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**EFFECT OF CONSERVATION AGRICULTURE-BASED CROP ESTABLISHMENT OPTIONS ON RICE GROWTH IN RICE-WHEAT SYSTEM**

**ABSTRACT:**

Rice accounts for over 40% of India's total crop production, thereby reinforces the country's food security. However, rice production in India faces several challenges like high consumption of water, labour, and energy, which are becoming scarcer and more costly. Keeping above facts in view, an experiment was conducted during *Kharif* season of 2021and 2022 at the Agricultural Research Farm, Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi to evaluate the effect of different conservation agriculture-based crop establishment options on growth of rice under rice-wheat system. The field experiment was arranged in a completely randomized block design having four replications and six different crop establishment methods, namely CE1: Conventional till puddled transplanted rice - Conventional till wheat (no residue retention/incorporation), CE2: Conventional till puddled transplanted rice - Conventional till wheat - Conventional till mung bean (Rice & Wheat residue removal, full mungbean residue incorporation), CE3: Conventional till direct seeded rice - Zero till wheat (anchored residue retentionof Rice), CE4: Conventional till direct seeded rice - Zero till wheat - Zero till mung bean (anchored residue retention of Riceand full Mungbean residue incorporation), CE5: Zero till direct seeded rice – Zero till wheat (anchored residue retention of Rice and Wheat), and CE6: Zero till direct seeded rice – Zero till wheat – Zero till mung bean (anchored residue retention of Rice and Wheat and full mungbean residue retention). The CE6 treatment (ZTR–ZTW–ZTMB) demonstrated significant superiority over the conventional CE1 (CTR–CTW) method across all assessed growth parameters. Specifically, CE6 resulted in an increase of up to 26% in plant height, 33 % in number of tillers per m2, and nearly 16 % in the leaf area index during the early growth stage of rice.
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**1. INTRODUCTION:**

The rice-wheat cropping system (RWCS) is a pivotal component of Indian agriculture, particularly within the Indo-Gangetic Plains. This system plays an indispensable role in ensuring national food security and is instrumental in achieving self-sufficiency in staple grain production (Dhanda *et al*., 2022; Islam *et al*., 2022). However, the sustainability of this system is jeopardized by various environmental and agronomic challenges. The continuous implementation of the RWCS, especially in north-western India, has led to the soil nutrient depletion, groundwater scarcity, and rising production costs. These issues highlight the urgent need for sustainable practices (Dhanda *et al*., 2022; Kaur *et al*., 2021).At the same time, management of rice residuesis also a major concern, which are frequently disposed through open burning. This practice contributes to air pollution and degrades soil health by causing nutrient loss (Leharwan *et al*., 2023). Sustainable residue management techniques, such as retaining and incorporating residues into the soil, have demonstrated the potential for enhancing soil properties and minimizing environmental impacts (Chandra *et al*., 2023; Singh & Sidhu, 2014). The persistent challenges and innovative practices within the rice-wheat cropping system underscore the need for advanced agricultural strategies. These strategies aim to sustain productivity while addressing environmental and resource-related issues, thereby ensuring the continued success and effectiveness of this vital agronomic practice in India (Dhanda *et al*., 2022; Jat *et al*., 2019).

Rice cultivation constitutes a fundamental aspect of India's agricultural sector and economy, serving as the primary food source for a substantial portion of the population and playing a pivotal role in ensuring food security. For millions of farmers, rice farming represents a principal means of livelihood. This indispensable crop forms the backbone of the nation's food security system, appropriately encapsulated by the proverb "rice is life" within the Indian context (Mahajan *et al*., 2017). This is critical because rice accounts for over 40% of India's total crop production, thereby reinforcing the country's food security (Gandhi *et al*. 2016). However, rice production in India faces several challenges. Traditional practices, such as puddled transplanting, are becoming increasingly untenable because of their high consumption of water, labour, and energy, which are becoming scarcer and more costly. This unsustainable method necessitates a transition towards alternatives, such as direct-seeded rice (DSR) (Chauhan and Singh, 2016). Furthermore, climate change poses a significant threat to rice yields, exacerbating the difficulties farmers encounter owing to unpredictable weather patterns and their impact on livelihoods (Gandhi *et al*., 2016). The sustainability and future productivity of rice hinge on the adoption of innovative farming techniques. Rice farming remains a crucial component of India's agricultural landscape, necessitating ongoing adaptation to evolving environmental conditions and efficient resource management to sustain its essential role in food security and rural livelihood. There is an increasing emphasis on conservation agriculture as a solution to the challenges faced by the RWCS. Techniques, such as zero or minimal tillage and improved crop residue management, are recommended to enhance yield, efficiency, and sustainability. Additionally, incorporating legumes into the cropping sequence improves productivity and economic returns (Banjara*et al*., 2021). Practices such as zero tillage contribute to the enhancement of soil health by increasing soil organic carbon content and mitigating soil compaction. Such conservation practices are pivotal for addressing the environmental challenges inherent in traditional rice cultivation, there by fostering a more sustainable and resilient agricultural system (Kumar *et al*., 2021; Chang *et al*., 2024;Tran *et al*., 2024; Pervaiz *et al*., 2024).Therefore, CA based options are needed under changing climatic and socio-economic conditions.

