# ACCEPTED ARTICLE Effect of powered disc coulters and residue holding wheel on cutting performance of rice residues under no-tillage system in soil bin Uday R. Badegaonkar<sup>a</sup>, Manish Kumar<sup>a\*</sup>, Anil K. Kamble<sup>b</sup>, Shailesh H. Thakare<sup>b</sup>, V. Bhushan Babu<sup>a</sup>, Manoj Kumar<sup>a</sup>, Ajay K. Roul<sup>a</sup> <sup>a</sup> Agricultural Mechanization Division, ICAR-Central Institute of Agricultural Engineering, Bhopal, India. <sup>b</sup> Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola, India. **\* Corresponding author; manishugrineer@gmail.com**

12 13 14

1 2

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11

# ABSTRACT

The management of rice residue is still a challenging issue and factors such as poor feed 15 quality of rice residue, limited and timely unavailability of suitable residue handling machines 16 and narrow window period available prior to seeding of next crop act as driving forces for 17 residue burning by the farmers. In-situ management of rice crop residue can prevent ill effects 18 19 of residue burning on the natural resources. In this study, three types of power-driven disc coulter; serrated, plain, and toothed, with three different arrangements of residue holding 20 device, viz. no holding wheel, single holding wheel, and twin holding wheels with speed ratio 21 (ratio of rotational speed of coulter and forward speed) of 5.2, 6.94, and 8.67 were evaluated in 22 23 the soil bin of Soil Dynamic Research Laboratory of ICAR-Central Institute of Agricultural Engineering, Bhopal, India. Horizontal forces, vertical forces, torque, and residue cutting 24 performance were measured with residue density ranging from 3000 to 5000 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. The 25 experiments (243 including replications) were conducted according to completely randomized 26 27 (CRD) design. The mean horizontal forces, vertical forces, torques, and cutting percentage increased significantly at level of significance P< 0.05 with the increase in the number of 28 residue holding wheel. Increasing the residue load had no effect on the cutting percentage of 29 the residue. The results showed that the residue cutting performance of the plain coulter with 30 twin holding wheels was nearly 100% at any combination of selected variables. Introduction of 31 residue holding wheels to the coulters helped in sowing successive crop (like wheat, maize, 32 etc.) in the combine harvested rice field with heavy residue. 33

**Keywords:** Conservation tillage, coulters, residue holding wheel assembly, residue cutting, residue clogged.

34 35

### 40 INTRODUCTION

Most of the South Asian countries produce rice, wheat and maize as main food crops (Gathala 41 et al., 2020). However, it has been observed that a significant quantity of crop residue is burned 42 across the region, especially in rice-growing areas. (Devi et al., 2017; Goswami et al., 2020; 43 Ravindra et al., 2022; Lin et al., 2022). This practice has created a long-term hazardous impact 44 on the soil, human health and environmental. The Indo-Gangetic plain of South Asia, which 45 covers 13.5 mha across India, Pakistan, Nepal, and Bangladesh, have been spotted with high 46 levels of air pollution (The Energy and Resources Institute, 2019) due to burning of rice residue 47 in combination with other injudicious practices. This practice of burning contributed up to 70% 48 in PM2.5 and over 40% increase in level of atmospheric black carbon concentrations (Kumari 49 et al., 2021; Ravindra et al., 2021). 50

India produces more than 650 million tons of crop residue every year, out of which 51 52 approximately 70% of the residue is utilised as fodder, fuel and industrial purposes. The rest of the, 26% (178 Mt) of crop residue, is still available as a surplus, out of which 87 Mt is burned 53 in the agricultural field directly (Kumar et al., 2023). Rice-wheat alone contribute 54 approximately 70% of the total crop residues in Indian agriculture. Rice-wheat rotation 55 occupies about 10.5 mha and contributes to 40% of the country's total food grain basket 56 (Bijarniya et al., 2020). As much as two-thirds to three-fourths of the residue is burnt in the 57 case of rice due to a lack of economically viable options for managing the residue (Kumar et 58 al., 2015). 59

The anchored residues of height up to 300–400 mm do not affect the direct sowing performance with conventional no-till seeding equipment. However, the long loose retained residue, which is left on the soil surface after combine harvesting, frequently blocks the tyne and furrow openers, resulting in hindrance to the seeding operation, causing long delays, uneven seeding rate and depth and a patchy stand of plants (Singh *et al.*, 2014).

Several researchers have attempted to modify furrow openers, coulter size and shapes, coulter
driving arrangements, and ground clearance of tynes to improve the performance of no-till
sowing machines in terms of seed placement (Tola *et al.*, 2001; Magalhaes *et al.*, 2007;
Bianchini and Magalhães, 2008; Ahmad *et al.*, 2015; Aikins *et. al.*, 2019; Zeng *et al.*, 2021).

Bianchini and Magalhães (2008) in a soil bin experiment with smooth, notched, and toothed disc coulters found that the smooth coulter delivered the lowest performance in terms of horizontal forces, vertical forces, rolling resistance, and residue cutting percentage. The working depth for a toothed coulter to sufficiently cut the sugarcane residue was found to be 80 mm. Ahmad *et al.*, (2015) evaluated the draft requirements and residue cutting performances of different sized disc openers in no-till rice soil conditions. The disc opener with a 450 mm diameter provided higher residue cutting efficiency (88.6%) at 90 mm. Aikins et al., 2019 reported that the powered cutting unit increases the efficiency of residue cutting as compared to the rolling type. Zeng *et al.*, (2021) compared soil and corn residue cutting performance of different discs under soil bin conditions and found that the working depth had a stronger effect on the performances of discs as compared to the disc type.

Numerous studies have been conducted in the context of various aspects such as coulter types, 80 power requirement, performance, etc., of residue management devices. Kushwaha et al., 81 82 (1986a) conducted a soil bin study with coulter sizes ranging from 360-460 mm in diameter. The vertical forces and horizontal forces were found to be in the range of 30-300 N and 45-130 83 N, respectively. The residue parameter had the most significant influence on residue cutting 84 and forces on the coulters. Kushwaha et al., (1986b) found that the power requirement of a plain 85 86 coulter (35-121 W) was lower than that of a notched coulter (104-199 W) at a residue level of 5000 kg/ha. The study also revealed that when using powered and free disc coulters at a depth 87 88 of 50-70 mm, the draft of the powered coulter was significantly lower (30.4–177.6 N) compared to the free-rolling coulter (106.1–428.6 N) for cutting wheat residue ranging from 0 to 5000 89 kg/ha. At all crop residue densities and at a depth of 70 mm, a plain coulter could achieve nearly 90 100% cutting efficiency. Bianchini and Magalhães (2008) in a soil bin experiment with smooth, 91 notched, and toothed disc coulters found that the smooth coulter delivered the lowest 92 performance in terms of horizontal and vertical forces, rolling resistance, and residue cutting 93 percentage. Ahmad et al., (2015) evaluated the draft requirements and residue cutting 94 performances of different sized disc openers in no-till rice soil conditions. The disc opener with 95 a 450 mm diameter provided higher residue cutting efficiency (88.6%). 96

The majority of recent studies focused on soil cutting forces (Malasli and Celik, 2019), soil disturbance (Zeng *et al.*, 2019), residue incorporation (Zeng and Chen 2018a, 2018b) and residue spatial distribution (Zhou *et al.*, 2020) but not on residue cutting effectiveness.

