seed rate on phenology, growth and yield attributes of canola.									
	No. of days to	No. of	Plant	Number of	Number of	Number	Number	Pod length (cm)	1000-grain
Treatments	pod	days to	height	leaves	branches	of pods	of seeds		weight
	formation	maturity	(cm)	plant ⁻¹	plant ⁻¹	plant ⁻¹	pod ⁻¹		(g)
S_0	75.0 a	136.7 с	122.7 h	8.7	7.0 de	46.7 hi	18.7 hi	2.57 m	3.31 m
S_1	75.7 a	143.7 a	126.0 gh	11.5	4.3 h	50.3 g	23.3 fg	3.53 i-k	4.59 ij
S_2	73.7 a-c	140.3 b	112.3 j	10.0	5.3 gh	44.3 ij	20.7 gh	3.67 1	3.99 j
S_3	74.3 ab	141.3 b	104.7 k	10.7	6.3 efg	42.0 j	16.3 i	3.101	4.04 kl
S_0	72.3 a-d	130.7 de	132.3 ef	10.3	7.7 cd	49.0 gh	22.3 g	3.70 h-j	4.87 hi
S_1	68.3 a-g	140.0 b	136.7 d	14.4	5.3 gh	53.7 ef	26.7 e	4.07 e-g	5.29 e-g
S_2	72.7 a-d	135.0 c	126.3 g	11.7	6.3 efg	50.2 g	21.0 gh	3.43 jk	4.46 i-k
S ₃	72.0 a-e	136.7 с	116.0 i	12.7	5.7 fg	51.0 fg	21.3 gh	3.011	3.97 1
S_0	66.0 b-g	126.0 fg	135.3 de	12.0	8.3 c	55.7 e	26.7 e	3.77 g-i	4.90 g-i
S_1	72.3 a-d	136.3 с	143.7 c	15.3	6.0 efg	60.4 d	30.3 d	4.17 d-f	5.41 d-f
S_2	68.7 a-g	132.3 d	130.7 f	14.0	6.7 def	54.7 e	26.3 e	3.73 h-j	4.85 hi
S_3	70.7 a-f	132.3 d	122.7 h	12.7	5.7 fg	58.7 d	25.3 ef	3.33 kl	4.33 j-l
S_0	64.3 d-g	1227 h	141.3 c	15.3	9.7 ab	64.7 e	30.3 d	3.73 h-j	4.84 hi
S_1	69.0 a-g	135.0 c	148.7 b	16.3	6.7 def	68.7 b	35.3 c	4.37 с-е	5.68 c-e
S_2	65.0 d-g	127.0 f	137.3 d	14.0	7.7 cd	64.7 c	30.7 d	3.92 f-h	5.08 f-h
S_3	67.3 a-g	130.0 e	135.0 de	14.3	6.3 efg	64.7 c	31.7 d	3.97 f-h	4.16 f-h
S_0	61.7 g	120.7 i	149.7 b	16.3	6.3 efg	71.0 b	35.3 с	4.43 b-d	5.77 b-d
S_1	65.3 c-g	132.0 de	158.3 a	18.3	10.7 a	76.3 a	40.3 a	4.93 a	6.41 a
S_2	63.7 efg	126.3 f	143.7 c	15.0	8.7 bc	69.7 b	38.3 ab	4.73 ab	6.16 ab
S_3	63.3 fg	124.0 gh	141.7 c	15.7	7.7 cd	68.7 b	35.7 bc	4.56 bc	5.94 bc
	So S1 S2 S3 S0 S1 S2 S3	No. of days to pod formation So 75.0 a S1 75.7 a S2 73.7 a-c S3 74.3 ab S0 72.3 a-d S1 68.3 a-g S2 72.7 a-d S3 72.0 a-e S0 66.0 b-g S1 72.3 a-d S2 68.7 a-g S3 70.7 a-f S0 64.3 d-g S1 69.0 a-g S2 65.0 d-g S3 67.3 a-g S0 61.7 g S1 65.3 c-g S2 63.7 efg	nents No. of days to pod formation No. of days to maturity So 75.0 a 136.7 c S1 75.7 a 143.7 a S2 73.7 a-c 140.3 b S3 74.3 ab 141.3 b S0 72.3 a-d 130.7 de S1 68.3 a-g 140.0 b S2 72.7 a-d 135.0 c S3 72.0 a-e 136.7 c S0 66.0 b-g 126.0 fg S1 72.3 a-d 136.3 c S2 68.7 a-g 132.3 d S3 70.7 a-f 132.3 d S0 64.3 d-g 1227 h S1 69.0 a-g 135.0 c S2 65.0 d-g 127.0 f S3 67.3 a-g 130.0 e S0 61.7 g 120.7 i S1 65.3 c-g 132.0 de S2 63.7 efg 126.3 f	nents No. of days to pod formation No. of days to maturity Plant height (cm) S0 75.0 a 136.7 c 122.7 h S1 75.7 a 143.7 a 126.0 gh S2 73.7 a-c 140.3 b 112.3 j S3 74.3 ab 141.3 b 104.7 k S0 72.3 a-d 130.7 de 132.3 ef S1 68.3 a-g 140.0 b 136.7 d S2 72.7 a-d 135.0 