

/

350 300 250
18×18 18×24 (S×L)

% 88.82	% 78.56	% 3.83	10.8	350				
					% 77.78	% 69.78		
% 62.5	52.68	% 79.79	% 66.07	% 11.72				
	250	300		350				
3.83		10.8						
4.86		350	% 77.78	% 69.78	% 88.82	% 78.56	%	
			% 61.11	% 56.35	% 82.64	% 68.1	%	
% 11.72					250			
% 27.43		350	% 62.5	52.68	% 79.79	% 66.07		
		250	% 43.75	% 37.41	% 68.17	% 54.88		

Effect of operational pressure and sprinkler arrangement on efficiency of sprinkler irrigation

A. M. M. AL-Kubiasi Bassam Al-D Al-k Husham M. M. Yakoob

College of Agriculture / AL-Anbar University

Abstract

A field experiment was achieved to study the effect of operational pressure and sprinkler arrangement on sprinkler spray losses , distribution uniformity, application efficiency and irrigation adequacy .Three levels of operational pressure I . e ; 250, 300 , and 350 kpa and two types of sprinkler arrangement i.e;rectangular and sequare were used.

The results showed that square arrangement was the best as compared to rectangular arrangement at all irrigation depths when pressure is constant values at sprinkler spray losses ,distribution uniformity , application efficiency , overall efficiency and irrigation adequacy for square arrangement at 10.8 mm irrigation depth

and 350 kpa pressure were 3.83 % , 78.56 % , 88.82 % ,6.78 % and 77.78 % respectively .While the co. values for the same parameters of the rectangular arrangement at the same irrigation depths and pressure were 11.72 % , 66.07 % , 79.74 % , 52.68 % and 65.2 % respectively .

Results also showed that the 350 kpa pressure was the best in compare with 250 and 300 kpa at the same arrangement and irrigation depth ,the values of the above parameters at 10.8 mm irrigation depth and square arrangement were 3.83 % , 78.56 % ,88.82 % , 69.78 % and 77.78 % at 350 kpa pressure .While the co. values were 4.86 % , 68.19 % , 82.64 % , 56.35 % and 61.11 % at 250 kpa pressure respectively . On the other hand ,for rectangular arrangement and 10.8 mm irrigation depth ,the values for the above parameters were 11.72 %and 27.43 ,66.07 % and 54.88 % , 79.74 % and 68.17 ,52.68 % and 37.41 ,and 62.5 % and 43.75 at 350 and 250 kpa pressure respectively .

(1998)

(S)

(L)

%84

Keller and Bliesner (1990)

Amir and Keller(1990)

Al- Chanatis (1992)

Haman and Yeager (2001)

Kara et.al., (2009)

King and Kincaid (1998)

24*24 18*24 18*18 (2000)
 %77 %84 %89
 (2009) . % 80 18*18
 18*18 12*18 12*12 6*18 6*12 6*6 Kara et.al.,
 4.8 4.5 4 3.5 3 2.5 2 1.5
 . 4 6*6 % 98.1
 5 3 (2002)

Nuzzled (2009)

2007/12/1

- -

2008/5/15

(90_60) (60_30) (30_0)

.(2 1)

FLUMAR-85

200

18-48-0

1-

120

)

1-

200

1-

.(1998

Operating Pressure (p)

350 = P3

300 = P2

250 = P1

Sprinkler Arrangement (A)

-(L)

(S)

24= L

18= S

A1

18

A2

RCBD

² 324

18

² 432

20 2007/12/ 2

-: (NDI)

..... (1)

$$NDI = II \times CU$$

$$= II :$$

$$= CU$$

جدول 1 بعض الخصائص الفيزيائية لتربة الدراسة قبل الزراعة

نسجة التربة							العمق ()		
	(غم.كغم ⁻¹)			1500	33	0			
	الطين	الغرين	الرمل	()					
مزيجة رملية	133	92	775	16.34	40.16	53.97	2.65	1.31	30-0
مزيجة رملية	75	191	734	18.77	46.21	60.04	2.67	1.52	60-30
مزيجة رملية	96	231	673	18.94	45.85	57.35	2.69	1.55	90-60

جدول 2 بعض الخصائص الكيميائية لتربة الدراسة قبل الزراعة

						()
1-			(1-)			
192	7	231	8.1	4.3	30-0	
430	-----	184	8.1	5.1	60-30	
450	-----	127	8.1	5.4	90-60	

$$Q \times t = A \times NDI / 1000 \quad \dots\dots\dots (2)$$

:

:

$$. 1- . 3 = Q$$

$$. = t$$

$$2 = A$$

. 3

جدول 3 فترة شتغال منظومة الري بالرش حسب معاملات التجربة

(³)	()	(¹⁻³)	(²)	()	
4.2	97	2.57	432	9.6	A1P1
4.2	50	5			A1P2
4.2	35	7.2			A1P3
3.1	73	2.57	324	9.6	A2P1
3.1	37	5			A2P2
3.1	26	7.2			A2P3
3.1	73	2.57	432	7.2	A1P1
3.1	37	5			A1P2
3.1	26	7.2			A1P3
2.30	54	2.57	324	7.2	A2P1
2.30	28	5			A2P2
2.30	19	7.2			A2P3
4.7	109	2.57	432	10.8	A1P1
4.7	56	5			A1P2
4.7	39	7.2			A1P3
3.5	82	2.57	324	10.8	A2P1
3.5	42	5			A2P2
3.5	29	7.2			A2P3
6.5	151	2.57	432	15	A1P1
6.5	78	5			A1P2
6.5	54	7.2			A1P3
4.90	113	2.57	324	15	A2P1
4.90	58	5			A2P2
4.90	41	7.2			A2P3
3.2	76	2.57	432	7.5	A1P1
3.2	39	5			A1P2
3.2	27	7.2			A1P3
2.4	57	2.57	324	7.5	A2P1
2.4	29	5			A2P2
2.4	20	7.2			A2P3

$$Hf = 1.14 \times 10^9 \times \left(\frac{Q}{C}\right)^{1.852} \times \frac{LP}{D^{4.87}} \times F \quad \text{-----}(3)$$

Hf
 $= Hf$:
 $= Q$
 $= LP$
 $= D$

$$F = \frac{1}{M+1} + \frac{1}{2N} + \frac{\sqrt{M-1}}{6N^2} \quad \text{----- (4)}$$

= C
= F

1.852 3 = M ;
= N
4 3
()
4

()						
P3		P2		P1		
Hf ()						
8.07	0.75	8.22	0.57	4.79	0.36	A1
8.07	1.17	8.22	1.08	4.79	0.88	A2

:

$$Q = \frac{Vs}{t} \quad \text{----- (5)}$$

= Q :
= Vs
= t
تم قيا
()

م³ بساعة⁻¹
3
. 5

5

قطر دائرة خدمة المرشحة (م)	التصريف (م ³ . ساعة ⁻¹)	الضغط كيلو باسكال
25.5	2.57	P1
26.0	5	P2
30.0	7.2	P3

3

10

20

. 3*3

5

Christiansen (1942)

:) UC Uniformity Coefficient (

$$UC = 100 \left(1 - \frac{\sum Xi}{\sum Ri} \right) \quad \text{.....(6)}$$

$$= \sum Xi :$$

$$= \sum Ri$$

: (1992)

$$(AE) \quad \text{.....(7)}$$

$$AE = 100 - (DPL + SSL)$$

$$: \quad (\%) \quad = SSL : \quad \text{.....(8)}$$

$$SSL = \frac{Vs - Vl}{Vs} \times 100$$

$$.3 \quad = Vs :$$

$$: \quad = Vl \quad \text{.....(9)}$$

$$Vl = dc \times S \times L$$

$$= dc :$$

$$: \quad (\%) \quad = DPL$$

$$DPL = \frac{V_{DPL}}{VS} \times 100 \quad \dots\dots\dots(10)$$

$$V_{DPL} = \sum NE \times ag \times 10^{-3} \quad \dots\dots\dots(11)$$

= V_{DPL} :

= $\sum NE$:

= ag

(Overall Efficiency)(OE)

Anderson et.al., (1978)

$$OE = \frac{UC \times AE}{100} \quad \dots\dots\dots(12)$$

.% = OE :

.% = UC

.% = AE

(Adq)

$$Adq = \frac{Ni}{\sum N} \times 100 \quad \dots\dots\dots(13)$$

= N :

= $\sum N$

Uniformity Distribution

-1.4

6

(A2)		7.2		
(A1)		P3 P2 P1	%69.92 %59.96 %49	
	P3 P2 P1	%48.78 %45.95 %36.71		
	(trend)			

P2 P1 30 26 25.5 P3
 7.2
 %48.78 %59.96 %45.95 %49 %36.71
 P3 P2 P1 %69.92
 (S*L)

6

LSD _{0.05}									
			A2P3	A2P2	A2P1	A1P3	A1P2	A1P1	()
									()
23.63	13.64	16.71	78.02	68.39	60.06	65.85	57.14	44.79	9.6
22.01	6.55	8.02	69.92	59.96	49.00	48.78	45.95	36.71	7.2
12.23	7.06	8.56	78.56	73.37	68.19	66.07	65.47	54.88	10.8
14.86	8.58	2.00	87.94	85.50	83.35	74.24	66.72	56.03	15
18.58	5.84	7.00	69.34	58.56	49.90	53.73	46.04	43.51	7.5

Sprinkler Spray Losses 2-4

7.2 (7)
 P1 %6.09 %10.00 %20.96 (A2)
 (A1) P3 P2
 P3 P2 P1 %19.00 %22.48 %26.84
 (3)
 7.2
 P3 P2 P1 %19.00 %22.48 %26.84
 %6.09 % 10.00 % 20.96
 (S*L)

