

## 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; [manishagineer@gmail.com](mailto:manishagineer@gmail.com)

### ABSTRACT

The management of rice residue is still a challenging issue and factors such as poor feed quality of rice residue, limited and timely unavailability of suitable residue handling machines and narrow window period available prior to seeding of next crop act as driving forces for residue burning by the farmers. *In-situ* management of rice crop residue can prevent ill effects of residue burning on the natural resources. In this study, three types of power-driven disc coulters; serrated, plain, and toothed, with three different arrangements of residue holding device, viz. no holding wheel, single holding wheel, and twin holding wheels with speed ratio (ratio of rotational speed of coulters and forward speed) of 5.2, 6.94, and 8.67 were evaluated in 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 performance were measured with residue density ranging from 3000 to 5000 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. The experiments (243 including replications) were conducted according to completely randomized (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 residue holding wheel. Increasing the residue load had no effect on the cutting percentage of the residue. The results showed that the residue cutting performance of the plain coulters with twin holding wheels was nearly 100% at any combination of selected variables. Introduction of residue holding wheels to the coulters helped in sowing successive crop (like wheat, maize, etc.) in the combine harvested rice field with heavy residue.

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

## 40 INTRODUCTION

41 Most of the South Asian countries produce rice, wheat and maize as main food crops (Gathala  
42 *et al.*, 2020). However, it has been observed that a significant quantity of crop residue is burned  
43 across the region, especially in rice-growing areas. (Devi *et al.*, 2017; Goswami *et al.*, 2020;  
44 Ravindra *et al.*, 2022; Lin *et al.*, 2022). This practice has created a long-term hazardous impact  
45 on the soil, human health and environmental. The Indo-Gangetic plain of South Asia, which  
46 covers 13.5 mha across India, Pakistan, Nepal, and Bangladesh, have been spotted with high  
47 levels of air pollution (The Energy and Resources Institute, 2019) due to burning of rice residue  
48 in combination with other injudicious practices. This practice of burning contributed up to 70%  
49 in PM<sub>2.5</sub> and over 40% increase in level of atmospheric black carbon concentrations (Kumari  
50 *et al.*, 2021; Ravindra *et al.*, 2021).

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

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

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

69 Bianchini and Magalhães (2008) in a soil bin experiment with smooth, notched, and toothed  
70 disc coulters found that the smooth coulter delivered the lowest performance in terms of  
71 horizontal forces, vertical forces, rolling resistance, and residue cutting percentage. The  
72 working depth for a toothed coulter to sufficiently cut the sugarcane residue was found to be 80  
73 mm. Ahmad *et al.*, (2015) evaluated the draft requirements and residue cutting performances

74 of different sized disc openers in no-till rice soil conditions. The disc opener with a 450 mm  
75 diameter provided higher residue cutting efficiency (88.6%) at 90 mm. Aikins et al., 2019  
76 reported that the powered cutting unit increases the efficiency of residue cutting as compared  
77 to the rolling type. Zeng *et al.*, (2021) compared soil and corn residue cutting performance of  
78 different discs under soil bin conditions and found that the working depth had a stronger effect  
79 on the performances of discs as compared to the disc type.

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

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

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

103  
104  
105  
106  
107

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

Sl. no.	Residue management device	Crop residue	Sowing crop	Findings	References
1.	1. Turbo coulters blade (TCB), 2. Double disc opener with a seed press (DDP) and 3. notched disc row cleaner with a track wheel or floating star cleaner	Maize ( <i>Zea mays</i> L.)	--	The treatment combining RC, TCB and DDP yielded the most favorable outcomes concerning crop stand and uniformity.	Soza <i>et al.</i> , 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 coulters compared to the smooth coulters.	Nejadi and Raoufat 2013.
4.	Active toothed coulters row cleaner attachment	wheat	maize	The findings indicate that utilizing a row crop planter equipped with an active toothed coulters 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 coulters rotation at higher speeds, as experimentally observed, leads to more significant straw cutting compared to inactive disc coulters rotation in contact with the soil.	Sarauski <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, <i>et al.</i> , 2014.
7.	No-coulters, 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 <i>et al.</i> , 2016.
8.	Five coulters were four types of fluted coulters (8 W, 13 W, 18 W, and 25 W) and one notched-flat coulters (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 <i>et al.</i> , 2018
9.	Crop residue cutting discs (plain flat disc, wavy disc, rippled disc, and helical wavy disc coulters)	--	--	The plain flat disc yielded the lowest values for traction force, hourly fuel consumption, and mobilized soil area.	Becker <i>et al.</i> , 2019