c 126.3 g S3 72.0 a-e 136.7 c 116.0 i S0 66.0 b-g 126.0 fg 135.3 de S1 72.3 a-d 136.3 c 143.7 c S2 68.7 a-g 132.3 d 130.7 f S3 70.7 a-f 132.3 d 122.7 h S0 64.3 d-g 1227 h 141.3 c S1 69.0 a-g 135.0 c 148.7 b S2 65.0 d-g 127.0 f 137.3 d S3 67.3 a-g 130.0 e 135.0 de S0 <td< td=""><td>nents No. of days to pod formation No. of days to maturity Plant height (cm) Number of leaves plant⁻¹ S0 75.0 a 136.7 c 122.7 h 8.7 S1 75.7 a 143.7 a 126.0 gh 11.5 S2 73.7 a-c 140.3 b 112.3 j 10.0 S3 74.3 ab 141.3 b 104.7 k 10.7 S0 72.3 a-d 130.7 de 132.3 ef 10.3 S1 68.3 a-g 140.0 b 136.7 d 14.4 S2 72.7 a-d 135.0 c 126.3 g 11.7 S3 72.0 a-e 136.7 c 116.0 i 12.7 S0 66.0 b-g 126.0 fg 135.3 de 12.0 S1 72.3 a-d 136.3 c 143.7 c 15.3 S2 68.7 a-g 132.3 d 130.7 f 14.0 S3 70.7 a-f 132.3 d 122.7 h 12.7 S0 64.3 d-g 1227 h 141.3 c 15.3 S1 69.0 a-g</td><td>nents No. of days to pod formation No. of days to height formation Plant height maturity Number of leaves plant⁻¹ Number of branches plant⁻¹ S0 75.0 a 136.7 c 122.7 h 8.7 7.0 de S1 75.7 a 143.7 a 126.0 gh 11.5 4.3 h S2 73.7 a-c 140.3 b 112.3 j 10.0 5.3 gh S3 74.3 ab 141.3 b 104.7 k 10.7 6.3 efg S0 72.3 a-d 130.7 de 132.3 ef 10.3 7.7 cd S1 68.3 a-g 140.0 b 136.7 d 14.4 5.3 gh S2 72.7 a-d 135.0 c 126.3 g 11.7 6.3 efg S3 72.0 a-e 136.7 c 116.0 i 12.7 5.7 fg S0 66.0 b-g 126.0 fg 135.3 de 12.0 8.3 c S1 72.3 a-d 136.3 c 143.7 c 15.3 6.0 efg S2 68.7 a-g 132.3 d 130.7 f 14.0 6.7 def <t< td=""><td>nents No. of days to pod formation No. of days to maturity Plant height (cm) Number of leaves plant¹¹ Number of pods plant²¹ Act pods plant²¹ Act pods plant²¹ Number of pods plant²¹ Number of pods plant²¹ Number of plant²¹ Act pods plant²¹ Act pods plant²¹ Number of plant²¹</td><td>nents No. of days to pod formation No. of days to maturity Plant height (cm) Number of leaves plant¹¹ Number of pod phant¹¹ Number of pods plant¹¹ Number of pod pod¹¹ Number of pod³¹ Number of pod¹¹ Number of pod³¹ Number of pod¹¹ Number of pod¹¹ Number of pod¹¹ Number of pod³¹ Number of pod³² Number of pod³² Number of pod³² Numb</td><td>No. of days to pod formation No. of days to pod formation Plant height formation Number of leaves plant¹ Number of pods plant¹ Number of seeds plant¹ Number of plant¹ Number of plant¹ Number of plant¹ Number of pods plant¹ Number of pods plant¹ Number of pods plant¹ Number of plant¹ Number of pods plant² Number of plant²</td></t<></td></td<>	nents No. of days to pod formation No. of days to maturity Plant height (cm) Number of leaves plant ⁻¹ S0 75.0 a 136.7 c 122.7 h 8.7 S1 75.7 a 143.7 a 126.0 gh 11.5 S2 73.7 a-c 140.3 b 112.3 j 10.0 S3 74.3 ab 141.3 b 104.7 k 10.7 S0 72.3 a-d 130.7 de 132.3 ef 10.3 S1 68.3 a-g 140.0 b 136.7 d 14.4 S2 72.7 a-d 135.0 