Several researchers carried out experiments on performance evaluation of various types of
 disc coulters and their finding based on selection of residue management device is presented in
 the Table 1.

103

104

105

106

107

Table 1: Selection of residue management device of selected studies.

100	Table 1. Sele	cuon or res	iuuc mana	igement device of selected studies.	
Sl. no.	Residue management device	Crop residue	Sowing crop	Findings	References
1.	1. Turbo coulter blade (TCB), 2. Double dis opener with a seed press (DDP) and 3. notched disc row cleaner with a track wheel or floating star cleaner	Maize (Zea mays L.)		The treatment combining RC, TCB and DDP yielded the most favorable outcomes concerning crop stand and uniformity.	Soza et al., 2003
2.	The residue management device (RME) consisted of nine parts; each part consisted of two powered wheels, one wheel for cutting the residue and the other wheel for removing them away from no-till drill furrow openers.	Rice residue		Incorporating RME into the no-till drill reduced residue clogging by 33% and raised the percentage of cut hills from 14.9% to 63.7%.	Hegazy and Dhaliwal 2011.
3.	Smooth and toothed coulters	Wheat residue and	maize	The Emergence Rate Index (ERI) demonstrated an increase of up to 18% with the toothed coulter compared to the smooth coulter.	Nejadi and Raoufat 2013.
4.	Active toothed coulter row cleaner attachment	wheat	maize	The findings indicate that utilizing a row crop planter equipped with an active toothed coulter is a viable option for direct corn planting with residues from the previous crop.	Nejadi and Raoufat 2013.
5.	Active coulters (different combination of number of notch and depth of notch; 6 combinations)	Wheat		Active disc coulter rotation at higher speeds, as experimentally observed, leads to more significant straw cutting compared to inactive disc coulter rotation in contact with the soil.	Sarauskis <i>et al.</i> , 2013.
6.	Plain disc with twin press wheels and serrated blade with twin press assembly.	Rice		The plain blade with a twin press wheels assembly achieved a 100% straw-cutting rate.	Badegaonkar, et al., 2014.
7.	No-coulter, smooth and offset fluted.	Soybean		Coulters combined with furrow openers reduce soil swelling by around 8% for smooth and 20% for offset fluted configurations.	Francetto et al., 2016.
8.	Five coulters were four types of fluted coulters (8 W, 13 W, 18 W, and 25 W) and one notched-flat coulter (NF) (W: wave number)	Maize		The findings indicate that flat coulters and large-wavenumber fluted coulters (18 W and 25 W) exhibit lower cutting force and are more effective for cutting straw residue in fields with residue coverage.	Wang et al., 2018
9.	Crop residue cutting discs (plain flat disc, wavy disc, rippled disc, and helical wavy disc coulter)			The plain flat disc yielded the lowest values for traction force, hourly fuel consumption, and mobilized soil area.	Becker <i>et al.</i> , 2019

109

Residue handling and cutting largely depends on sharpness of the disc, quality and characteristics of residue (moisture, length, brittleness, softness etc.), moisture and softness of the soil, speed of operations, disc design etc. which are beyond control in actual field conditions. Therefore, relying exclusively on the cutting mechanism for residue handling and cutting is rarely effective (Baker, 2007). This necessitates integrating an additional assisting device that

can enhance the performance of residue cutting and handling. No published work was found on 115 crop residue holding devices, which may improve the residue cutting efficiency to facilitate 116 smooth handling and right seed placement to make proper seed soil contact without any hair-117 pinning effect to overcome poor germination and establishment. The objective of the research 118 was therefore set to study the residue cutting performance of different types of powered discs 119 viz. plain, serrated, and toothed coulter in association with residue holding devices, under 120 varying rice residue conditions in clay soil. The performance characteristics of powered disc 121 coulters in cutting paddy residue, with and without any residue holding wheels, under controlled 122 123 conditions in the soil bin, have been discussed.

124

### 125 MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 126 Experimental Details

The experimental work was carried out in the Soil Dynamic Research Laboratory, Agricultural Mechanization Division (23°18'33.3"N, 77°24'6.8"E), ICAR-Central Institute of Agricultural Engineering, Bhopal, India. The soil used in the bin was a mixture of sand (47.5%), silt (23.0%), and clay (29.5%) particles having good water retention and nutrient holding capacity and generally easy to work.

132

# 133 Soil Bin

134 The concrete structured soil bin, sized at 16 m in length, 2.5 m in width and 1 m deep as shown in Figure 1, was filled with a 900 mm soil column, enough soil volume to facilitate testing of 135 136 full-sized equipment without side effects and variability. It was equipped with a tool bar and instrumentation carriage, soil processing gadgets, and a power transmission unit. The tool bar 137 138 carriage contained two tool bars, a front and a rear. The front tool bar was used for mounting the experimental tool and the rear for attaching the soil processing gadgets. Each tool bar was 139 equipped with a steering wheel and a chain sprocket drive to raise, lower, and lock the gadget 140 in the desired position. The speed of the carriage was varied by varying the rpm of automatic 141 variable speed (AVS) drive and measured by a linear speed sensor (Sick AG Ltd., Waldkirch, 142 Germany). The tool carriage was driven at a travel speed of 2.5 km h<sup>-1</sup> in all experiments (Tice 143 and Hendrick, 1992; Rautaray, 2002; Bianchini and Magalhaes, 2008). 144



**Figure 1.** A view of soil bin system: 1. Rectangular soil bin; 2. Variable speed motor; 3. Linear speed sensor; 4. Tool and instrumentation carriage; 5. Chain drive and guide rail; 6. Control room, 7. Mimic panel.

# 146147 Instrumentation for Measurement

148 The soil bin system was fitted with an electronic measuring, computing, and analysis system to evaluate the performance of the attached equipment. The instrumentation system was 149 arranged to measure horizontal force (H), vertical force (V), and torque (T) acting on a tool in 150 operation. Forces acting on a tool during operation were measured with the help of six S-type 151 152 load cells (IPA, Pvt. Ltd., Bengaluru). Three vertically mounted load cells (Sensitivity:  $1.5 \pm$ 0.01 mV/V; Range 500 kg) for measuring vertical force, two horizontally mounted load cells 153 154 for horizontal force or draft, and one load cell mounted on the side for measurement of lateral 155 force. All load cells were calibrated (ISO 7500-1:2015) for both tensile and compressive loading. Each transducer consisted of a fixed end attached to the toolbar and a free end on which 156 the tool was mounted. With such an arrangement, loads having any combination of translational 157 and rotational soil reactions can be tested while parameters such as speed, rpm of the tool, depth 158 of operation, etc. are varied. A separate provision was made for giving power to the residue 159 160 cutting discs through the variable speed drive (VS-616 G5, Fukuoka, Japan) of capacity 20kW. A torque transducer (SA-10, Sushama Industries, Bangalore) of capacity 100 Nm was coupled 161 between the motor and the rotational cutting discs with the help of a coupling and locking bolt 162 at one end and a chain-sprocket arrangement at the other end of the rotational disc shaft. A 163 computer-controlled SCADA based data acquisition and programmable logic control based 164 165 system was utilized during the experiment. The acquisition rate was 0.5 Hz (Badegaonkar et al., 2014). A close view of instruments used in this study is shown in Figure 2. 166



Figure 2. Close view of instruments used in this study.