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

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

124

## 125 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### 126 **Experimental Details**

127 The experimental work was carried out in the Soil Dynamic Research Laboratory,  
128 Agricultural Mechanization Division (23°18'33.3"N, 77°24'6.8"E), ICAR-Central Institute of  
129 Agricultural Engineering, Bhopal, India. The soil used in the bin was a mixture of sand (47.5%),  
130 silt (23.0%), and clay (29.5%) particles having good water retention and nutrient holding  
131 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  
135 in Figure 1, was filled with a 900 mm soil column, enough soil volume to facilitate testing of  
136 full-sized equipment without side effects and variability. It was equipped with a tool bar and  
137 instrumentation carriage, soil processing gadgets, and a power transmission unit. The tool bar  
138 carriage contained two tool bars, a front and a rear. The front tool bar was used for mounting  
139 the experimental tool and the rear for attaching the soil processing gadgets. Each tool bar was  
140 equipped with a steering wheel and a chain sprocket drive to raise, lower, and lock the gadget  
141 in the desired position. The speed of the carriage was varied by varying the rpm of automatic  
142 variable speed (AVS) drive and measured by a linear speed sensor (Sick AG Ltd., Waldkirch,  
143 Germany). The tool carriage was driven at a travel speed of 2.5 km h<sup>-1</sup> in all experiments (Tice  
144 and Hendrick, 1992; Rautaray, 2002; Bianchini and Magalhaes, 2008).

145



**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.

146

147 **Instrumentation for Measurement**

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



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

167

168 **Soil Bed Preparation**

169 The soil in the bin was prepared to simulate the field conditions for sowing. The soil  
 170 compaction level was measured in the field and in the soil bin with a cone penetrometer  
 171 (M1.06.15.SA.E, Eijkelkamp, AgriSearch Netherlands) of maximum range of 5000 kPa which  
 172 consisted of a force sensor, the logger, a probing rod, a cone, and an ultrasonic depth  
 173 measurement system. Data for soil penetration resistance was collected at seeding time with  
 174 stubble under no-till conditions on the experimental farm of the ICAR-Central Institute of  
 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.

177 The different operations in soil bed preparation included soil tilling, moistening of soil,  
 178 levelling, and compaction followed by rotary tiller, sheep foot roller, soil leveller, plain roller,  
 179 and water application system to maintain uniform moisture and penetration resistance  
 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  
 183 to achieve soil conditions at par with the field conditions. The penetration resistance of a near  
 184 value of 1.40 MPa was maintained in the top 150 mm of soil depth. The soil physical properties  
 185 used in the soil bin for the experiment are given in Table 2.

186

187

188

189

**Table 2:** Physical properties of soil used in experiment.

Soil type	Values
Soil texture	Clay soil
<i>Particle size distribution</i>	
Sand (20–2000 $\mu\text{m}$ ), %	47.5
Silt (2–20 $\mu\text{m}$ ), %	23.0
Clay (<2 $\mu\text{m}$ ), %	29.5
Mean weight diameter of wet aggregates, mm	0.713
Bulk density (0–150 mm depth), $\text{g cm}^{-3}$	1.45
Cone Index	1.40
Moisture content (wb) %	20–22

190

191 **Rice Residue**

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

198

199 **Residue Cutting Coulters**

200 Three types of residue cutting coulters, viz., serrated coulter, plain coulter, and toothed  
 201 coulter, were used in the investigation, which is shown in Figure 3 and Table 3. All cutting  
 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  
 204 Raoufat 2008; Nejadi and Raoufat 2013). The dimensions of the major components of residue  
 205 cutting systems are given in Table 3. The residue cutting system was attached to the carriage as  
 206 shown in Figure 5.


207

208

209

210





**Figure 3.** Different types of coulters used in the study.

211  
212

**Table 3.** Specifications of selected coulters.

Particulars	Type of coulters		
	Serrated coulters (B1)	Plain coulters (B2)	Toothed coulters (B3)
Outer diameter of coulters, mm	460	460	460
Thickness of coulters, mm	4	4	4
No. of discs/or teeth	0/8	0/0	0/16

213  
214

### **Residue Holding Wheel Assembly**

215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221

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**

224 The speed ratio of residue cutting discs is defined as the ratio of the rotational speed of the  
 225 cutting disc to forward speed. Hegazy and Dhaliwal (2011) recommended a rotor shaft speed  
 226 of 200 rpm for a power-driven residue manager for a no-till drill. Accordingly, three levels of  
 227 rotational speeds of the residue cutting disc, one lower and one higher in equal proportion, i.e.,  
 228 150, 200, and 250 rpm for the study. For a 460 mm diameter residue-cutting disc moving at 2.5  
 229 km h<sup>-1</sup> forward speed of the carriage, three speed ratios of 5.20, 6.94, and 8.67 could be  
 230 established.