c 126.3 g 11.7 S3 72.0 a-e 136.7 c 116.0 i 12.7 S0 66.0 b-g 126.0 fg 135.3 de 12.0 S1 72.3 a-d 136.3 c 143.7 c 15.3 S2 68.7 a-g 132.3 d 130.7 f 14.0 S3 70.7 a-f 132.3 d 122.7 h 12.7 S0 64.3 d-g 1227 h 141.3 c 15.3 S1 69.0 a-g	nents No. of days to pod formation No. of days to height formation Plant height maturity Number of leaves plant ⁻¹ Number of branches plant ⁻¹ S0 75.0 a 136.7 c 122.7 h 8.7 7.0 de S1 75.7 a 143.7 a 126.0 gh 11.5 4.3 h S2 73.7 a-c 140.3 b 112.3 j 10.0 5.3 gh S3 74.3 ab 141.3 b 104.7 k 10.7 6.3 efg S0 72.3 a-d 130.7 de 132.3 ef 10.3 7.7 cd S1 68.3 a-g 140.0 b 136.7 d 14.4 5.3 gh S2 72.7 a-d 135.0 c 126.3 g 11.7 6.3 efg S3 72.0 a-e 136.7 c 116.0 i 12.7 5.7 fg S0 66.0 b-g 126.0 fg 135.3 de 12.0 8.3 c S1 72.3 a-d 136.3 c 143.7 c 15.3 6.0 efg S2 68.7 a-g 132.3 d 130.7 f 14.0 6.7 def <t< td=""><td>nents No. of days to pod formation No. of days to maturity Plant height (cm) Number of leaves plant¹¹ Number of pods plant²¹ Act pods plant²¹ Act pods plant²¹ Number of pods plant²¹ Number of pods plant²¹ Number of plant²¹ Act pods plant²¹ Act pods plant²¹ Number of plant²¹</td><td>nents No. of days to pod formation No. of days to maturity Plant height (cm) Number of leaves plant¹¹ Number of pod phant¹¹ Number of pods plant¹¹ Number of pod pod¹¹ Number of pod³¹ Number of pod¹¹ Number of pod³¹ Number of pod¹¹ Number of pod¹¹ Number of pod¹¹ Number of pod³¹ Number of pod³² Number of pod³² Number of pod³² Numb</td><td>No. of days to pod formation No. of days to pod formation Plant height formation Number of leaves plant¹ Number of pods plant¹ Number of seeds plant¹ Number of plant¹ Number of plant¹ Number of plant¹ Number of pods plant¹ Number of pods plant¹ Number of pods plant¹ Number of plant¹ Number of pods plant² Number of plant²</td></t<>	nents No. of days to pod formation No. of days to maturity Plant height (cm) Number of leaves plant¹¹ Number of pods plant²¹ Act pods plant²¹ Act pods plant²¹ Number of pods plant²¹ Number of pods plant²¹ Number of plant²¹ Act pods plant²¹ Act pods plant²¹ Number of plant²¹	nents No. of days to pod formation No. of days to maturity Plant height (cm) Number of leaves plant¹¹ Number of pod phant¹¹ Number of pods plant¹¹ Number of pod pod¹¹ Number of pod³¹ Number of pod¹¹ Number of pod³¹ Number of pod¹¹ Number of pod¹¹ Number of pod¹¹ Number of pod³¹ Number of pod³² Number of pod³² Number of pod³² Numb	No. of days to pod formation No. of days to pod formation Plant height formation Number of leaves plant¹ Number of pods plant¹ Number of seeds plant¹ Number of plant¹ Number of plant¹ Number of plant¹ Number of pods plant¹ Number of pods plant¹ Number of pods plant¹ Number of plant¹ Number of pods plant² Number of plant²

