Radiation Use Efficiency and Yield of Pepper (Capsicum annuum L. cv. California Wonder) under Different Irrigation Treatments
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ABSTRACT

This study assessed the optimum water need of pepper (Capsicum annuum L. cv. California Wonder) and the critical irrigation level to be applied in order to achieve a reasonable economic yield in water shortage conditions. In a controlled field experiment involving five different treatments, seasonal evapotranspiration for pepper fluctuated from 89 mm in the severe stress treatment (I0.00) to 1,018 mm in the excess water application (I1.25). The highest yield was obtained in the full treatment where water in the root zone was refilled up to field capacity. In cases of water shortage, applying water of 690 mm ensures an economical yield. Maximum leaf area index was recorded in the full treatment (I1.00), which enabled the pepper to receive more benefit from total incoming solar radiation (average, 2,387 MJ m⁻²). An average of 555.45 MJ m⁻² was held by the pepper canopy throughout the whole growing season. Radiation use efficiency values on a dry yield basis were 0.69 g MJ⁻¹ in 2011 and reached 1.07 g MJ⁻¹ in 2012, since the leaf area index increased from 1.46 to 2.44. Therefore, averaged over two years, the peppers in the full treatment converted irrigation water of 888 mm and intercepted photosynthetically active radiation into the highest yield of 75.5 t ha⁻¹, which was more efficient than the excess and deficit water application treatments.
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INTRODUCTION

A reduction in freshwater resources forces agricultural producers to use second quality or contaminated water (Bustan et al., 2005, Alomran et al., 2012, Bijani and Hayati, 2015). The required amount of water necessary for agricultural crops could not be met due to erratic rainfall and water shortages in recent years during the summer, especially in arid and semi-arid regions, which caused significant loss of crops. For this reason, identification of drought-resistant varieties of all crops has become an important issue (Kusvuran and Abak, 2012). Climatic conditions such as temperature and radiation affect the water requirement of crops (Young et al., 1985). Giorgi (2006) reported that according to climate models, the Mediterranean area will become one of the hottest regions in future climate change projections. Saadi et al. (2014) tried to predict the effects of climate change on plant evapotranspiration. According to their forecast, the overall reduction in annual precipitation and increase in air temperature will be 39.1±55.1 mm and 1.57±0.27°C,
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respectively between the years 2000 and 2050. The consequent increase of annual reference evapotranspiration will be 92.3±42.1 mm and the average length of the growing season for wheat and tomato will be shorter in 2050 by 15 and 12 days, respectively. The world population is now around 6 billion and is expected to reach 8.3 billion in 2030 (Anonymous, 2009). It is clear that agricultural productivity must increase in order to feed the growing world population (Howell, 2001). An increment in crop production is possible only by knowing the pushing effect of irrigation and radiation on plant growth and yield. One of the most important factors affecting crop growth and yield is water.

The interception of solar radiation and utilization of radiant energy for plant biomass is essential for plant growth and yield (Purcell et al., 2002). Under optimum plant growth condition, crop biomass accumulation depends on the quantity of Photosynthetically Active Radiation (PAR) intercepted by the canopy (Monteith, 1977, Kiniry et al., 2005). Plant growth models require information related to each plant on Leaf Area Index (LAI), light extinction coefficient for PAR, and Radiation Use Efficiency (RUE) (Monteith, 1965). Recently, solar radiation has been used both to estimate crop yield and also to activate automatic irrigation systems. Higashide (2009) estimated weekly tomato yield in a greenhouse by using cumulative solar radiation before harvesting. Jovicich and Cantliffe (2007) used the amount of solar radiation as a parameter to schedule irrigation events. Plant water, nutrient uptake and transpiration rate are closely related to solar radiation (Adams, 1992). There is a strong relationship between transpiration and the amount of radiation intercepted by the canopy. Hence, the intercepted radiation by the canopy was used in development of an automated irrigation system (Casadesus et al., 2011). There has been much research about the effect of different irrigation levels or light intensity on plant growth, but there has been little research combining light intensity with soil water stress (Dong et al., 2015).

