

## OPTIMUM SIZE AND SHAPE OF PLOTS AND BLOCKS FOR EXPERIMENTS ON PEARL MILLET

G.V.S.R. KRISHNA, N.L. JOSHI AND B.S. GUPTA

*Central Arid Zone Research Institute, Jodhpur-342003, India*

The optimum size and shape of plots have generally been established by conducting uniform variety trials on different crops. Ray *et al.* (1973) provided a method of obtaining an optimum size and shape of plots for perennial crops from fertilizer trials to save time and resources. In view of its economy the method was applied to an annual crop of pearl millet.

The treatments consisted of five pearl millet cultivars (BJ 104, PHB 12, BD 111, CM 46 and CAZRI local) in main plots and five nitrogen levels (0, 30, 60, 90 and 120 kg/ha) in sub plots. The treatments were replicated four times in a split plot design. The gross plot adopted was 5m x 4 m and net plot size was 4m x 3m. The crop was sown in rows 50 cm apart with a plant spacing of 12.5 cm, making a plant population of 16 plants/m<sup>2</sup>. The standard errors of main plot and sub plot means worked out were 49.99 and 42.68 kg/ha, respectively. The mean experimental yield of grain was 1100 kg/ha. The crop was harvested square metre-wise. The yield data were adjusted first for the plant population and then for the treatment effects. The adjustment factor ( $t_{ij}$ ) was calculated as per equation (1) :

$$t_{ij} = \frac{T_{ij}}{r} - m \dots \dots (1)$$

Where,  $T_{ij}$  is the total yield of the  $j$ th variety and  $j$ th nitrogen level from the 'r' replications and 'm' generated mean.

Then  $\left(\frac{t_{ij}}{12}\right)$  was subtracted from the square metre yields of (i, j)<sup>th</sup> plot since each plot was of 12 sqm. The adjusted data were than analysed as uniformity data to obtain optimum size and shape of plot and block. The efficiency of blocks ( $B_e$ ) was estimated as per equation (2) :

$$B_e = \frac{V_t}{V_x} \dots \dots (2)$$

Where  $V_x$  is coefficient of variation of block size x and  $V_t$  is the coefficient of variation without blocking.

The yields of various plot and block sizes and shapes were obtained by combining yields of square metre plots in different combinations.

Table 2. Efficiency of blocks of different sizes and shapes

| Block size<br>(m <sup>2</sup> ) | No. of<br>plots/block | Plot<br>shape<br>(m) | Block<br>shape<br>(m) | C.V.<br>(%) | Block efficiency |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------|------------------|
| 60                              | 4                     | 3x5                  | 12x5                  | 9.88        | 1.77             |
|                                 |                       | 5x3                  | 20x3                  | 10.28       | 1.46             |
| 75                              | 5                     | 3x5                  | 15x5                  | 10.97       | 1.59             |
|                                 |                       | 5x3                  | 25x3                  | 10.18       | 1.48             |
| 80                              | 4                     | 4x5                  | 16x5                  | 5.41        | 2.57             |
|                                 |                       | 5x4                  | 20x4                  | 8.35        | 1.49             |
| 90                              | 6                     | 3x5                  | 18x5                  | 9.59        | 1.82             |
|                                 |                       | 5x3                  | 30x3                  | 12.65       | 1.19             |
| 96                              | 4                     | 4x6                  | 16x6                  | 9.50        | 1.72             |
|                                 |                       | 6x4                  | 24x4                  | 13.50       | 0.96             |
| 100                             | 5                     | 4x5                  | 20x5                  | 3.48        | 3.99             |
|                                 |                       | 5x4                  | 25x4                  | 7.55        | 1.65             |
| 120                             | 6                     | 4x5                  | 24x5                  | 8.86        | 1.57             |
|                                 |                       | 5x4                  | 30x4                  | 7.55        | 1.65             |
|                                 | 5                     | 4x6                  | 20x6                  | 8.69        | 1.88             |
|                                 |                       | 6x4                  | 30x4                  | 12.15       | 1.10             |
|                                 | 4                     | 5x6                  | 20x6                  | 9.95        | 1.25             |
|                                 |                       | 6x5                  | 24x5                  | 9.39        | 1.47             |
| 150                             | 5                     | 5x6                  | 25x6                  | 10.36       | 1.20             |
|                                 |                       | 6x5                  | 30x5                  | 6.79        | 2.03             |

The authors thank Dr. K.A. Shankarnarayan, Director and Dr. Jagdeesh C. Kalla, Head of the Agricultural Economics and Statistics, Central Arid Zone Research Institute, Jodhpur for facilities.

#### REFERENCES

- Ray, S., Sharma, C. B. and Shukla, V. 1973. Technique of estimating optimum size and shape of plot from fertilizer trial data. *J. Indian Soc. Ag. Stat.* 25: 193-196.
- Smith, H.F. 1938. An empirical law describing heterogeneity in yield of agricultural crops. *J. Ag. Sci.* 28: 1-23.

*Size and shape of plots*: The coefficient of variation decreased with the increase in length and breadth of the plot (Table 1). The plots with greater length, in general, had lesser coefficient of variation compared to those of same size but with shorter lengths which indicated that the shape of plot influenced the precision of the experiment. The plot size of 5m x 4m had the least coefficient of variation and thus can be regarded as optimum size and shape.

Table 1. Coefficient of variation (%) with different shapes and sizes of plots

| Length (m) | Breadth (m) |       |       |       |       |
|------------|-------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|            | 2           | 3     | 4     | 5     | 6     |
| 2          | 26.12       | 23.33 | 20.66 | 20.62 | 20.06 |
| 3          | 22.94       | 19.33 | 18.01 | 17.48 | 15.77 |
| 4          | 19.14       | 15.66 | 13.00 | 13.90 | 16.37 |
| 5          | 16.43       | 15.02 | 12.47 | 17.14 | 12.53 |
| 6          | 15.60       | 15.44 | 13.36 | 13.79 | 12.74 |

The data were fitted for the soil fertility after Smith (1938) as presented by equation (3):

$$V_x = 33.48 x^{-0.3388} \dots (3)$$

Where,  $V_x$  is variance of mean per plot of X units.

The value 0.3388 in eq.3 indicated a low correlation among contiguous plots.

*Block size and shape*: The blocks of oblong shape were found to be less efficient (Table 2). The plots in a block arranged with their lengths were more efficient. Among the block sizes tested, the blocks with 5 plots were found to be more efficient compared with other sizes. For the optimum plot size (5m x 4m), the block of 5 plots had an efficiency of 1.65.

The relationship between the coefficient of variation (V) and block size (X) is expressed by the equation (4):

$$V = 2.598 x^{1.1284} \dots (4)$$