# 168 Soil Bed Preparation

167

The soil in the bin was prepared to simulate the field conditions for sowing. The soil 169 compaction level was measured in the field and in the soil bin with a cone penetrometer 170 (M1.06.15.SA.E, Eijkelkamp, AgriSearch Netherlands) of maximum range of 5000 kPa which 171 consisted of a force sensor, the logger, a probing rod, a cone, and an ultrasonic depth 172 measurement system. Data for soil penetration resistance was collected at seeding time with 173 stubble under no-till conditions on the experimental farm of the ICAR-Central Institute of 174 175 Agricultural Engineering, India. Cone index (CI) values were evaluated at 0 to 300 mm depth 176 by taking an average of five readings at five different locations.

The different operations in soil bed preparation included soil tilling, moistening of soil, 177 levelling, and compaction followed by rotary tiller, sheep foot roller, soil leveller, plain roller, 178 and water application system to maintain uniform moisture and penetration resistance 179 180 throughout each experiment with repeatability measures. The soil moisture was managed across 181 its entire width with the help of a spray boom attached to the carriage. A hollow drum roller of 182 1800 mm width and 500 mm diameter, filled with sand, was used to compact the surface soil to achieve soil conditions at par with the field conditions. The penetration resistance of a near 183 184 value of 1.40 MPa was maintained in the top 150 mm of soil depth. The soil physical properties used in the soil bin for the experiment are given in Table 2. 185

186

187

Table 2: Physical properties of soil used in ex	xperiment.
Soil type	Values
Soil texture	Clay soil
Particle size distribution	
Sand (20–2000 µm), %	47.5
Silt (2–20 μm), %	23.0
Clay (<2 μm), %	29.5
Mean weight diameter of wet aggregates, mm	0.713
Bulk density (0–150 mm depth), g cm <sup>-3</sup>	1.45
Cone Index	1.40
Moisture content (wb) %	20-22

T-LL 1. DL • 1 1. c

#### **Rice Residue** 191

The amount of residue leftover under actual field conditions, after combine harvesting of rice, 192 was recorded. The height of stubbles ranged between 275 and 375 mm, the length of loose 193 residue was 350-450 mm, and the density of loose residue varied between 3000 and 5000 kg 194 ha<sup>-1</sup>. Therefore, the residue length of 350–450 mm and density of 3000–5000 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> at moisture 195 content between 20–22% (wb) was used in the soil and was spread flat and perpendicular to the 196 motion of the test tool, uniformly along the length of the soil bin during each experimental trial. 197

198

189

190

#### **Residue Cutting Coulters** 199

200 Three types of residue cutting coulters, viz., serrated coulter, plain coulter, and toothed coulter, were used in the investigation, which is shown in Figure 3 and Table 3. All cutting 201 202 coulters were made of the same size (460 mm dia), based on the quality of performance reported 203 by various researchers (Raoufat and Mahmoodieh 2005, Magalhães et al., 2007, Fallahi and Raoufat 2008; Nejadi and Raoufat 2013). The dimensions of the major components of residue 204 cutting systems are given in Table 3. The residue cutting system was attached to the carriage as 205 shown in Figure 5. 206

207

208

209



(B1) Plain coulter (B2) Toothed coulter (B **Figure 3.** Different types of coulters used in the study.

Dortioulors		Type of coulters					
Fatticulais	Serrated coulter (B1)	Plain coulter (B2)	Toothed coulter (B3)				
Outer diameter coulter, mm	r of 460	460	460				
Thickness of com mm	ilter, 4	4	4				
No. of dis teeths	cs/or 0/8	0/0	0/16				

# **Residue Holding Wheel Assembly**

A Residue holding wheel assembly with a single wheel and another twin wheel assembly having two wheels of the same size was developed, which is shown in Figure 4, aiming to holding and hold the loose residue in the original position while being cut. The holding wheels were made of mild steel material and had a diameter of 75 mm and a width of 35 mm. The wheel assembly consisted of a single or twin holding wheel, fork, and spring-loaded holding system. For experimentation, each type of holding wheel assembly was fixed on either side of each cutting disc on the frame and tested for effect on the residue cutting performance.



(a)



(b)



**Figure 4.** Residue holding device (a) Single holding wheel assembly (b) Pair of twin holding wheels assembly.

222

# 223 Speed Ratio of Residue Cutting Coulters

The speed ratio of residue cutting discs is defined as the ratio of the rotational speed of the cutting disc to forward speed. Hegazy and Dhaliwal (2011) recommended a rotor shaft speed of 200 rpm for a power-driven residue manager for a no-till drill. Accordingly, three levels of rotational speeds of the residue cutting disc, one lower and one higher in equal proportion, i.e., 150, 200, and 250 rpm for the study. For a 460 mm diameter residue-cutting disc moving at 2.5 km h<sup>-1</sup> forward speed of the carriage, three speed ratios of 5.20, 6.94, and 8.67 could be established.

231

# 232 **Residue Cutting**

Residue cutting is crucial to ensure adequate seed-soil contact, which leads to better germination and strong crop establishment. To measure the residue cutting, the initial weight of residue for a specific patch area of one square meter (0.4 m width and 2.5 m long) was measured, which was then placed on the soil surface across the plane of cutting. The uncut residue was carefully removed after the experimental coulters passed over it, and its weight was recorded. The percent residue cutting (Q) is measured by Eq. (1).

Residue cutting (Q), 
$$\% = 1 - \frac{\text{weight of uncut residue (g)}}{\text{initial weight of the residue (g)}} \times 100$$
 (1)

# 240 Clogged Residue

Clogged residue is the amount of residue clogged or clumped with the no-till drill tool bar or residue management device during sowing operation. This clogged residue was found to be hindering smooth rotations of coulters subsequent cutting of residue and entangling in the furrow openers. Surface residue samples were collected from 2 m<sup>2</sup> area from the test run of soil bin. Clogged residue during cutting operation in the soil bin was collected from the furrow
opener up to 5 m run. The collected residue was then weighed, and the quantity of clogged
residue was reported in kg/ha.