**2.MATERIALS AND METHODS:**

The study was conducted during *Kharif* season of 2021and 2022 at the Agricultural Research Farm, Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi. The experimental sites remained consistent throughout the study period. The soil of the experimental field was characterized as sandy clay loam in texture, well-drained, and moderately fertile, with low levels of available nitrogen and phosphorus, and medium levels of available potassium. The field experiments were arranged in a completely randomized block design with four replications and six different crop establishment methods. The crop establishment methods were as follows: CE1: Conventional till puddled transplanted rice - Conventional till wheat [CTPTR-CTW (no residue retention/incorporation)], CE2: Conventional till puddled transplanted rice - Conventional till wheat - Conventional till mung bean [CTPTR - CTW - CTMB (full MB residue incorporation)], CE3: Conventional till direct seeded rice -Zero till wheat [CT DSR - ZT W (anchored residue retention of R)], CE4: Conventional till direct seeded rice - Zero till wheat - Zero till mung bean [CT DSR - ZTW - ZTMB (anchored residue retention of R and full MB residue incorporation)], CE5: Zero till direct seeded rice – Zero till wheat [ZT DSR - ZT W (anchored residue retention of R and W)], and CE6: Zero till direct seeded rice – Zero till wheat - Zero till mung bean [ZTDSR - ZTW - ZTMB (anchored residue of R and W and full MB residue retention)]. Field preparation was conducted as per the tillage requirements. The rice variety "Sarjoo 52" was sown/transplanted in all treatments, with a row spacing of 20 cm. In the transplanted rice treatments (CE1 and CE2), the field was tilled dry and wet, followed by puddling, and then 27-day-old seedlings were transplanted. For the conventional transplanted system*, i.e.*CE1 and CE2,the seeds were sown in nursery on the same day as the seeding for the DSR crop establishment systems (CE3, CE4, CE5, and CE6) for ensuring the same physiological age of the rice plants under different treatments.The crop was sown at a seed rate of 30 kg ha-1. In the CT DSR treatments (CE3 and CE4), the field was ploughed twice with a tractor-drawn cultivator, followed by planking. In the zero till DSR treatments (CE5 and CE6), sowing was done without soil disturbance,using a tractor-drawn zero-till seed cum fertilizer drill after the need-based application of Glyphosate (1 kg ha-1) for controlling weeds. Pre-sowing irrigation was applied before sowing and subsequent irrigation was done as per crop demand.

**3. RESULTS:**

**3.1 PLANT HEIGHT**

Table1 illustrates that the height of rice plants was significantly affected by different crop establishment (CE) methods at all growth stages observed (30, 60, 90 DAS, and at harvest) during both the year of investigation. There was a noticeable increase in plant height as the crop establishment method shifted from conventional puddled transplanted to conservation agriculture (CA). At 30 DAS, the shortest rice plants were recorded under CE1: CTPTR–CTW, with heights of 24.8 cm in 2021 and 26.8 cm in 2022. Conversely, the tallest plants were found under CE6: ZTDSR–ZTW–ZTMB (with residue retention in all crops), measuring 33.8 cm in 2021 and 35.0 cm in 2022, which were significantly taller than those under CE1 and other treatments. Similar, pattern persisted at 60 DAS, where CE6 again resulted in the tallest plants, with heights of 76.0 cm in 2021 and 80.1 cm in 2022, while CE1 remained the shortest (67.5 cm and 71.8 cm, respectively). At 90 DAS, CE6 continued to produce the tallest plants (105.7 cm in 2021 and 108.6 cm in 2022), followed by CE5: ZTDSR–ZTW and CE4: CTDSR–ZTW–ZTMB. The conventional puddled transplanted system (CE1) had the shortest plants (96.2 cm and 96.1 cm) during both years. By harvest time, CE6 consistently had the tallest plants (104.0 cm and 106.8 cm), while CE1 recorded the shortest (94.6 cm and 94.5 cm). Overall, plant height increased progressively with the adoption of conservation agricultural practices, particularly those incorporating zero tillage and crop diversification (mungbean). These findings suggest that CA-based methods create a more conducive environment for crop growth throughout the crop cycle, resulting in significantly taller plants compared with conventional systems.