An evaporation pan provides a measurement of the integrated effect of radiation, wind, temperature and humidity on evaporation from an open water surface. Therefore, evapotranspiration of grown plants can be predicted by pan evaporation with the help of empirically derived coefficients taking into account the climate and pan’s environment (Doorenbos et al., 1984). A Class-A pan is commonly preferred both in irrigation scheduling for farmers and also in research, since it is the most suitable system for showing the plant, water and climate interrelationship (Ertek et al., 2006).

The objectives of this research were to determine both the effects of different irrigation levels and pan coefficients ($K_{cp}$) and also the Intercepted Photosynthetically Active Radiation (IPAR) of pepper at different irrigation levels.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Experimental Site and Soil Description**

The field experiment was carried out at Dardanos Agricultural Research Station of Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University during 2011 and 2012 near the Dardanelles straits in Canakkale province, Turkey. The location of the experimental area was 40°08' N, 28°20' E at an elevation of 3 meters. Dates of transplantation for the peppers (Capsicum annuum L. cv. California Wonder) were June 10th, 2011 and June 1st, 2012, at spacing's of 0.33×1 m in both years. The chemical characteristics of the soil are given in Table 1.

Each plot had dimensions of 10 m in length and 4 m in width, including 4 rows and 120 plants. The experiment was laid out using a randomized complete block design. In total there were 15 plots (5 treatments×3 replications). The climate parameters of solar radiation (W m⁻²), temperature (°C) and relative humidity (%) at the site were measured above the canopy of the plants while the solar radiation was measured above and inside the canopy. All data were measured by a HOBO U12 data logger
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Table 1. Physical and chemical properties of soil in experiment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (cm)</th>
<th>Field capacity (%)</th>
<th>Wilting point (%)</th>
<th>Bulk density (g cm(^{-3}))</th>
<th>pH a</th>
<th>Total changeable sodium (mg l(^{-1})) a</th>
<th>Cation exchange capacity (me 100g(^{-1})) a</th>
<th>CaCO(_3) (%) a</th>
<th>Organic matter (%) a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-90</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Taken from Ozcan et al. (2004).

(MicroDAQ com Inc.), including sensors. Data were saved into the data logger at 1-hour intervals throughout the experiment. The Electrical Conductivity of the irrigation water (EC\(_w\)), measured with an EC59 pyranometer (Milwaukee Instruments, Inc.), was 0.410 ds m\(^{-1}\), which was reported as having no harmful effect according to Ayers and Westcot (1989).

Irrigation Practice

Each plot in the experiment took the same amount of fertilizer; namely, urea (280 kg ha\(^{-1}\)), triple super phosphate (140 kg ha\(^{-1}\)) and potassium sulfate (140 kg ha\(^{-1}\)) in 2011 and 420 kg ha\(^{-1}\) (NPK; 18:18:18) in 2012. The total amount of urea in 2011 and NPK in 2012 was applied three times, first at planting then on the 15th and 20th day following. The irrigation program was run for full irrigation (Ik\(_{cp2}\)). Hence, the irrigation treatments included five irrigation levels from excess water to severe water stress. Only in the full irrigation treatment, the water was refilled in the root zone up to field capacity at 7-day intervals.

Irrigation regimes consisted of five different irrigation levels of cumulative pan Evaporation (E\(_{pan}\)) values. These irrigation treatments were applied based on different plant-pan coefficients (Ik\(_{cp1}\)= 1.25, Ik\(_{cp2}\)= 1.00, Ik\(_{cp3}\)= 0.66, Ik\(_{cp4}\)= 0.33 and Ik\(_{cp5}\)= 0.00). In both years, however, for the first 4 weeks after transplanting, all treatments were irrigated equally twice a week in order for the transplanted peppers to develop. Following this, they were then irrigated according to the irrigation treatments; however, plants in the treatment of Ik\(_{cp5}\) did not receive any water after the establishment of root development. All amounts of evaporation from the Class-A pan one month after transplanting were measured every 7 days for both years, since Doorenbos et al. (1984) reported that predicting crop water requirements for periods of 10 days or longer by using a Class-A pan is still warranted.