248

### 249 Experimental Design

A factorial experiment with four factors, each at three levels, was set up with three 250 251 replications to compare the effects of different speed ratios (S: 5.2, 6.94, and 8.67), number of holding wheels (P: without holding wheel, single holding wheel, and twin holding wheels) on 252 253 both sides of the coulters, and different residue densities (R: 3000, 4000, and 5000 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). The performance of the coulters was evaluated by conducting tests in a comparative way using 254 dependent parameters such as vertical force (V), horizontal force (H), torque (T) applied to 255 different disc coulters and residue holding wheel, residue cutting percentage (Q) and residue 256 clogged (C). An analysis of variance was performed to examine the effect of independent 257 variables on response variables such as horizontal force, vertical force, torque requirements and 258 percentage of rice residue cut, and F-test was conducted, and the results were evaluated at a 5% 259 level of significance. Adjustment for multiple comparisons was performed using the Tukey-260 Kramer method. The statistical analysis of experimental data was carried out using SAS 9.3 261 software (SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, NC). Table 4 indicates the treatment combinations of 262 variable levels used in the completely randomized design (CRD). 263

264

**Table 4.** Treatment combinations of variable levels.

Name of the	Range	Code	Levels			Intervals
variables		(Xi)	Xi1	Xi2	Xi3	
			-1	0	+1	
Speed ratio (S)	5.2 - 8.67	X1	5.2	6.935	8.67	1.735
Pair of holding wheels (Nos.) (P)	0 - 2	X2	0	1	2	1
Residue load (kg/ha) (R)	3000-5000	X3	3000	4000	5000	1000
Type of disc coulters (B)	D <sub>1</sub> - D <sub>3</sub>	X4	$D_1$	$D_2$	<b>D</b> <sub>3</sub>	-

266

**Results** 

265

### 267 Evaluation of Horizontal Force (H)

Significant variation in the horizontal force was observed for different levels of speed ratios, residue holding wheels, residue loads and type of coulters. With an increase in speed ratio from 5.20 to 8.67, horizontal forces increased for all the three residue cutting coulters at all the residue load levels and the number of residue holding wheels increased from 0 to 2.

The effect of different factors and their interactions on horizontal force has been presented in Table 5. It was found from the ANOVA that all the considered factors significantly affected the

requirement for horizontal forces. The LS-means of the effect of one factor are appropriately adjusted for the other factor effects in the model. The effect of different parameters on mean 275 horizontal force is shown in Table 6. As speed increases, mean horizontal force also increases. 276

277 278

		-				-	
Source	df			F Value			
		Н	V	Т	Q	С	
Model	32	80.76*	73.98*	69.45*	37.74*	805.09*	
S	2	20.76*	5.81*	13.55*	6.81*	109.76*	
Р	2	945.83*	672.74*	450.10*	553.87*	7485.67*	
S*P	4	0.84	0.44	1.23	0.21	9.16*	
R	2	65.19*	134.75*	156.90*	0.28	2.08	
S*R	4	0.68	0.39	0.44	0.34	1.20	
P*R	4	1.06	0.40	1.20	0.43	2.63	
В	2	212.06*	321.44*	379.85*	25.13*	3012.65*	
S*B	4	0.63	0.52	0.27	3.99*	6.19*	
P*B	4	2.32	3.65*	6.13*	3.50	1112.26*	
R*B	4	7.02*	1.87	16.19*	2.11	4.22	
Error Corrected total	63 95						

**Table 5.** ANOVA table for showing the effects of different factor on different response.

279 \*Significant at 5%.

Note: S-Speeds, P-Holding wheels, R-Residue loads, B-Type of coulters, C-Residue clogged. 280

281

**Evaluation of Vertical Force (V)** 282

Significant variation in the vertical force with changes in speed ratio, residue holding wheels, 283 residue load, and type of disc coulter was observed (P < 0.001). With an increase in speed ratio 284 from 5.20 to 8.67, vertical forces increased for all the three residue cutting coulters at all the 285 residue load levels (3000 to 5000 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and increased with the pair of residue holding wheels 286 287 increased from 0 to 2.

The effect of different factors and their interactions on vertical force has been presented in 288 Table 5. It was observed that there was significant variation in the vertical force with changes 289 in speed ratio, residue holding wheels, residue loads, and type of disc coulters (P<0.001). The 290 multiple comparisons between the effects of levels of factors are shown in Table 6. The LS-291 means of the effect of one factor are appropriately adjusted for the other factor effects in the 292 model. 293

294

296	Table 6	6. Effect o	of different p	arameters or	n different re	esponses		
-	Parameters	Values	LS mean					
		-	H, N	V, N	T, Nm	Q, %	C, kg/ha	
		5.20	105.17 <sup>C</sup>	282.07 <sup>B</sup>	13.09 <sup>B</sup>	46.49 <sup>B</sup>	42.46 <sup>A</sup>	
	Speeds (S)	6.94	111.55 <sup>AB</sup>	286.57 <sup>AB</sup>	13.45 <sup>BC</sup>	52.96 <sup>A</sup>	34.66 <sup>C</sup>	
		8.67	115.10 <sup>A</sup>	294.05 <sup>A</sup>	14.27 <sup>A</sup>	45.62 <sup>BC</sup>	40.09 <sup>B</sup>	
		0	77.47 <sup>C</sup>	219.02 <sup>C</sup>	10.38 <sup>C</sup>	12.91 <sup>C</sup>	20.11 <sup>B</sup>	
	Residue holding wheels (P)	1	108.93 <sup>B</sup>	295.00 <sup>B</sup>	13.14 <sup>B</sup>	44.19 <sup>B</sup>	77.24 <sup>A</sup>	
		2	145.42 <sup>A</sup>	348.68 <sup>A</sup>	17.30 <sup>A</sup>	87.98 <sup>A</sup>	19.86 <sup>B</sup>	
		B1	122.45 <sup>B</sup>	326.14 <sup>A</sup>	16.13 <sup>A</sup>	44.94 <sup>B</sup>	62.64 <sup>A</sup>	
	Coulters (B)	B2	93.14 <sup>A</sup>	240.89 <sup>C</sup>	10.18 <sup>C</sup>	57.18 <sup>A</sup>	22.49 <sup>C</sup>	
		B3	116.22 <sup>BC</sup>	295.67 <sup>B</sup>	14.50 <sup>B</sup>	42.95 <sup>BC</sup>	32.08 <sup>B</sup>	
		3000	101.42 <sup>C</sup>	258.64 <sup>C</sup>	11.46 <sup>C</sup>	$48.70^{A}$	39.67 <sup>A</sup>	
	Residue loads (R)	4000	111.16 <sup>B</sup>	287.07 <sup>B</sup>	13.79 <sup>B</sup>	47.44 <sup>A</sup>	38.59 <sup>A</sup>	
		5000	119 24 <sup>A</sup>	316 98 <sup>A</sup>	15 57 <sup>A</sup>	48 95 <sup>A</sup>	39 67 <sup>A</sup>	

T-LL ( Eff. 4 of 1'ff. and a survey of an 1:00----

297 Note: Number with different symbols (A, B and C) in each column are significantly different at  $\alpha = 0.05$ . 298 The vertical force requirements exhibit nearly equal effects for speed ratios of 5.20 and 6.94. 299 Similarly, speed ratios of 6.94 and 8.67 also result in almost identical impacts on vertical force. 300 301 The mean vertical forces differ significantly at 5% probability level as number of holding wheels increases. 302

303

#### **Evaluation of Torque (T)** 304

Significant variation in the torque with changes in speed ratio, a pair of holding wheels, 305 residue loads, and type of coulters was observed (P<0.001). It is also observed that the torque 306 307 requirement decreased linearly with increased speed ratio and increased linearly with a pair of holding wheels and residue loads, while it increased quadratically with speed ratio and number 308 309 of residue holding wheels using all three coulters.