**Table 1: Effect of CA based crop establishment methods on plant height (cm) at different growth stages of rice**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Crop Establishment methods** | **30 DAS** | | **60 DAS** | | **90 DAS** | | **At harvest** | |
| **2021** | **2022** | **2021** | **2022** | **2021** | **2022** | **2021** | **2022** |
| CE1: CTPTR-CTW | 24.8 | 26.8 | 67.5 | 71.8 | 96.2 | 96.1 | 94.6 | 94.5 |
| CE2:CTPTR-CTW-CTMB | 27.0 | 27.5 | 69.8 | 74.0 | 98.1 | 98.8 | 97.0 | 96.5 |
| CE3: CTDSR - ZT W | 28.5 | 29.5 | 71.0 | 73.8 | 98.8 | 101.3 | 97.7 | 99.1 |
| CE4:CTDSR-ZTW-ZTMB | 32.5 | 33.5 | 74.5 | 76.3 | 103.0 | 103.0 | 101.1 | 100.9 |
| CE5: ZT DSR-ZT W | 32.0 | 33.0 | 73.8 | 78.3 | 102.8 | 105.5 | 100.5 | 102.6 |
| CE6:ZTDSR-ZTW-ZTMB | 33.8 | 35.0 | 76.0 | 80.1 | 105.7 | 108.6 | 104.0 | 106.8 |
| **S.Em.±** | **1.57** | **1.86** | **1.87** | **1.64** | **2.03** | **2.60** | **1.77** | **2.06** |
| **CD (P=0.05)** | **4.74** | **5.62** | **5.65** | **4.95** | **6.13** | **7.82** | **5.33** | **6.21** |

**3.2 NUMBER OF TILLERS**

The different crop establishment methods had a notable impact on the number of tillers per square meter at all growth stages (30, 60, and 90 DAS) over the two years (2021 and 2022) (Table 2). A steady rise in tiller numbers has been observed under conservation agriculture (CA)-based crop establishment approach, especially those incorporating zero tillage and crop diversification. At 30 DAS, the lowest tillers were found in CE1: CTPTR–CTW, 107.50 m⁻² in 2021 and 109.25 m⁻² in 2022. However, a significant boost was noted with CA-based methods, with CE6: ZTDSR–ZTW–ZTMB achieving the highest tiller count, at 159.25 m⁻² in 2021 and 164.00 m⁻² in 2022. At 60 DAS, tiller production increased in all the treatments. However, CE6 again recorded the maximum tillers (391.00 m⁻² in 2021 and 394.00 m⁻² in 2022), followed by CE5: ZTDSR–ZTW and CE4: CTDSR–ZTW–ZTMB. In contrast, CE1 consistently had the lowest numbers, with 344.75 and 350.25 tillers m⁻², respectively. These differences were statistically significant, as indicated by the CD values. At 90 DAS, similar trend persisted, with CE6 reaching the highest tiller density (468.25 m⁻² in 2021 and 471.75 m⁻² in 2022), significantly surpassing all other treatments. The lowest tiller density remained in CE1 (424.75 and 431.50 tillers m⁻²). The gradual increase in tiller numbers with CA-based methods, particularly in CE6, can be attributed to improved soil aeration, better moisture retention, and enhanced microbial activity facilitated by zero tillage and mungbean inclusion. These practices likely contributed to better root development and nutrient availability, thereby fostering robust tiller production.

**Table 2: Effect of CA based crop establishment methods on number of tillers (m-2) at different growth stages of rice**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Crop Establishment methods** | **30 DAS** | | **60 DAS** | | **90 DAS** | |
| **2021** | **2022** | **2021** | **2022** | **2021** | **2022** |
| CE1: CTPTR-CTW | 107.50 | 109.25 | 344.75 | 350.25 | 424.75 | 431.50 |
| CE2:CTPTR-CTW-CTMB | 118.00 | 120.50 | 355.00 | 361.00 | 435.00 | 438.75 |
| CE3: CTDSR - ZT W | 139.50 | 141.75 | 363.25 | 369.70 | 443.25 | 447.20 |
| CE4:CTDSR-ZTW-ZTMB | 146.50 | 153.50 | 375.50 | 378.35 | 451.00 | 454.00 |
| CE5: ZT DSR-ZTW | 151.00 | 157.25 | 381.25 | 383.75 | 455.00 | 460.25 |
| CE6:ZTDSR-ZTW-ZTMB | 159.25 | 164.00 | 391.00 | 394.00 | 468.25 | 471.75 |
| **S.Em.±** | **4.56** | **5.76** | **5.51** | **5.35** | **6.34** | **6.40** |
| **CD (P=0.05)** | **13.75** | **17.35** | **16.61** | **16.13** | **19.12** | **19.29** |