In the deficit treatments, water was applied at 66% (Ik\(_{cp3}\)), at 33% (Ik\(_{cp4}\)), and at 0% (Ik\(_{cp5}\)) of full irrigation. A Class-A Evaporation Pan was located next to the experimental plot. In calculation of the applied water in the full irrigation treatment, class-A pan evaporation was used for each equation given by Kanber (1984):

\[
I = A \times E_{pan} \times k_p \tag{1}
\]

Where, \(I\) is the amount of irrigation water applied (mm), \(A\) is the plot area, \(E_{pan}\) is the cumulative evaporation at irrigation interval (mm) and \(k_p\) is the plant-pan coefficient. Sezen et al. (2006) obtained the highest bell pepper yield at 6-day irrigation intervals with \(k_p=1.00\). The actual Evapotranspiration (ET) of the pepper (Capsicum annuum L. cv. California Wonder) was estimated using the soil water balance method, as:

\[
ET = I + P + C_r - D_p - R_f \pm \Delta SW \tag{2}
\]

Where, \(ET\) is the actual crop evapotranspiration (mm), \(I\) is the irrigation depth (mm) and \(P\) is rainfall (mm). The Capillary rise water (\(C_r\), mm) is negligible considering a ground water level of 40-50 m below the soil surface (Li et al., 2008), the Deep percolation (\(D_p\), mm) below the root zone was also ignored because irrigation...
depths were small and water applied to each
treatment was only sufficient to compensate
for the soil moisture deficit caused by crop
evapotranspiration and thus not enough to
percolate through the bottom of the root
zone. Surface Runoff (R_s, mm) was also
ignored because no runoff was observed
during the periods of irrigation and
precipitation. ΔSW is the change in soil
water content (mm) at a depth of 90 cm from
the soil surface. Soil water content was
determined by the gravimetric method at 30
cm intervals and 7-day intervals.

Water Use Efficiency (WUE) (kg m⁻³)
was calculated according to Hillel and
Guron (1975) as:

\[ WUE = \frac{Y}{ET} \]  (3)

Where, Y is yield (t ha⁻¹), and ET is the
same as described above.

**Leaf Area Index (LAI)**

Three plant samples from each plot were
selected randomly for leaf area
measurement. The green leaf portions were
separated and leaf area was determined
using a CI-202 Portable Laser area meter
(CID, Inc., USA) in cm². All leaves of each
plant were collected in all treatments, and
the Leaf Area Index (LAI) was determined
by the following equation (Kar and Kumar,
2007):

\[ \text{LAI} = \frac{\text{Measured leaf area of 3 plants}}{\text{Ground area covered by 3 plants}} \]  (4)

**Light Attenuation and Radiation Use
Efficiency**

Two pyranometer sensors were placed in
the center of the plot. One was placed above
the canopy of a reference plant at a height of
about 1.5 m to determine the incident PAR.
The other measurement was taken at soil
surface level by placing the sensor below the
canopy in order to determine the transmitted
PAR, as indicated by Charles-Edwards and
Lawn (1984), and these sensors were
connected to the HOBO U12 data logger,
which had 2 inputs to measure total solar
radiation (W m⁻²), and also registering the
time and date at 1-hour intervals. Daily solar
radiation of MJ m⁻² d⁻¹ was estimated as
recommended by Monteith (1977).

The light extinction coefficient (k) could
be calculated by Transmitted PAR (TPAR as
MJ m⁻² d⁻¹) and incident PAR (MJ m⁻² d⁻¹)
(Kiniry et al., 2005; Lindquist et al., 2005)
as:

\[ k = \frac{-\ln(TPAR / PAR)}{LAI} \]  (5)

We estimated k as 0.75 in 2011 and 0.78 in
2012 for the pepper (*Capsicum annuum* L.
cv. California Wonder). They were very
close to the value of k estimated by Sarlikioti et al. (2011), who found the light
extinction coefficient (k) to be 0.8 for sweet
pepper. In this study, an exponential
function was fitted for the period analysis
and the fraction of PAR intercepted (F) was
calculated according to Trapani et al. (1992)
as:

\[ F = 1 - \exp(-k \cdot LAI) \]  (6)

Multiplying the daily fraction of PAR
intercepted (F) with PAR gives an estimate
of the amount of radiation intercepted by a
crop canopy (IPAR, MJ m⁻²). The Radiation
Use Efficiency (RUE) on a fresh and dry
yield basis was calculated as defined by
Ahmad et al. (2008):

\[ IPAR = F \times PAR \]  (7)

\[ \text{RUE}_\text{Yield} = \frac{\text{Yield}}{\sum IPAR} \]  (8)

\[ \text{RUE}_\text{TDM} = \frac{\sum \text{TDM}}{\sum IPAR} \]  (9)

Where, TDM is the total dry matter (leaves
and stem) (g).