It has found from Table 6 and ANOVA that the mean torque was found to be statistically same 310 at a lower level of speed ratio, but it was significantly different at 8.67 of speed ratio. The mean 311 torque differed significantly at the 5% probability level as the number of holding wheels 312 increases. 313

314 315

# **Evaluation of Residue Cutting percentage (Q)**

The F-values indicated that the number of residue holding wheels was the most influential 316 factor for residue cutting percentage. The effect of different factors and their interactions on 317 318 cutting percentage has been presented in Table 5. The effect of speed ratio, holding wheels, and type of coulters had a significant effect on cutting percentage, whereas the levels of residue 319 320 load had no significant effect.

321 Based on an LS means comparison (Table 6) of percentage residue cut, the machine setting at 322 6.94 speed ratio with the second pair of twin wheel holding wheels with coulter (B2) was found to be superior. This implies that elevating the rotational speed of coulters up to a 323

324 certain level did not impact the amount of crop residue cut. As a result, the machinery could 325 potentially operate with greater efficiency and reduced energy consumption. The maximum 326 mean cutting efficiency was 87.98% in the case with a system run with a twin holding wheel 327 system, and the minimum was found when there was no holding wheel mounted on the residue 328 cutting assembly.

329

# 330 **Residue Clogged (C)**

Table 5 illustrates the impact of various factors and their effect on residue clogging. The Fvalues suggest that the interaction of the number of residue holding wheels and coulters has the most significant effect on minimizing residue clogging. Through a comparison of LS means (Table 6) for residue clogging, it was determined that the optimal machine configuration for minimizing clogging involved a speed ratio of 6.94 paired with twin wheel holding wheels featuring coulter coulters (B2).

337

# 338 Overall effect of residue holding assembly

Combination of type of holding wheels and coulters revealed that pairing holding wheels and B2 coulter yielded 100% absolute cutting efficiency (Table 7). Overall, the machine set at speed ratio 6.93 using two holding wheels and a B2 type of coulter was found superior for cutting rice residue. Interaction showing effect of other parameters interaction ( $R \times B$ ,  $P \times B$ ,  $S \times B$  and  $S \times P$ ) on studied parameters (H, V, T, Q and C) is shown in Table 8.

344 **Table 7.** Combination of type of holding wheels and coulters on cutting percentage.

Holding wheels	Type of disc coulters	LS mean of cutting efficiency %
0	B1	11.07 <sup>f</sup>
0	B2	16.26 <sup>e</sup>
0	В3	11.40 <sup>f</sup>
1	B1	37.43 <sup>d</sup>
1	B2	55.29°
1	В3	39.83 <sup>d</sup>
2	B1	86.33 <sup>b</sup>
2	B2	100.00 <sup>a</sup>
2	В3	77.63 <sup>b</sup>

Note: The numbers with different symbols of alphabets in the column are significantly different at  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

345

346 347

**Table 8:** Interaction showing effect of other parameters interaction ( $R \times B$ ,  $P \times B$ ,  $S \times B$  and  $S \times P$ ) on studied parameters.

-	Interaction	ns	LS Means						
			H, N	V, N	T, Nm	Q, %	C, kg/ha		
	B1	P1	87.08ef	335.20abc	12.45e	11.07f	23.58e		
	B1	P2	120.46d	341.80ab	16.04c	37.43d	128.82a		
	B1	P3	158.76a	390.10a	19.80a	86.33b	35.53d		
	B2	P1	63.49g	179.07d	7.70h	16.26e	18.44f		
BxP	B2	P2	89.23e	257.24bcd	9.61g	55.29c	43.84c		
	B2	P3	126.91c	302.32abc	13.61d	100.00a	5.18g		
	B3	P1	81.86f	228.67cd	11.01f	11.40f	18.32f		
	B3	P2	117.21d	307.03abc	14.13d	39.83d	59.05b		
	B3	P3	150.61b	373.90a	18.80b	77.63b	18.87f		
	B1	S1	115.70cd	397.99a	15.53b	41.68d	67.20a		
	B1	S2	122.19b	331.02ab	16.02ab	48.17c	56.55c		
	B1	S3	128.40a	338.09ab	16.73a	41.51d	64.18b		
	B2	S1	88.70f	240.37b	9.76f	58.76b	24.12g		
BxS	B2	S2	95.03e	247.04b	10.03f	62.93a	19.56h		
	B2	S3	95.90e	251.23b	11.13e	56.93b	23.79g		
	B3	R1	111.12d	297.43a	14.01d	39.87d	36.07d		
	B3	R2	117.55b	302.25a	14.65dc	50.59c	27.86f		
	B3	R3	121.01b	309.93a	15.27bc	37.22e	32.31e		
	P1	S1	72.12f	289.03ab	9.64f	10.08f	22.54d		
	P2	S2	77.44fe	222.17b	10.24f	18.29e	16.94e		
	P3	<b>S</b> 3	82.86e	231.77b	11.28e	8.94f	20.85d		
	P1	S1	101.89d	295.56ab	12.79d	43.94d	82.52a		
PXS	P2	S2	110.48c	301.57ab	13.09d	52.69c	70.25c		
	P3	<b>S</b> 3	114.52c	308.96ab	13.90c	40.94d	78.95b		
	P1	R1	141.50b	351.21a	16.89b	86.28b	22.33d		
	P2	R2	146.83ab	356.58a	17.38ab	90.71a	16.78e		
	P3	R3	147.93a	358.53a	17.95a	85.78b	20.48d		
	B1	R1	108.97d	373.24a	13.04d	43.39b	64.65a		
	B1	R2	122.23bc	363.93a	16.22b	44.52b	60.55b		
	B1	R3	135.09a	336.81a	19.02a	43.45b	62.73ab		
	B2	R1	89.18f	329.93ac	9.34h	59.86a	22.38d		
BxR	B2	R2	94.56ef	304.26ac	10.39g	59.62a	23.16d		
	B2	R3	95.89e	268.63ac	11.19f	59.14a	21.93d		
	B3	R1	106.11d	268.54ac	12.02e	42.90b	31.98c		
	B3	R2	116.79c	247.64c	15.10c	42.17b	32.06c		
	B3	R3	126.77b	222.37c	16.81b	42.60b	32.20c		

352

The plot of attributes such as horizontal force, vertical force, torque and cutting efficiency, reflecting the effect of residue holding assembly, has been shown in Figure 5. The value measurement data of all attributes increased significantly at a 5% level of significance as the number of holding wheels increased (Figure 4) for all levels of residue load.



**Figure 5.** Effect of holding wheel assembly on different attributes. \* Vertical force significantly differ with types of holding wheel; + Horizontal force significantly differ with types of holding wheels; # Torque significantly differ with types of holding wheel, ~ cutting efficiency significantly differ with types of holding wheel.