231

### 232 **Residue Cutting**

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

$$239 \text{ Residue cutting (Q), \%} = 1 - \frac{\text{weight of uncut residue (g)}}{\text{initial weight of the residue (g)}} \times 100 \quad (1)$$

### 240 **Clogged Residue**

241 Clogged residue is the amount of residue clogged or clumped with the no-till drill tool bar or  
 242 residue management device during sowing operation. This clogged residue was found to be  
 243 hindering smooth rotations of coulters subsequent cutting of residue and entangling in the  
 244 furrow openers. Surface residue samples were collected from 2 m<sup>2</sup> area from the test run of soil

245 bin. Clogged residue during cutting operation in the soil bin was collected from the furrow  
 246 opener up to 5 m run. The collected residue was then weighed, and the quantity of clogged  
 247 residue was reported in kg/ha.

248

249 **Experimental Design**

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

264

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

Name of the variables	the Range	Code (Xi)	Levels			Intervals
			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 <sub>1</sub>	D <sub>2</sub>	D <sub>3</sub>	-

265

266 **Results**

267 **Evaluation of Horizontal Force (H)**

268 Significant variation in the horizontal force was observed for different levels of speed ratios,  
 269 residue holding wheels, residue loads and type of coulters. With an increase in speed ratio from  
 270 5.20 to 8.67, horizontal forces increased for all the three residue cutting coulters at all the  
 271 residue load levels and the number of residue holding wheels increased from 0 to 2.

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

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

277  
 278

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

Source	df	F Value				
		H	V	T	Q	C
Model	32	80.76*	73.98*	69.45*	37.74*	805.09*
S	2	20.76*	5.81*	13.55*	6.81*	109.76*
P	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
B	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	63					
Corrected total	95					

279

*\*Significant at 5%.*

280

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

281

282

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

283

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

288

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

294

295

**Table 6.** Effect of different parameters on different responses

Parameters	Values	LS mean				
		H, N	V, N	T, Nm	Q, %	C, kg/ha
Speeds (S)	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>
	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>
Coulters (B)	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>
	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>
Residue loads (R)	3000	101.42 <sup>C</sup>	258.64 <sup>C</sup>	11.46 <sup>C</sup>	48.70 <sup>A</sup>	39.67 <sup>A</sup>
	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>

Note: Number with different symbols (A, B and C) in each column are significantly different at  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

The vertical force requirements exhibit nearly equal effects for speed ratios of 5.20 and 6.94. Similarly, speed ratios of 6.94 and 8.67 also result in almost identical impacts on vertical force. The mean vertical forces differ significantly at 5% probability level as number of holding wheels increases.

#### Evaluation of Torque (T)

Significant variation in the torque with changes in speed ratio, a pair of holding wheels, residue loads, and type of coulters was observed ( $P < 0.001$ ). It is also observed that the torque 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 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 at a lower level of speed ratio, but it was significantly different at 8.67 of speed ratio. The mean torque differed significantly at the 5% probability level as the number of holding wheels increases.

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

The F-values indicated that the number of residue holding wheels was the most influential factor for residue cutting percentage. The effect of different factors and their interactions on 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 load had no significant effect.

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

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)**

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

337  
 338 **Overall effect of residue holding assembly**

339 **Combination of type of holding wheels and coulters** revealed that pairing holding wheels and  
 340 B2 coulters yielded 100% absolute cutting efficiency (Table 7). Overall, the machine set at speed  
 341 ratio 6.93 using two holding wheels and a B2 type of coulters was found superior for cutting rice  
 342 residue. Interaction showing effect of other parameters interaction ( $R \times B$ ,  $P \times B$ ,  $S \times B$  and  $S$   
 343  $\times P$ ) 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	B3	11.40 <sup>f</sup>
1	B1	37.43 <sup>d</sup>
1	B2	55.29 <sup>c</sup>
1	B3	39.83 <sup>d</sup>
2	B1	86.33 <sup>b</sup>
<b>2</b>	<b>B2</b>	<b>100.00<sup>a</sup></b>
2	B3	77.63 <sup>b</sup>

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


346  
 347  
 348

350 **Table 8:** Interaction showing effect of other parameters interaction (R × B, P × B, S × B and S  
351 × P) on studied parameters.