**Plant and Fruit Quality Parameters**

Plots were harvested 134 Days After
Transplanting (DAT) in 2011 and 110 DAT
in 2012. One representative plant was also
harvested in all plots in each individual
growth period (vegetative, flowering,
ripening and yield formation) and used for growth analysis. Shoot and fruit tissues were dried at 70°C for subsequent dry weight determination. All plant weights (stem, leaf and fruit) were determined using a digital balance (±0.01 g) and diameters were measured with a digital clipper (±0.01 mm). Soluble solids were determined on a blended composite using a portable hand-held refractometer (SERICO, Shanghai E-Reliance International Co., Ltd., China). pH was determined for 100 ml fruit juice by a handheld pH meter (Milwaukee Instruments, Inc., USA.). Fresh weights (stem, leaf and fruit) were determined separately by weighing. After that, they were all oven-dried to a constant weight at about 70°C for two days to determine the dry weight of whole plants in each treatment.

Yield and quality parameters were analyzed using ANOVA. Means were separated by Duncan’s Multiple Range Test at the probability level of 1 and 5% (P< 0.01, P< 0.05).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Irrigation Water, Evapotranspiration (ET) and Yield

Different irrigation treatments in both experiment years had a significant effect on the yield and vegetative development of the California Wonder pepper. The Irrigation amounts (I), Evapotranspiration (ET) and yield values for both years of the experiment are given in Table 2.

The amount of water applied in both years fluctuated on average from 89 mm in the severe stress treatment (Ik<sub>c0.00</sub>) to 1018 mm in the excess water application (Ik<sub>c1.25</sub>). The amount of applied irrigation water increased the crop water consumption (ET) for all treatments. Even though the applied water and ET were higher in the excessive water treatment (Ik<sub>c1.25</sub>), the highest yield was obtained in the treatment where the full water requirement of pepper was fully covered (Table 2). The yield results, especially for the treatments of Ik<sub>c1</sub>, Ik<sub>c2</sub>, and Ik<sub>c3</sub> in the present study, were almost twice the findings given in the literature.

Sezen et al. (2006) obtained the highest values for bell pepper yield (35.3 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) by applying 570.4 mm of irrigation water. Yıldırım et al. (2012) obtained the highest bell pepper yield with an application of 400 mm irrigation water, and Karam et al. (2009) obtained the highest marketable pepper yield with 31.9 t ha<sup>-1</sup>. The yield and plant development parameters of the present study, however, are in good agreement with the findings of Sener and Erken (2004), who obtained the highest pepper (Capsicum annuum L. cv. California Wonder) yield with 65.64 t ha<sup>-1</sup> by applying 915 mm of irrigation water according to the Class-A pan method. The reason for their high yield depended to a large extent on genotype, since the California Wonder’s fruit size, weight and flesh thickness are higher than those of other pepper types. This shows that pepper requires at least 887 mm (average of

### Table 2. Irrigation water amount (I), Evapotranspiration (ET), yield.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irrigation water amount (I) (mm)</td>
<td>ET (mm)</td>
<td>Yield&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (t ha&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td>WUE (kg m&lt;sup&gt;-3&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I&lt;sub&gt;1.25&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>71.36&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I&lt;sub&gt;1.00&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>837.6</td>
<td>84.16&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I&lt;sub&gt;0.66&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>65.67&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I&lt;sub&gt;0.33&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>37.09&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I&lt;sub&gt;0.00&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>20.25&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>P<0.01, lower case letters show the significant differences between irrigation treatments.
both years) irrigation water in order to obtain high yields.