7

LSD _{0.05}									
			A2P3	A2P2	A2P1	A1P3	A1P2	A1P1	()
			(%)						
22.2	2.00	2.05	1.29	4.19	7.68	1.29	4.19	28.21	9.6
19.00	5.31	7.37	6.09	10.00	20.96	19.00	22.48	26.84	7.2
21.16	1.20	1.00	3.83	4.86	4.86	11.72	14.60	27.43	10.8
7.95	4.59	0.85	1.55	2.47	3.20	5.98	11.38	20.80	15
17.59	3.35	4.10	2.88	4.38	10.75	4.38	14.78	26.31	7.5

Adequacy of Irrigation 3.4

P3 P2 P1 %52.78 %44.44 %38.89 7.2
 %47.92 %41.67 %35.42
 .(8)
) (5)
 (
 7.2
 %35.42 %38.89 (8) 250
 %44.44 300
 %52.78 %41.67
 350 %47.92
 8
 15 10.8

8

LSD _{0.05}									()
			A2P3	A2P2	A2P1	A1P3	A1P2	A1P1	
(%)									
16.92	2.2	2.31	66.67	63.89	58.33	52.08	47.92	41.67	9.6
14.2	4.2	5	52.78	44.44	38.89	47.92	41.67	35.42	7.2
5.57	5.67	5.52	77.78	72.22	61.11	62.50	50.00	43.75	10.8
14.2	2	2.5	83.33	80.56	75.00	62.50	56.25	45.83	15
16	2	2.6	63.89	56.56	44.44	47.92	43.75	39.58	7.5

Application Efficiency 4.4

9

%77.95 % 66.83

7.2

P3 P2 P1

%84.44

%71.88 %65.91 % 61.08

(4)

7.2

(9)

%77.95 %65.91 % 66.83 %61.08

P3 P2 P1

%84.44 %71.88

9

15 10.8

9

LSD _{0.05}									()
			A2P3	A2P2	A2P1	A1P3	A1P2	A1P1	
(%)									
16.00	3.00	3.00	86.92	83.56	78.56	81.09	72.09	65.06	9.6
13.00	6.00	7.00	84.44	77.95	66.83	71.88	65.91	61.08	7.2
7.20	4.16	5.09	88.82	84.80	82.64	79.74	77.63	68.17	10.8
15.70	9.07	1.00	93.12	92.57	90.56	85.99	80.31	71.31	15
9.12	5.26	6.45	83.43	78.74	71.62	76.07	67.22	66.24	7.5

Overall Efficiency

5.4

10

%32.75

7.2

P3 P2 P1

%59.04 %46.74

%35.06 %30.29 %22.42

7.2

% 30.29

250

% 32.75

%22.42

350

%59.04

%35.06

300

%46.74

)

. (12

. 15 10.8

10

LSD _{0.05}									()
			A2P3	A2P2	A2P1	A1P3	A1P2	A1P1	
(%)									
19.83	8.30	10.17	67.81	57.15	47.18	53.40	41.19	29.14	9.6
24.00	8.58	11.00	59.04	46.74	32.75	35.06	30.29	22.42	7.2
12.64	7.00	9.00	69.78	62.22	56.35	52.68	50.82	37.41	10.8
19.64	11.34	9.00	81.89	79.15	75.48	63.84	53.58	39.95	15
18.00	9.52	11.00	58.43	47.67	35.74	40.87	30.95	28.82	7.5

- .1998 . .1
- .1992 . .2
- .1998 . .3
- .66-58 .(1) .2
- .2002. .4
- .2000 . .5
6. Amir, I. and V. Al Chanatis. 1992. Procedure for predicting and designing moving sprinkler application pattern. *Irri. Sci.* 13:93-98.
 7. Christiansen, J. E. 1942. *Irrigation by sprinkling*. University of California. Benkly. California, USA.
 8. Haman, Z. and T. H. Yeager. 2001. Field evaluation of container nurseries irrigation system uniformity of water application in sprinkler systems. Cooperative extension service. Institute of food and agricultural sciences of florida, Gainesville, 32611.
 9. Kara,T.,Ekmekci, E. and Apen, M. 2009. Determining the uniformity coefficient and water distribution characteristics of some sprinklers. Department of agricultural structures and irrigation engineering, Ondokuz Mayıs University, 55139, Kurupelit, Samsun, Turkey.
 10. Keller, J. 1990. *Sprinkler and trickle irrigation*. Van Nostrand. New York. USA.
 11. Keller, J. and R. D. Bliesner. 1990. *Sprinkler Irrigation*. Van Nostrand. New York.
 12. King, B. A. and D. C. Kincaid. 1998. Optimizing performance of pivot sprinkler packages. *Irrigation business and technology feature*. University of Idaho. USA.
 13. Nuzzled, N. U. 2009. Irrigation system performance measure. MAF information services Pastoral House 25 Th. Terrace PO Box 2526 Wellington, New Zealand Government - Ministry of Irrigation Research. Shared Dept With Wellington University.