The seeding attachment as shown in Figure 7a was mounted just behind the residue cutting mechanism of the plain coulter with a pair of twin holding wheels for the sowing of wheat seeds with 5000 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of residue load of rice in the soil bin to check their emergence and accumulation of rice residue found with the incorporation of the furrow opener. The residue cutting mechanism with seeding attachment carriage, which is shown in Figure 6, was operated at 2.5 km h<sup>-1</sup> speed, maintaining the minimum speed ratio of 6.94 and maintaining the depth of residue cutting of 15 mm. Figure 7b depicts a view of wheat seedlings after 7 days of sowing.

367

368

369



**Figure 6.** Cutting of residue by (a) serrated coulter, (b) plain coulter and (c) toothed coulter with two residue holding wheel assembly.



(a)

**(b)** 

**Figure 7.** (a) Residue cutting-holding wheels with seed drill attachment and (b) wheat seedling emergence after 7 days after sowing in soil bin

# 372 **DISCUSSION**

# 373 Horizontal Force (H)

The LS means (Table 6) showed that the horizontal force was significantly higher for twin holding wheels, followed by the single holding wheel and no holding wheel. As the number of holding wheel increases, normal force and rolling resistance increases. This causes an increase in horizontal force on coulter. The mean horizontal force (101.42–119.24 N) was proportional to the residue level (0-500 kg) at each level of increased residue load. The increased number of

holding wheels affects normal force and rolling resistance by enhancing soil compression, 379 increasing frictional forces, improving traction, contributing to soil and residue compaction and 380 stabilizing coulters. Plain disc provided smooth operation and exerted less horizontal force 381 compared to the other disc coulters i.e. serrated disc and disc toothed. Becker et al., (2019) 382 observed that the horizontal force exerted by a plain disc coulter was the lowest at 115 N, 383 compared to the wavy (135 N), rippled (128 N), and helical wavy (125 N) disc coulters. 384 Kushwaha et al., (1984) reported that the lowest horizontal force was in the range of 59.8-92.1 385 N for a plain coulter on straw density of 5000 kg/ha, as compared to notched and serrated 386 387 coulters. Increased speed ratio also increased draft force for all residue levels from 0 to 5000 kg/ha. However, Bianchini and Magalhaes' (2008) study revealed a contrasting result, 388 389 indicating a descending order of horizontal force for smooth (0.94 kN), followed by notch (0.60 kN), and toothed surfaces (0.32 kN) at 80 mm depth. Ahmad et al., (2019) concluded that the 390 391 draft of the toothed type disc was found to be the lowest (421 N) in comparison to notched (444.3 N) and smooth (781.3 N) type discs. Zeng et al., (2021) found that the draft force 392 393 required to cut corn residue (load 7500 kg/ha) was lowest in the case of the notched (579 N) 394 disc, followed by plain and ripple (675 N) discs.

395

### **396** Vertical Force (V)

The minimum vertical force was found with B2 coulters, which significantly differ from the 397 other two types of coulters (Table 6). The serrated disc coulters B1 and B3 touched to the 398 ground surface, experienced sudden load resulted in higher vertical force compared to plain 399 400 disc coulter (B2). The higher vertical force associated with the coulters may lead to increased wear and tear on the coulters and increases the power requirements. The lowest mean vertical 401 force was found at 3000 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of residue load and increased significantly with an increased 402 403 level of residue load. As residue load increases, the depth required to cut increases which 404 increase vertical force on the disc coulter. The relationship between residue load, cutting depth, 405 and vertical force extend to optimizing machinery performance. This will help to mitigate 406 excessive forces, leading to prolonged equipment lifespan and reduced maintenance costs. 407 Kushwaha et al., (1984) observed that the lowest vertical force for a plain coulter at 5000 kg/ha 408 straw density was in the range of 262.9–309.6 N, which was lower than for notched and serrated coulters. It was also found that increasing the speed ratio decreased the vertical force for all 409 residue levels, ranging from 0 to 5000 kg/ha. However, Bianchini and Magalhaes' (2014) study 410 revealed a contrasting result, indicating a descending order of vertical force for smooth (3.54 411 412 kN), followed by notch (2.12 kN), and toothed surfaces (1.24 kN) at 80 mm depth. Ahmad et *al.*, 2019 determined that the vertical force of the toothed disc type was the lowest at 903.7 N,
as opposed to the notched (1105.3 N) and smooth (923 N) disc types. Zeng *et al.*, (2021) also
found that the notched disc exhibited a minimal vertical force of 164 N, which was lower than
that of the rippled disc (289 N), as well as the plain disc.

417

### 418 **Torque** (**T**)

The torque produced was significantly lower for the plain coulter (10.18 Nm) followed by the 419 B3 and B1 coulters. The lowest mean torque was found at 3000 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of residue load and 420 421 increased significantly with an increased level of residue load. The highest mean torque (15.57 Nm) was observed at 5000 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of residue load. The plain coulter showed the lowest 422 423 minimum mean torque (10.18 Nm) due to lower rolling resistance as compared to the other selected coulters. The absence of serrations on the plain coulter might result in a smoother 424 cutting action, reducing the resistance encountered during soil penetration. Magalhaes and 425 Bianchini's 2014 study revealed a contrasting result, indicating a descending order of torque 426 required for smooth, followed by notch and toothed surfaces. Lower torque requirements for 427 cutting residue can potentially operate machinery more efficiently and consume less energy. 428

429

### 430 **Residue Clogged** (C)

The residue cutting coulter, equipped with twin holding wheels, effectively cuts rice residue to a shorter length, facilitating its smooth passage between two furrow openers. The cutting coulter efficiently slices through the remaining rice stalks, while the twin holding wheels play a crucial role in compacting and preparing the cut residue for easy traversal. The shortened residue can then move smoothly between the furrow openers, resulting in minimal residue clogging.

### 437 438

### Cutting Performance and Residue Holding Assembly

The toothed and serrated coulter caused greater residue disturbance, either by throwing it 439 backward at high rotation or by carrying the residue along the periphery at lower rotation, and 440 thereby, in the process, caused greater soil disturbance too. The plain disc coulter, in 441 442 combination with the holding device, greatly facilitated the residue cutting without displacing the residue from its original position and created a clean and clear space for dropping the seed 443 into the furrow with good soil contact. Variations in cutting percentage influence residue 444 management, leading to improved sowing operations without any mechanical blockages. This 445 results in better short-term crop growth and long-term soil health. 446

The effectiveness of disc coulter coulters to cut rice residue increased significantly with the 447 use of holding wheel assembly because more continuous holding of residue with soil surface 448 took place when the cutting coulter rolled over on the residue surface with double holding wheel 449 assembly than with single holding wheel assembly. There was no such holding of residue 450 observed without holding wheel assembly. The serrated and toothed coulters didn't make 451 smooth contact with loose residue, resulting in more throwing of residue than cutting, even with 452 the use of holding wheel assembly, resulting in poor residue cutting performance, which could 453 be seen in Figures 5a&c. 454