Water stress is increasing in a number of countries and regions are moving into increasingly water-stressed conditions (Kijne et al., 2009). In a global climatic change scenario, where the sustainable use of the water has become a priority, water has to be preserved. That is why, by limiting water application water use efficiency can be increased in the treatment of Ik_{cp0.66} (Table 2), and also this water management causes the pepper to produce a reasonable economical yield. Therefore, the treatment of Ik_{cp0.66} should be preferred with minimal yield loss by averaging 690 mm irrigation water. Sener and Erken (2004) reported that when the amount of irrigation water dropped from 732 mm to 549 mm, water use efficiencies and yields were reduced from 6.5 kg da^{-1} mm^{-1} and 47.32 t ha^{-1} to 4.1 kg da^{-1} mm^{-1} and 30.25 t ha^{-1}, respectively. Therefore, 700 mm of water application constitutes the break point in yield reduction for our pepper (Capsicum annuum L. cv. California Wonder). In the non-irrigated treatment (Ik_{cp0.0}) in both years, dry conditions from flowering onwards resulted in a significant reduction in yield; therefore, severe water stress led to the pepper producing a very uneconomical yield. The ratio between yield and evapotranspiration increased from full water application through to severe stress treatment. This event resulted in an increment of WUE to the severe stress treatment. These findings agree well with Sezen et al. (2006), who obtained the highest WUE from the stress treatment.

** Intercepted Radiation and Radiation Use Efficiency

For the whole growing season, the total amount of solar radiation was 2,452 MJ m^{-2} in 2011 for a growing cycle of 134 days and 2,322 MJ m^{-2} in 2012 for a cycle of 110 days. Different irrigation treatments caused the pepper to have different leaf areas; hence the maximum value of LAI was recorded in the full irrigation treatment. Even though the amount of water applied was over 25% in the excess water application compared with the full irrigation treatment, good plant development in terms of plant weight and yield was observed with irrigation water of 887 mm (average of both years) in the full treatment. Therefore, the excess water application of almost 130 mm in the Ik_{cp1.25} treatment was found not to have a significant effect on the yield and quality parameters of pepper (Capsicum annuum L. cv. California Wonder). However, in all treatments, LAI increased faster after the 26th day of the growing cycle and continued until the 100th growing day, then started decreasing due to senescence of the old leaves [Figure 1 (a, b)]. This clearly indicates that meeting the full water demand of pepper is a key factor, especially 26 days after planting, for efficiently converting radiation and plant nutrients into yield.

On the other hand, parameters related to development such as plant weight, LAI, yield and RUE indicated that plant development was negatively affected as the amount of water fell below 800 mm. The value of LAI in the Ik_{cp1.00} treatment, in which irrigation water of 800 mm was applied, was higher; with 1.46 and 2.44 in the two consecutive years in comparison with the over- and deficit irrigations. Lindquist et al. (2005) reported that a reduction in LAI resulted in reduced PAR interception and contributed to consistently lower biomass. Jonckheere et al. (2004) reported that leaf area has a significant impact on photosynthesis and PAR interception. In the full irrigation treatment of the present study, peppers that were not under stress at all converted the irrigation water, nutrients and Intercepted PAR (IPAR) into a marketable yield more efficiently than the over- and deficit irrigation treatments. If limited use of irrigation water is a necessity, then the amount of 690 mm, as in the Ik_{cp0.66}
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Figure 1. Changes in LAI and cumulative IPAR in growing cycle.

treatment, is the critical level for converting irrigation water and intercepted PAR into a reasonable economic yield.

Extreme water stress applications (Ik<sub>cp0.33</sub> and Ik<sub>cp0.00</sub>) have a significant negative effect on both vegetative development and yield. When LAI is greater than 3, almost 90% of PAR is intercepted by the canopy (Sarlikioti et al., 2011). In the present study, even though the total incoming solar radiation...
during the growing period was 2452 MJ m\(^{-2}\) in 2011, the intercepted \(\text{PAR}\) by the canopy was 447.82 MJ m\(^{-2}\) (Figure 1-c.), since \(\text{LAI}\) had the highest value (1.46) in the \(\text{Ik}_{cp1.00}\) treatment. In 2012, that \(\text{LAI}\) reached 2.44 and caused the intercepted \(\text{PAR}\) to increase to 662.99 MJ m\(^{-2}\) (Figure 1-d). In both seasons, the highest yield was obtained from full irrigation in which the highest \(\text{PAR}\) was intercepted by the pepper canopy [Figure 1 (e, f)]. Karam et al. (2009) reported that water stress reduces the \(\text{IPAR}\) and radiation use efficiency of the crop. Therefore, the amount of intercepted \(\text{PAR}\) has a significant effect on yield due to its influence on the photosynthesis of the leaf area. Consequently, the highest yield was obtained from the treatment in which the full water demand of the pepper was met, as seen in Figure 1 (e, f).