Interactions			LS Means				
			H, N	V, N	T, Nm	Q, %	C, kg/ha
BxP	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
	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
BxS	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
	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
PXS	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	S3	82.86e	231.77b	11.28e	8.94f	20.85d
	P1	S1	101.89d	295.56ab	12.79d	43.94d	82.52a
	P2	S2	110.48c	301.57ab	13.09d	52.69c	70.25c
	P3	S3	114.52c	308.96ab	13.90c	40.94d	78.95b
BxR	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
	B2	R2	94.56ef	304.26ac	10.39g	59.62a	23.16d
B3	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

353 The plot of attributes such as horizontal force, vertical force, torque and cutting efficiency,  
354 reflecting the effect of residue holding assembly, has been shown in Figure 5. The value  
355 measurement data of all attributes increased significantly at a 5% level of significance as the  
356 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.

357

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

365

366


367

368


369

370





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



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

371

372 **DISCUSSION**

373 **Horizontal Force (H)**

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

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

397 The minimum vertical force was found with B2 coulters, which significantly differ from the  
398 other two types of coulters (Table 6). The serrated disc coulters B1 and B3 touched to the  
399 ground surface, experienced sudden load resulted in higher vertical force compared to plain  
400 disc coulters (B2). The higher vertical force associated with the coulters may lead to increased  
401 wear and tear on the coulters and increases the power requirements. The lowest mean vertical  
402 force was found at 3000 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of residue load and increased significantly with an increased  
403 level of residue load. As residue load increases, the depth required to cut increases which  
404 increase vertical force on the disc coulters. 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 coulters 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  
409 coulters. It was also found that increasing the speed ratio decreased the vertical force for all  
410 residue levels, ranging from 0 to 5000 kg/ha. However, Bianchini and Magalhaes' (2014) study  
411 revealed a contrasting result, indicating a descending order of vertical force for smooth (3.54  
412 kN), followed by notch (2.12 kN), and toothed surfaces (1.24 kN) at 80 mm depth. Ahmad *et*

413 *al.*, 2019 determined that the vertical force of the toothed disc type was the lowest at 903.7 N,  
414 as opposed to the notched (1105.3 N) and smooth (923 N) disc types. Zeng *et al.*, (2021) also  
415 found that the notched disc exhibited a minimal vertical force of 164 N, which was lower than  
416 that of the rippled disc (289 N), as well as the plain disc.

417

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

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

429

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

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

437

#### 438 **Cutting Performance and Residue Holding Assembly**

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

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

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

470 As shown in Fig 7, after passing the residue cutting mechanism over the rice residue, a clear  
471 furrow was observed and seed was placed in the soil at an average depth of 35 mm as the furrow  
472 opener was fitted at a 20 mm higher depth than that of the residue cutting mechanism. The study  
473 conducted by other authors, the depth of operation of residue cutting coulters has been in the  
474 range of 50–90 mm in order to achieve complete cutting of residue and overcome the problem  
475 of 'hair pinning' in softer soil (RL Kushwaha 1986a; RL Kushwaha 1986b; Magalhães *et al.*,  
476 2007; Bianchini and Magalhaes 2008).

477  
478 **CONCLUSIONS**

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

- 482 1. The performance of the disc coulters with twin wheel residue holding assembly in  
483 cutting rice residue was superior to that of the serrated and toothed coulters for all  
484 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 coulters as compared to other disc coulters.
- 489 3. The residue holding device had a greater influence on the rice residue cutting  
490 performance to facilitate direct seeding in residue condition. The combinations of plain  
491 disc coulters and double holding wheel assembly performed nearly 100% cutting at all  
492 residue levels and coulters speed ratios.
- 493 4. The seeding machine could be fabricated with this coulters accompanied by twin  
494 residue holding wheels to evaluate its performance under real field conditions.

495

#### 496 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

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

500

#### 501 **REFERENCES**

- 502 1. Ahmad, F., Weimin, D., Qishou, D., Rehim, A. and Jabran, K. 2017. Comparative  
503 performance of various disc-type furrow openers in no-till paddy field conditions.  
504 *Sustainability*, 9(7), PP. 1143.
- 505 2. Ahmad, F., Weimin, D., Qishuo, D., Hussain, M. and Jabran, K. 2015. Forces and  
506 Residue Cutting Performance of Double Disc Furrow Opener in No-Till Paddy Soil.  
507 *PLoS ONE*, 10(3), <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0119648>.
- 508 3. Aikins, K. A., Antille, D. L., Jensen, T.A. and Blackwell, J. 2019. Performance  
509 comparison of residue management units of no-tillage sowing systems: A review. *Eng.*  
510 *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 *Res. J.*, **38(1)**: 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.

