



# EFFECT OF DRIP IRRIGATION ON YIELD, WATER PRODUCTIVITY AND EVAPOTRANSPIRATION OF PEPPER (*Capsicum annum* L.)

Pejić, B.<sup>1</sup>, Bajić, I.<sup>2\*</sup>, Mačkić, K.<sup>1</sup>, Bugarski, D.<sup>2</sup>, Vlajić, S.<sup>2</sup>, Takač, A.<sup>2</sup>, Aksić, M.<sup>3</sup>

1. University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Agriculture, Dositeja Obradovića 8, 21000 Novi Sad, Serbia  
2. Institute of Field and Vegetable Crops, Maksima gorkog 30, 21000 Novi Sad, Serbia  
3. Faculty of Agriculture, Kosovska Mitrovica-Lešak, University of Priština, Kopaonička bb, Lešak, Srbija  
\* Corresponding author: ivana.bajic@nsseme.com

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- Pepper growing is considered one of the most susceptible crops to water stress.
- In practice there are several methods for determining the time of irrigation. The most used method is the water budget method. To schedule irrigation using the water budget method precise estimation of daily crop evapotranspiration ( $ET_d$ ) is required.
- The most used methods to compute  $ET_d$  evapotranspiration of pepper are reference evapotranspiration ( $ET_o$ ) and evaporation from an open water surface ( $E_o$ ).
- In the situation of growing population, increasing food requirements and limited fresh water resources water use efficiency in irrigated agriculture is of particular importance. Irrigation water use efficiency (IWUE) provides a more realistic assessment of the irrigation effectiveness.
- The purpose of the study was to compare  $ET_o$  and  $E_o$  usually used for irrigation programs and prediction of  $ET_{crop}$ . In the case of statistical difference in yield and other tested parameters one of the methods will be recommended in irrigation scheduling of pepper in climatic conditions of the Vojvodina region.



## 4. CONCLUSION

Comparing  $ET_o$  and  $E_o$  methods which are usually use for irrigation programs and prediction of crop evapotranspiration it could be concluded that differences in the yield and irrigation water use efficiency were not statistically different. That indicates that both methods can be recommended for irrigation scheduling programs of pepper in the climatic conditions of the Vojvodina region. However, priority should be given to the  $ET_o$  kc due to easy accessibility and reliability of data.



## 2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

- The irrigation was scheduled on the basis of the water balance method (the soil water budget).
- Two methods were used to compute daily evapotranspiration of pepper ( $ET_d$ ): reference evapotranspiration ( $ET_o$ ) and evaporation from an open water surface ( $E_o$ ). Crop coefficients ( $k_c$ ) and crop factor (F) were used to convert  $ET_o$  and  $E_o$  values into  $ET_d$ .  $Kc$  and F were 0.3-0.4, 0.6-0.7, 0.9-1.1, 0.8-0.9 and 0.4, 0.7, 1.0 and 0.8 for initial, crop development, mid season, and and season respectively.
- $ET_o$  was calculated by Hargreaves equation, the  $E_o$  values were measured by Class-A pan.
- The irrigation water use efficiency (IWUE) was calculated as fresh pepper yield (Y) divided by total seasonal irrigation water applied (I).
- Data reported for yield and yield components were subjected to analyses of variance (ANOVA). LSD test was used to group the means of irrigation when the F-test was significant. Different letters indicate significant differences between values.

## 3. RESUTS AND DISCUSSION

Tab. 1 Differences in yield components of pepper depending on the method used for comuting the daily water used on evapotranspiration

Var.	Replicate	No. of fruits per plant	Fruit weight (g)	Fruit lenght (cm)	Fruit diameter (cm)	Pericarp thickness (mm)	Content of dry matter (%)
Eo	1	9	87.6	13	5.6	4	8.0
	2	9	92.3	13	5.8	5	6.9
	3	8	97.8	12	5.9	4	7.3
	4	7	90.1	13	5.7	4	7.2
average		8 <sup>a</sup>	92.0 <sup>a</sup>	12.8 <sup>a</sup>	5.8 <sup>a</sup>	4.2 <sup>a</sup>	7.4 <sup>a</sup>
ETo	1	8	96.3	13	5.8	4	6.6
	2	7	92.8	12	5.8	4	6.5
	3	9	84.6	13	6.5	4	7.0
	4	9	81.6	12	5.5	4	6.5
average		8 <sup>a</sup>	88.8 <sup>a</sup>	12.5 <sup>a</sup>	5.9 <sup>a</sup>	4.0 <sup>a</sup>	6.7 <sup>b</sup>

Tab. 2 Yield, IWUE and ETWUE of pepper

Variant	Repliate	Yield (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	IWUE (kg m <sup>-3</sup> )
E <sub>o</sub>	1	44.31	15.82
	2	44.59	15.92
	3	44.64	15.94
	4	36.80	13.14
	average	42.58 <sup>a</sup>	15.20 <sup>a</sup>
ET <sub>o</sub>	1	42.21	15.08
	2	37.56	13.41
	3	41.49	14.82
	4	41.88	14.96
	average	40.78 <sup>a</sup>	14.56 <sup>a</sup>

Tab. 3 Reference evapotranspiration ( $ET_o$ ), evaporation ( $E_o$ ) and pepper evapotranspiration ( $ET_m$ ,  $ET_d$ )

Part of vegetation season	ET <sub>o</sub> (mm)	ET <sub>m</sub> (mm)	ET <sub>d</sub> (mm)	E <sub>o</sub> (mm)	ET <sub>m</sub> (mm)	ET <sub>d</sub> (mm)
Initial 18. VI-1. VII	74.4	28.0	2.0	66.2	20.9	1.5
Crop development 2. VII-22. VII	110.1	69.7	2.2	114.3	61.7	2.0
Mid season	114.0	109.2	5.0	149.4	121.7	5.5
23. VII-13. VIII And season 14. VIII-20. IX	157.9	130.4	4.7	209.4	159.9	5.7
For the entire vegetation season	456.4	337.3	3.5	539.3	364.2	3.7

## 5. REFERENCES

Ertek, A., Bolat, S., 2016. Growth and yield of pepper (*Capsicum Annuum* L.) under root zone restriction. Agri Res and Tech: Open Access J: 2(5) ARTOAJ.MS.ID.555599  
Kara, O.H., Yildirim, M., 2015. Water and radiation use efficiencies of pepper (*Capsicum annum* L. cv. Carliston). Scholars J. Agric. Vet. Sci. 2(2A):87-93.  
Liu, H., Yang, H., Zheng, J., Dongdong Jia, D., Wang, J., Li, Y., Huang, G., 2012. Irrigation scheduling strategies based on soil matric potential on yield and fruit quality of mulched-drip irrigated chili pepper in Northwest China. Agricultural Water Management 115: 232– 241  
Pejić, B., Mačkić, K., Pavković, S., Ljevnaić-Mašić, B., Aksić, M., Gvozdanović-Varga, J., 2016. Water-yield relations of drip irrigated watermelon in temperate climatic conditions. Contemporary Agriculture, 65 (1 – 2): 53 – 59.  
Sezen, SM., Yazar, A., Eker, S., 2006. Effect of drip irrigation regimes on yield and quality of field grown bell pepper. Agricultural Water Management 81(1-2): 115–131.