Changes in the fresh and dry weight of stem, leaf and fruit against \(\text{IPAR}\) obtained from each irrigation treatment are given in Figure 2. In all treatments, full water irrigation had significant effects on plant development parameters (stem, leaf, fruit weight) and also radiation use efficiency. Meeting the full water demand of pepper in the \(\text{I}_{1.00}\) treatment resulted in total fresh weight (stem, leaf, fruit) increasing to 107.46 and 79.03 t ha\(^{-1}\) in consecutive years. In the deficit treatments of \(\text{Ik}_{cp0.66}\), \(\text{Ik}_{cp0.33}\), and \(\text{Ik}_{cp 0.00}\), total fresh weight (stem, leaf, fruit) as the average of two years compared to full irrigation was reduced by 25, 49, and 78\% [Figure 2 (a, b)], respectively. According to ANOVA, the treatments had a significant effect on fresh leaf weight in 2011, but were not significant in 2012. Fresh stem weight and fruit weight (yield) in 2011 and in 2012 showed significant differences at 0.01 levels in both years. The results of ANOVA for stem and leaf weight were statistically significant in 2012, while they were not significant in 2011.

The dry weight including only stem and leaf in 2011 was the highest with 3.11 t ha\(^{-1}\) in the \(\text{I}_{1.00}\) treatment; this reduced to 1.29 t ha\(^{-1}\) in the non-irrigated treatment (\(\text{Ik}_{cp 0.00}\)) [Figure 2 (c, d)]. Plants produce less dry matter if they are under water stress because this reduces the amount of \(\text{IPAR}\) and radiation use efficiency of a crop canopy (Karam et al., 2009). Total dry weight including stem, leaf and fruit increased in 2012 up to 7.11 t ha\(^{-1}\) in the \(\text{Ik}_{cp1.00}\) treatment and decreased to 2.81 t ha\(^{-1}\) in the severe stress treatment. As seen in the figures, the amount of water applied primarily affected the development of plant leaf area, and its effect on the intercepted \(\text{PAR}\).

Therefore, these parameters have a significant effect on yield. \(\text{RUE}\) on a fresh and dry yield basis in the \(\text{Ik}_{cp 1.00}\) treatment were 18.8 and 0.69 g MJ\(^{-1}\) in 2011 and the equivalent values were 10.1 and 1.07 g MJ\(^{-1}\) in 2012, respectively [Figure 2 (e,f)]. Radiation use efficiency on a dry yield basis was higher at 0.69 g MJ\(^{-1}\) in the \(\text{Ik}_{cp1.00}\) treatment in 2011 and the equivalent value increased to 1.07 g MJ\(^{-1}\) in 2012, since \(\text{LAI}\) increased from 1.46 to 2.44. These results clearly indicate that the amount of irrigation water has a significant effect primarily on vegetative developments, such as the stem and leaf area, in which changes in the amount of photosynthesis and carbon dioxide uptake affects the subsequent crop yield. \(\text{RUE}\) on a fresh yield basis was reasonable for economic yield in the treatments of \(\text{Ik}_{cp1.25}\), \(\text{Ik}_{cp1.00}\), and \(\text{Ik}_{cp0.66}\) in both seasons. Therefore, the critical level for irrigation water is 690 mm for pepper in terms of radiation use efficiency on both a fresh yield and dry yield basis. \(\text{RUE}\) on a dry yield basis as compared with full irrigation treatment was lower by 5, 15, 19, and 25\% in the \(\text{Ik}_{cp1.25}\), \(\text{Ik}_{cp0.66}\), \(\text{Ik}_{cp0.33}\), and \(\text{Ik}_{cp0.00}\) treatments, respectively in 2011. A similar trend was seen in 2012. \(\text{RUE}\) clearly indicated a significant reduction in deficit treatments. In particular, it decreased by 43 and 57\% in the \(\text{Ik}_{cp0.33}\) and \(\text{Ik}_{cp0.00}\) treatments, respectively.