**3.3 LEAF AREA INDEX (LAI)**

Leaf Area Index (LAI), a crucial physiological factor affecting the photosynthetic efficiency of rice, was notably influenced by various crop establishment (CE) methods at all growth stages (30, 60, and 90 DAS) during both years of the study (2021 and 2022) (Table 3). At 30 DAS, LAI values ranged from 1.21 (2021) and 1.23 (2022) under CE1: CTPTR–CTW to a significantly higher 1.45 (2021) and 1.47 (2022) in CE6: ZTDSR–ZTW–ZTMB. This suggests that CA-based methods, promote early canopy development and leaf expansion. At 60 DAS, LAI values increased across all treatments, with CE6 maintaining the highest values (3.36 in 2021 and 3.38 in 2022), followed by CE5 and CE4. The conventional treatment CE1 recorded the lowest LAI at this stage (3.13 and 3.21), indicating a slower canopy development rate under traditional puddled transplanting systems. At 90 DAS, the highest LAI was again observed under CE6, with values of 3.50 in 2021 and 3.55 in 2022, significantly surpassing CE1 (3.31 and 3.37). This indicates that CA-based practices supported better canopy growth, even during the reproductive stage, likely enhancing light interception, biomass accumulation, and photosynthates production.

**3.4 GRAIN YIELD**

The grain yield of rice was significantly affected by different crop establishment methods during both the years of experimentation (2021 and 2022) (Table 3). There was a clear upward trend in grain yield as the practices shifted from conventional puddled transplanted system to conservation agriculture based crop establishment methods. In 2021, the lowest yield was recorded with CE1: CTPTR–CTW, yielding 4027.50 kg ha⁻¹. Slightly higher yields were seen with CE2: CTPTR–CTW- CTMB (4115.58 kg ha⁻¹) and CE3: CTDSR–ZTW (4207.50 kg ha⁻¹). However, yields increased significantly with CA based practices. CE4: CTDSR–ZTW–ZTMB and CE5: ZTDSR–ZTW produced 4252.50 kg ha⁻¹ and 4327.50 kg ha⁻¹, respectively. The highest yield was achieved with CE6: Zero till dry seeded rice followed by zero till wheat and zero till mungbean (ZTDSR–ZTW–ZTMB), which yielded 4396.09 kg ha⁻¹, outperforming most other treatments. A similar pattern in yield was observed in 2022, with yields ranging from 4080.00 kg ha⁻¹ in CE1 to 4493.26 kg ha⁻¹ in CE6. The yield improvement under CE6 was statistically significant, as indicated by the critical difference (CD) values at P=0.05.

**Table 3: Effect of CA based crop establishment methods on Leaf Area Index (LAI) at different growth stages and grain yield of rice**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Crop Establishment methods** | **30 DAS** | | **60 DAS** | | **90 DAS** | | **Grain yield (kg ha-1)** | |
|  | **2021** | **2022** | **2021** | **2022** | **2021** | **2022** | **2021** | **2022** |
| CE1: CTPTR-CTW | 1.21 | 1.23 | 3.13 | 3.21 | 3.31 | 3.37 | 4027.50 | 4080.00 |
| CE2:CTPTR-CTW-CTMB | 1.27 | 1.28 | 3.17 | 3.25 | 3.36 | 3.43 | 4115.58 | 4140.00 |
| CE3: CTDSR - ZT W | 1.31 | 1.33 | 3.23 | 3.32 | 3.40 | 3.45 | 4207.50 | 4230.00 |
| CE4:CTDSR-ZTW-ZTMB | 1.36 | 1.38 | 3.28 | 3.33 | 3.42 | 3.47 | 4252.50 | 4311.81 |
| CE5: ZT DSR-ZTW | 1.39 | 1.43 | 3.33 | 3.35 | 3.44 | 3.51 | 4327.50 | 4402.50 |
| CE6:ZTDSR-ZTW-ZTMB | 1.45 | 1.47 | 3.36 | 3.38 | 3.50 | 3.55 | 4396.09 | 4493.26 |
| **S.Em.±** | **0.03** | **0.03** | **0.03** | **0.03** | **0.04** | **0.04** | **54.10** | **63.84** |
| **CD (P=0.05)** | **0.08** | **0.08** | **0.08** | **0.10** | **0.11** | **0.11** | **163.06** | **192.44** |