- 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>).
- 556 18. Kumari, S., Verma, N., Lakhani, A. and Kumari, K. M. 2021. Severe haze events in  
557 the Indo-Gangetic Plain during post-monsoon: Synergetic effect of synoptic  
558 meteorology and crop residue burning emission. *Science of the Total Environment*,  
559 768, PP.145479.
- 560 19. Kushwaha, R. L., Vaishnav, A. S. and Zoerb, G. C. 1986a. Performance of powered-  
561 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2022.115104>)
- 567 22. Magalhaes, P. S. G., Bianchini, A., and Braunbeck, O. A. 2007. Simulated and  
568 experimental analyses of a toothed rolling coulters for cutting crop residues. *Biosyst.*  
569 *Eng.*, **96(2)**:193–200. (doi:10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2006.10.014.)
- 570 23. Malasli, M. Z, and Celik, A. 2019. Disc angle and tilt angle effects on forces acting on  
571 a single-disc type no-till seeder opener. *Soil Till. Res.*, 194. PP.104304.
- 572 24. Nejadi, J. and Raoufat, M.H. 2013. Residue management practices and planter  
573 attachments for corn production in a conservation agriculture system. *Span. J. Agric.*  
574 *Res.*, **11(4)**: 919-928.
- 575 25. Nejadi, J., and Raoufat, M. H. 2013. Field performance of a pneumatic row crop  
576 planter equipped with active toothed coulters for direct planting of corn in wheat  
577 residue. *Span. J. Agric. Res.*, **11(2)**: 327-334. doi:10.5424/sjar/2013112-2632.

- 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.
- 584 28. Ravindra, K., Singh, T. and Mor, S. 2022. COVID-19 pandemic and sudden rise in  
585 crop residue burning in India: issues and prospects for sustainable crop residue  
586 management. *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.*, **29**: 3155–3161.
- 587 29. Ravindra, K., Singh, T., Sinha, V., Sinha, B., Paul, S., Attri, S.D. and Mor S. 2021.  
588 Appraisal of regional haze event and its relationship with PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration, crop  
589 residue burning and meteorology in Chandigarh, India. *Chemosphere*, *273*,  
590 PP.128562.
- 591 30. Sarauskis, E., Masilionyte, L., Romanechas, K., Krianuciuniene, Z., and Jasinskas, A.  
592 2013a. The effect of the disc coulters forms and speed ratios on cutting of crop residue  
593 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 coulters operating characteristics. *Trans. of*  
599 *ASABE*, **35(2)**: 3–10.
- 600 34. Tola, E. H. M., Müller, J., and Köller, K. 2001. Crop residue management by a no-till  
601 single disc opener under different soil and residue conditions. *Farm Work Science*  
602 *Facing Challenges of the XXI Century*, 29th Congress of CIOSTA-CIGR V, PP.165–  
603 171.
- 604 35. Wang, Q., Zhu, L., Li, M., Huang, D. and Jia, H. 2018. Conservation agriculture using  
605 coulters: effects of crop residue on working performance. *Sustainability*, **10(11)**:  
606 PP.4099.
- 607 36. Zeng, Z., and Chen, Y. 2018a. The performance of a fluted coulters for vertical tillage  
608 as affected by working speed. *Soil Till. Res.*, **175**: 112–118.
- 609 37. Zeng, Z., & Chen, Y. 2018b. Performance evaluation of fluted coulters and rippled  
610 discs for vertical tillage. *Soil Till. Res.*, **183**: 93–99.



- 611 38. Zeng, Z., Chen, Y., and Qi, L. 2019. Soil cutting by a compact disc harrow having  
612 various disc arrangements. *Trans. of ASABE*, **62**: 429–437.
- 613 39. Zeng, Z., Thoms, D., Chen, Y., and Ma, X. 2021. Comparison of soil and corn residue  
614 cutting performance of different discs used for vertical tillage. *Sci. Rep.* **11**: 2537  
615 (<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-82270-9>)
- 616 40. Zhou, H., Zhang, C., Zhang, W., Yang, Q., Li, D., Liu, Z. and Xia, J., (2020).  
617 Evaluation of straw spatial distribution after straw incorporation into soil for different  
618 tillage tools. *Soil Till. Res.*, 196, PP.104440.

619  
620  
621

## 622 **Nomenclature**

B	Different types of disc coulters (dimensionless)
H	Horizontal force (N)
P	Holding wheel (dimensionless)
Q	Residue cutting percentage (%)
R	Residue density ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ )
S	Speed ratio ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ )
T	Torque (Nm)
V	Vertical force (N)
wb	Wet basis (%)

623