CM= Conventional method, GM= Gap chat method, DS= Drill sowing, RS= Ridges sowing, BS= Bed sowing, S_0 = Recommended seed rate, S_1 = Reduced seed rate (1.5 kg per acre), S_2 = Highly reduced (1 kg per acre), S_3 = Very high reduced (500 g per acre)

QURAT-UL-AIN *ET AL.*,




Fig. 2. Influence of different sowing methods and seed rate on grain yield and biological yield of canola. CM= Conventional method, GM=Gap chat method, DS=Drill sowing, RS=Ridges sowing, BS=Bed sowing, S₀= Recommended seed rate, S₁= Reduced seed rate (1.5 kg per acre), S₂= Highly reduced (1 kg per acre), S₃= Very high reduced (500 g per acre)




Fig. 3. Influence of different sowing methods and seed rate on oil contents and protein contents of canola CM= Conventional method, GM=Gap chat method, DS=Drill sowing, RS=Ridges sowing, BS=Bed sowing, S_0 = Recommended seed rate, S_1 = Reduced seed rate (1.5 kg per acre), S_2 = Highly reduced (1 kg per acre), S_3 = Very high reduced (500 g per acre).




Fig. 4. Influence of different sowing methods and seed rate on nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium uptake contents of canola, CM=Conventional method, GM=Gap chat method, DS=Drill sowing, RS=Ridges sowing, BS=Bed sowing, S_0 = recommended seed rate, S_1 = reduced seed rate (1.5 kg per acre), S_2 = highly reduced (1 kg per acre), S_3 = very high reduced (500 g per acre)

QURAT-UL-AIN *ET AL*.,

Mineral uptake: Minerals like nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium uptake showed a significant response towards the different sowing methods and seed rates. The interactive effect of different sowing methods and seed rates was significant for nitrogen and phosphorus while was non-significant for potassium uptake (Fig. 4). Results for the nitrogen and potassium uptake showed that bed sowing with a reduced seed rate (BS×S1) uptake the maximum nitrogen when it was compared with the conventional method with a very high reduced seed rate (CM×S3). The same results for phosphorus uptake were noted. The maximum phosphorus uptake was noted with bed sowing and reduced seed rate (BS×S1), and the minimum phosphorus uptake was noted in the conventional method with a high reduced seed rate (CM×S2) followed by (CM×S3). The interactive effect for potassium uptake was non-significant (Fig. 4).

Discussion

Our results showed that canola showed maximum growth at bed sowing with a reduced seed rate. Crop yield and yield attributes were significantly affected by different sowing methods and seed rates (Table 1).