455 Kushwaha et al., 1986 observed and analysed that the straw cutting performance of the plain coulter reached nearly 100%. The quantity of straw cut increased with higher rotational speeds 456 457 and decreased with elevated straw density with notch and serrated coulters. Kumar et al., 2021 458 found that the star wheel disc coulter exhibited the highest mean residue cutting at 98.15%, 459 surpassing notched (84.12%), curved teeth (75.82%), plain (61.82%), and cutter bar blade disc coulter (52.12%) when no residue holding devices was used. Conversely, other researchers such 460 461 as Bianchini and Magalhães (2008), Ahmad et al., 2017, and Zeng et al., 2021 reported contrasting results regarding the cutting performance of plain coulter. The residue cutting 462 463 effectiveness of the discs showed variations, ranging from the highest to the lowest, with no significant differences observed among the rippled, notched, and plain discs as results reported 464 by Zeng et al., 2021. Ahmad et al., 2017 found that the average straw-cutting efficiency for 465 notched, toothed, and smooth-edge single disc, and double disc furrow openers were 12.4%, 466 46.2%, 11.4%, and 78.5%, respectively. Despite this, from a practical standpoint, the fabrication 467 of plain coulters is economically viable and can be carried out by local fabricators. The 468 incorporation of a residue holding wheel enhances cutting efficiency. 469

As shown in Fig 7, after passing the residue cutting mechanism over the rice residue, a clear furrow was observed and seed was placed in the soil at an average depth of 35 mm as the furrow opener was fitted at a 20 mm higher depth than that of the residue cutting mechanism. The study conducted by other author, the depth of operation of residue cutting coulters has been in the range of 50–90 mm in order to achieve complete cutting of residue and overcome the problem of 'hair pinning' in softer soil (RL Kushwaha 1986a; RL Kushwaha 1986b; Magalhães *et al.*, 2007; Bianchini and Magalhaes 2008).

### CONCLUSIONS

Our research investigated the performance of various disc coulters with a combination of
residue-holding wheels for cutting rice residue in direct seeding applications. Based on that, the
following conclusions have been drawn from this study:

- The performance of the disc coulter with twin wheel residue holding assembly in
  cutting rice residue was superior to that of the serrated and toothed coulters for all
  levels of residue loads.
- 485
  2. Horizontal forces, vertical forces, and torques increased with an increase in speed
  486 ratio, residue load and the number of residue holding wheels for all tested coulters.
  487 The horizontal forces, vertical forces and torques were found to be lower in case of
  488 plain disc coulter as compared to other disc coulters.
- 3. The residue holding device had a greater influence on the rice residue cutting
  performance to facilitate direct seeding in residue condition. The combinations of plain
  disc coulter and double holding wheel assembly performed nearly 100% cutting at all
  residue levels and coulter speed ratios.
- 4934. The seeding machine could be fabricated with this coulter accompanied by twin494 residue holding wheels to evaluate its performance under real field conditions.
- 495

# 496 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful to NICRA (National Innovations on Climate Resilient Agriculture,
New Delhi, India) and ICAR-Central Institute of Agricultural Engineering, Bhopal, India for
their administrative support for this study.

500

505

506

507

508

509

510

# 501 **REFERENCES**

- Ahmad, F., Weimin, D., Qishou, D., Rehim, A. and Jabran, K. 2017. Comparative
   performance of various disc-type furrow openers in no-till paddy field conditions.
   *Sustainability*, 9(7), PP. 1143.
  - Ahmad, F., Weimin, D., Qishuo, D., Hussain, M. and Jabran, K. 2015. Forces and Residue Cutting Performance of Double Disc Furrow Opener in No-Till Paddy Soil. *PLoS ONE*, 10(3), https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0119648.
  - Aikins, K. A., Antille, D. L., Jensen, T.A. and Blackwell, J. 2019. Performance comparison of residue management units of no-tillage sowing systems: A review. *Eng. Agric. Environ. Food.*, **12(2):** 181–190.

511	4.	Badegaonkar, U. R., Kamble, A. K. and Thakare, S.H. 2014. Performance evaluation
512		of straw cutting mechanism under no-till crop residue conditions in the soil bin. PKV.
513		<i>Res. J.</i> , <b>38(1):</b> 47-52.
514	5.	Baker, C. J. and Saxton, K. E. eds., 2007. No-tillage seeding in conservation
515		agriculture. Published jointly by Food and Agriculture Organization of the United
516		Nations and Cabi Pub.
517	6.	Becker, R. S., dos Santos Alonço, A., Francetto, T. R., Carpes, D. P., Zart, B. C. C. R.
518		and Moreira, A.R. 2019. Operational performance of crop residue cutting discs in the
519		no-tillage system. Agric. Eng. Int.: CIGR J., 21(2): 78-85.
520	7.	Bianchini, A., and Magalhães, P. S. G. 2008. Evaluation of coulters for cutting sugar
521		cane residue in a soil bin. Biosyst. Eng., 100(3): 370-375. doi:
522		10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2008.04.012.
523	8.	Bijarniya, D., Parihar, C. M., Jat, R. K., Kalvania, K., Kakraliya, S.K. and Jat, M. L.
524		2020. Portfolios of climate smart agriculture practices in smallholder rice-wheat
525		system of Eastern Indo-Gangetic plains-Crop productivity, resource use efficiency
526		and environmental foot prints. Agron. J., 10(10), p.1561.
527	9.	Devi, S., Gupta, C., Jat, S. L. and Parmar, M. S. 2017. Crop residue recycling for
528		economic and environmental sustainability: The case of India. Open Agriculture, $2(1)$ :
529		486–494.
530	10	Fallahi, S., and Raoufat, M.H. 2008. Row-crop planter attachments in a conservation
531		tillage system: A comparative study. Soil Till. Res., 98(1): 27-34.
532		doi:10.1016/j.still.2007.10.005.
533	11	Francetto, T. R., Alonco, A. D. S., Brandelero, C., Machado, O. D. D. C., Veit, A. A.
534		and Carpes, D. P. 2016. Disturbance of Ultisol soil based on interactions between
535		furrow openers and coulters for the no-tillage system. Span. J. Agric. Res., 14(3):
536		PPe0208-e0208.
537	12	. Gathala, M. K., Laing, A. M., Tiwari, T. P., Timsina, J., Islam, S., Bhattacharya, P.
538		M., Dhar, T., Ghosh, A., Sinha, A. K., Chowdhury, A. K. and Hossain, S. 2020.
539		Energy-efficient, sustainable crop production practices benefit smallholder farmers
540		and the environment across three countries in the Eastern Gangetic Plains, South Asia.
541		J. Clean. Prod., 246, PP.118982.
542	13	. Goswami, S. B., Mondal, R. and Mandi, S. K. 2020. Crop residue management options
543		in rice-rice system: a review. Arch. Agron. Soil Sci., 66(9): 1218-1234.
		22