In the present study, peppers in the \(\text{Ik}_{cp1.00}\) treatment converted irrigation water of 888 mm and intercepted \(\text{PAR}\) into yield rather more efficiently than the other treatments. Also, the treatment of \(\text{Ik}_{cp0.66}\) indicated that applied water of 690 mm was the critical
Figure 2. Relationship between IPAR, vegetative growth and RUE.
level for pepper yield since a level lower than this significantly decreased the yield and other quality parameters of the pepper (*Capsicum annuum* L. cv. California Wonder).

Different irrigation levels also have a significant effect on the fruit quality parameters of pepper. In the excess and full water applications, fruit quality parameters (fruit weight, length, and diameter) were very close to each other, but in the higher-than-deficit treatments (i.e., where irrigation water is added to the pepper root area) will give both a higher yield and higher quality per unit increment of water. ANOVA test results for 2011 revealed mean fruit weight to be $F= 9.95$, $n = 30$, $P < 0.01$, mean fruit length of $F = 10.7$, $n = 30$, $P = 0.00< 0.01$, and the mean fruit diameter to be $F=10.46$, $n = 30$, $P = 0.00<0.01$. The equivalent values respectively, were $F= 19.02$, $n = 18$, $P = 0.00< 0.01$, $F= 29.7$, $n = 18$, $P = 0.00< 0.01$ and $F = 53.5$, $n = 18$, $P< 0.01$. The most important factors affecting sterilization time and temperature is the actual pH value of the food (Wilbur, 1983). The response of peppers to different water applications indicated that the values of pH were relatively constant at 4.50 for all treatments, but total soluble solids were higher in the deficit treatments. This agrees well with the findings of Shishido et al. (1992) and differences were significant at 0.01 level for both years, as given in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Mean(^a) fruit weight (g)</td>
<td>Mean(^a) fruit length (mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1.25</td>
<td>84.77(^a)</td>
<td>56(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1.00</td>
<td>81.16(^ab)</td>
<td>55(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0.66</td>
<td>79.68(^b)</td>
<td>51(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0.33</td>
<td>57.60(^b)</td>
<td>43(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0.00</td>
<td>31.90(^c)</td>
<td>35(^c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) $P < 0.01$.
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فتح تیمار های مختلف آبیاری

م. ایلدریم، ک. دمیرل، و. پیار

چکیده

این مطالعه به بررسی تأثیر هر اندازه فلک به آب (Capsicum annuum L. cv. California Wonder) به منظور مصرف عملکرد فلک در شرایط حداکثری کنترل شده مزرعه ای، شامل 5 تیمار مختلف تبخير و تعقیب فصل برای فلک از 89 میلی متر در تیمار اولین (0.0) به 10 میلی متر در کاربرد آب اضافی (1.25) در نومناس بود. جدول نشان می‌دهد که در آن آب در منطقه ریشه تا ظرفیت مزرعه پر شده بود، به طور گوناگون عملکرد در تیمار کامل که در آن آب در منطقه ریشه تا ظرفیت مزرعه پر شده بود، به سمت آمد. در موارد کم‌آب، استفاده از آب 10 میلی متر عملکرد مقرن به صرفه را تضمین می‌کند. ماکسیمم شاخص مطرح گز در تیمار کامل (I1.00)، به طور گوناگون عملکرد مقرن به صرفه را تضمین می‌کند.

جدول 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>تیمار آبیاری</th>
<th>عملکرد مقرن به صرفه (گرم MJ-1)</th>
<th>عملکرد مقرن به صرفه (گرم MJ-1)</th>
<th>عملکرد مقرن به صرفه (گرم MJ-1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I0.00</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1.25</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1.00</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

یا کمبود آب راندمان بالاتری داشت.