Sowing methods play an important role in crop production. Each sowing method has a different role in crop production. Our results revealed that bed sowing was an improved sowing method when compared with others. Bed planting systems increased the soil porosity and reduced crop lodging and disease attack, thereby increasing the production per unit area (Fahong et al., 2004). Bed planting of canola can significantly enhance yield potential through a combination of physiological and environmental factors. The raised bed structure fosters improved soil drainage, thereby mitigating waterlogging-induced stress (Du et al., 2022). Low productivity was observed with the conventional method of sowing. Conventional soil preparation methods have caused a loss of soil moisture content and soil health (Taghinazhad et al., 2012). Our results showed that plant growth and yield attributes decreased with increasing plant spatial arrangement (Plant-to-plant and row-to-row distance) in the conventional method.

Concerning the effect of different seed rates, maximum growth and productivity were observed with the reduced seed rate when it was compared with the recommended and other rates. Seed rate is an important factor in attaining the maximum plant population for high productivity. Plants compete for nutrients, light, and space. Hosseini et al., (2006) and Mobasser et al., (2008) found that plant height, number of pods per plant, and grain yield decreased with increasing the plant population. The same results were also reported by Li et al., (2014) and Kazemeini et al., (2010). Improved agronomic practices with spatial management is the strategy to enhance the canola productivity because it affects the phenology, like the number of branches per plant and yield of canola (Yantai et al., 2016; Rondanini et al., 2017). The findings prove our results that the number of branches per plant, the number of pods per plant, the number of seeds per plant, and pod length increased with the reducing seed rate but decreased when it reduced very high.

Conclusion

Canola crop is significantly affected by the different sowing methods and seed rates. Among the different sowing methods, bed sowing is more affected than other sowing methods, and among the different seed rates, it resulted that 1.5 kg per acre of seed rate gave the more grain yield. It was concluded that canola productivity can be increased with the bed sowing method with a seed rate of 1.5 kg per acre. Seed yield and quality of canola can be increased with maximum nutrient uptake of improved agronomic practice of bed sowing and reduced seed rate of 1.5 kg per acre.

Acknowledgement

This project was supported by Researchers Supporting Project Number (RSP2025R7) King Saud University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

References

- Anonymous. 2022. Economic survey of Pakistan. Islamabad: Ministry of Fianance.
- Bano, R., M.H. Khan, R.S. Khan, H. Rashid and Z.A. Swati. 2010. Development of an efficient regeneration protocol for three genotypes of *Brassica juncea*. Pak. J. Bot., 42(2): 963-969.
- Du, X., W. He, S. Gao, D. Liu, W. Wu, Tu, Tu, L. Kong and M. Xi. 2022. Raised bed planting increases economic efficiency and energy use efficiency while reducing the environmental footprint for wheat after rice production. *Energy*, 245: p.123256.
- Fahong, W., W. Xuqing and K. Sayre. 2004. Comparison of conventional, flood irrigated, flat planting with furrow irrigated, raised bed planting for winter wheat in China. *Field Crops Res.*, 87: 35-42.
- Garg, K.K., K.H. Anantha, S. Dixit, R. Nune, A. Venkataradha, P. Wable, N. Budama and R. Singh. 2022. Impact of raised beds on surface runoff and soil loss in Alfisols and Vertisols. *Catena*, 211: p.105972.
- Govt. of Pakistan 2023. Economic survey of Pakistan. Islamabad: Ministry of Fianance.
- Grant, C.A., J.T. O'Donovan, R.E. Blackshaw, K.N. Harker, E.N. Johnson, Y. Gan, G.P. Lafond, W.E. May, T.K. Turkington, N.Z. Lupwayi, and D.L. McLaren, 2016. Residual effects of preceding crops and nitrogen fertilizer on yield and crop and soil N dynamics of spring wheat and canola in varying environments on the Canadian prairies. Field Crops Research, 192: 86-102.
- Gul, S., J.K. Whalen, B.W. Thomas, V. Sachdeva and H. Deng. 2015. Physico-chemical properties and microbial responses in biochar-amended soils: mechanisms and future directions. *Agri. Ecosys. Environ.*, 206: 46-59.
- Hosseini, M.N. 2006. Effects of plant density and nitrogen rates on the competitive ability of canola (*Brassica napus* L.) against weeds. *J. Agri. Sci. Technol.*, 8: 281-291.
- Iqbal, M., N. Akhtar, S. Zafar and I. Ali. 2008. Genotypic responses for yield and seed oil quality of two Brassica species under semi-arid environmental conditions. S. Afr. J. Bot., 74: 567-571.
- Kazemeini, S.A., M. Edalat, A. Shekoofa and R. Hamidi. 2010. Effects of nitrogen and plant density on rapeseed (*Brassica napus* L.) yield and yield components in Southern Iran. *J. Appl. Sci*, 10: 1461-1465.
- Li, Y.S., C.B. Yu, S. Zhu, L.H. Xie, X.J. Hu, X. Liao, X.S. Liao