- 544 14. Hegazy, R. A. and Dhaliwal, I. S. (2011). Evaluation of a Power Driven Residue
  545 Manager for No-till Drills. *Agric. Eng. Int.: CIGR J.*, 13(1): 1–7.
- 546 15. Khippal, A., Tripathi, S. C. and Singh, G. P., 2023. Crop residue management
  547 challenges, opportunities and way forward for sustainable food-energy security in
  548 India: A review. Soil till. res., 228, PP.105641.
- 549 16. Kumar, N., Sawant, C.P., Sharma, R.K., Chhokar, R.S., Tiwari, P.S., Singh, D., Roul,
  550 A.K., Tripathi, S.C., Gill, S.C. and Singh, G.P. 2021. Combined Effect of Disc
  551 Coulters and Operational Speeds on Soil Disturbance and Crop Residue Cutting under
  552 No-Tillage System in Soil Bin. *J. Sci. Ind. Res.*, 80, PP. 739–749.
- 553 17. Kumar, P., Kumar, S. and Joshi, L., 2015. Socioeconomic and environmental
  554 implications of agricultural residue burning: A case study of Punjab, India (p. 144).
  555 Springer Nature New Delhi. (https://doi.org/10.1007/978-81-322-2014-5).
- 18. Kumari, S., Verma, N., Lakhani, A. and Kumari, K. M. 2021. Severe haze events in
  the Indo-Gangetic Plain during post-monsoon: Synergetic effect of synoptic
  meteorology and crop residue burning emission. Science of the Total Environment,
  768, PP.145479.
- 560 19. Kushwaha, R. L., Vaishnav, A. S. and Zoerb, G. C. 1986a. Performance of powered561 disc coulters under no-till crop residue in the soil bin. *Can. Agric. Eng.*, 28(2): 85–90.
- 562 20. Kushwaha, R. L., Vaishnav, A. S. and Zoerb, G. C. 1986b. Soil bin evaluation of disc
  563 coulters under no-till crop residue conditions. *Trans. of the ASAE*, 29(1): 40-44.
- 564 21. Lin, M. and Begho, T. 2022. Crop residue burning in South Asia: A review of the
  565 scale, effect, and solutions with a focus on reducing reactive nitrogen losses. J.
  566 Environ. Manage., 314, PP.115104. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2022.115104</u>)
  - 22. Magalhaes, P. S. G., Bianchini, A., and Braunbeck, O. A. 2007. Simulated and experimental analyses of a toothed rolling coulter for cutting crop residues. *Biosyst. Eng.*, 96(2):193–200. (doi:10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2006.10.014.)
    - Malasli, M. Z, and Celik, A. 2019. Disc angle and tilt angle effects on forces acting on a single-disc type no-till seeder opener. *Soil Till. Res.*, 194. PP.104304.
    - 24. Nejadi, J. and Raoufat, M.H. 2013. Residue management practices and planter attachments for corn production in a conservation agriculture system. *Span. J. Agric. Res.*, 11(4): 919-928.
    - 25. Nejadi, J., and Raoufat, M. H. 2013. Field performance of a pneumatic row crop planter equipped with active toothed coulter for direct planting of corn in wheat residue. *Span. J. Agric. Res*, **11**(2): 327-334. doi:10.5424/sjar/2013112-2632.

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

- 578 26. Raoufat, M.H., and Mahmoodieh, R.A. 2005. Stand establishment responses of maize
  579 to seedbed residue, seed drill coulters and primary tillage systems. *Biosyst. Eng.*,
  580 90(3): 261–269. (doi: 10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2004.11.012.)
- 581 27. Rautaray, S.K. 2002. Zero-till seed cum fertilizer drill for direct swing of wheat after
  582 rice. Herbicide resistance management and zero tillage in rice-wheat cropping system,
  583 Workshop, New Delhi, PP. 83–87.
- 28. Ravindra, K., Singh, T. and Mor, S. 2022. COVID-19 pandemic and sudden rise in
  crop residue burning in India: issues and prospects for sustainable crop residue
  management. Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res., 29: 3155–3161.
- 29. Ravindra, K., Singh, T., Sinha, V., Sinha, B., Paul, S., Attri, S.D. and Mor S. 2021.
  Appraisal of regional haze event and its relationship with PM2. 5 concentration, crop
  residue burning and meteorology in Chandigarh, India. Chemosphere, 273,
  PP.128562.
- 30. Sarauskis, E., Masilionyte, L., Romanechas, K., Krianuciuniene, Z., and Jasinskas, A.
  2013a. The effect of the disc coulters forms and speed ratios on cutting of crop residue
  in no-tillage system. Bulg. *J. Agric. Sci.*, **19:** 620–624.
- 594 31. Singh, M., Verma, A., and Mahal J.S. (2014). Performance evaluation of spatially
  595 modified no-till drill under different field conditions. *J. Agric. Eng.*, 51(4): 1–6.
- 596 32. Soza, E., Botta, G.F., Tourn, M. and Mete, A. 2003. Direct corn seeding: Effects of
  597 residue clearance on implant efficiency. *Span. J. Agric. Res.*, 1(3): 99–104
- 598 33. Tice, E.M., and Hendrick, J.G. 1992. Disc coulter operating characteristics. Trans. of
  599 ASABE, 35(2): 3–10.
  - 34. Tola, E. H. M., Müller, J., and Köller, K. 2001. Crop residue management by a no-till single disc opener under different soil and residue conditions. Farm Work Science Facing Challenges of the XXI Century, 29th Congress of CIOSTA-CIGR V, PP.165– 171.
    - 35. Wang, Q., Zhu, L., Li, M., Huang, D. and Jia, H. 2018. Conservation agriculture using coulters: effects of crop residue on working performance. *Sustainability*, **10(11)**: PP.4099.
      - 36. Zeng, Z., and Chen, Y. 2018a. The performance of a fluted coulter for vertical tillage as affected by working speed. Soil Till. Res., **175**: 112–118.
    - 37. Zeng, Z., & Chen, Y. 2018b. Performance evaluation of fluted coulters and rippled discs for vertical tillage. Soil Till. Res., 183: 93–99.

601

602

603

604

605

606

607

608

609

611	38. Z	Zeng, Z., Chen, Y., and Qi, L. 2019. Soil cutting by a compact disc harrow having
612	v	arious disc arrangements. Trans. of ASABE, 62: 429–437.
613	39. Z	Zeng, Z., Thoms, D., Chen, Y., and Ma, X. 2021. Comparison of soil and corn residue
614	с	utting performance of different discs used for vertical tillage. Sci. Rep. 11: 2537
615	(1	https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-82270-9)
616	40. Z	Chou, H., Zhang, C., Zhang, W., Yang, Q., Li, D., Liu, Z. and Xia, J., (2020).
617	E	Evaluation of straw spatial distribution after straw incorporation into soil for different
618	ti	llage tools. Soil Till. Res., 196, PP.104440.
619		
620		
621		
622	Nomenc	lature
	В	Different types of disc coulters (dimensionless)
	Н	Horizontal force (N)
	Р	Holding wheel (dimensionless)
	Q	Residue cutting percentage (%)
	R	Residue density (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
	S	Speed ratio (m s <sup>-1</sup> )
	Т	Torque (Nm)
	V	Vertical force (N)
	wb	Wet basis (%)