- and Z. Che. 2014. High planting density benefits to mechanized harvest and nitrogen application rates of oilseed rape (*Brassica napus* L.). *Soil Sci. Plant Nutr.*, 60: 384-392.
- Mobasser, H.R., M.S. Ghadikolae, M. Nasiri, J. Daneshian, D.B. Tari and H. Pourkalhor. 2008. Effect of nitrogen rates and plant density on the agronomic traits of canola (*Brassica napus* L.) in paddy field. *Asian J. Plant Sci.*, 7: 233-236.
- Nkebiwe, P.M., M. Weinmann,, A. Bar-Tal and T. Müller. 2016. Fertilizer placement to improve crop nutrient acquisition and yield: A review and meta-analysis. *Field Crops Res.*, 196: 389-401.
- Rathke, G.W., T. Behrens and W. Diepenbrock. 2006. Integrated nitrogen management strategies to improve seed yield, oil content and nitrogen efficiency of winter oilseed rape (*Brassica napus* L.): a review. *Agri. Ecosys. Environ.*, 117: 80-108.
- Rondanini, D.P., Y.C. Menendez, N.V. Gomez, D.J. Miralles and J.F. Botto. 2017. Vegetative plasticity and floral branching compensate low plant density in modern spring rapeseed. *Field Crops Res.*, 210: 104-113.
- Soomro, U.A., M.U. Rahman, E.A. Odhano, S. Gul and A.Q. Tareen. 2009. Effects of sowing method and seed rate on

- growth and yield of wheat (*Triticum aestivum*). World J. Agri. Sci., 5: 159-162.
- Steel, R.G.D. and J.H. Torrie. 1960. Principles and procedures of statistics. *Principles & Procedures of statistics*.
- Taghinezhad, J., S. Mohseni-Niari and A. Javadi. 2012. Effect of different methods of seedbed preparation on irrigated canola yield after corn in North West Iran. Afr. J. Agri. Res., 7: 5558-5563.
- Takeshima, R., S. Murakami, Y. Fujiwara, K. Nakano, R. Fuchiyama, T. Hara, T. Shima and T. Koyama. 2023. Subsurface drainage and raised-bed planting reduce excess water stress and increase yield in common buckwheat (Fagopyrum esculentum Moench). Field Crops Res., 297: 108935.
- Wanasundara, J.P.D., S. Tan, A.M. Alashi, F. Pudel and C. Blanchard. 2017. Proteins from canola/rapeseed: Current status. In Sustainable protein sources (pp. 285-304). Academic Press.
- Yantai, G., K.N. Harker, H.R. Kutcher, R.H. Gulden, B. Irvine, W.E. May and J.T. O'Donovan. 2016. Canola seed yield and phenological responses to plant density. *Can. J. Plant Sci.*, 96: 151-159.

(Received for publication 20 October 2023)