**4. DISCUSSION:**

The implementation of zero till direct seeded rice (ZTDSR) followed by zero till wheat (ZTW) and zero till mung bean (ZTMB), with residue retention, is linked to enhanced rice growth owing to several critical factors. Conservation agriculture (CA) practices, such as ZTDSR-ZTW-ZTMB, contributed to increase soil organic carbon (SOC) levels, which are instrumental in maintaining and improving soil quality, and promoting plant growth. (Dey*et al*., 2016; Sapkota *et al*., 2017,Mishra *et al*., 2024). The retention of crop residues augments nutrient availability in the soil. This approach enhances soil nitrogen pools, as residues from rice and mung beans exhibit a varied C:N ratio, thereby improving nitrogen utilization by crops. This increase in nutrient availability supports the overall growth and development of rice plants. (Dey*et al*., 2016;Thind*et al*., 2023). Practices such as ZTDSR with residue retention also enhance the soil physical properties, including soil structure and porosity. These enhancements improve root penetration and water retention capacity, creating a more favourable environment for plant growth and resulting in superior plant architecture. (Kumar *et al*., 2019). Residue retention enhances microbial activity in soil, which is essential for nutrient cycling and soil health. By providing continuous organic matter input, microbial biomass increases, improving nutrient accessibility and promoting plant health (Sharma *et al*., 2019). Overall, ZTDSR-ZTW-ZTMB system with residue retention improved growth in rice by enhancing soil health through increased organic carbon, nutrient availability, and soil physical properties, along with improved water &nutrient use efficiency, and increased microbial activity. Collectively, these factors supported robust plant growth and development.Conservation agriculture (CA) techniques have led to increased rice yields owing to several important factors. First, CA incorporates methods such as minimal tillage, maintaining crop residues, and rotating crops, which gradually improve the soil structure and fertility. This results in a healthier soil, which is essential for maintaining higher crop yields. For example, practices such as zero tillage and retaining crop residues in CA systems boost soil organic carbon levels and microbial health, fostering better root development and nutrient absorption, ultimately enhancing rice yields (Mishra *et al*., 2024; Song *et al*., 2024; Upadhyay *et al*., 2024). Furthermore, CA methods enhance water efficiency and productivity. Research indicates a notable decrease in water usage in CA systems compared with traditional methods, making rice farming more sustainable and adaptable to climate change (Jat *et al*., 2019). Improved water use efficiency leads to better crop performance and can significantly increase yield. Additionally, CA encourages crop rotations, such as incorporating legumes (e.g., mungbean) into rice-wheat systems, which can boost soil nitrogen levels and overall system productivity. This diversification not only increases yields, but also supports long-term soil health and economic gains (Jat *et al*., 2019). Finally, conservation agriculture lowers energy consumption and operational expenses by reducing the need for mechanical tillage and fuel usage. These efficiencies result in higher economic returns and can promote sustainable rice-farming practices (Nandan *et al*., 2020). Overall, conservation agriculture provides a holistic approach for sustainably increasing rice yields by enhancing soil health, optimizing water and nutrient utilization, and boosting the ecological resilience of rice-based cropping systems.

**5. CONCLUSION:**

Based on the results presented here, it can be concluded that full conservation agriculture based crop establishment method, CE6: ZTR–ZTW–ZTMB (with anchored residue retention in all the crops) has the potential to improve the rice growth and yield as compared to the conventional puddled transplanted method of rice within rice-wheat system of the eastern U.P.

Disclaimer (Artificial intelligence)

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc.) and text-to-image generators have been used during the writing or editing of this manuscript.

**References:**

Banjara TR, Bohra JS, Kumar S, Ram A, Pal V. Diversification of rice–wheat cropping system improves growth, productivity and energetics of rice in the Indo-Gangetic Plains of India. Agricultural Research. 2022;11(1):48-57.

Bera T, Sharma S, Thind HS, Sidhu HS, Jat ML. Soil biochemical changes at different wheat growth stages in response to conservation agriculture practices in a rice-wheat system of north-western India. Soil Research. 2017;56(1):91-104.

Chang SH, Benjamin EO, Sauer J. Factors influencing the adoption of sustainable agricultural practices for rice cultivation in Southeast Asia: A review. Agronomy for Sustainable Development. 2024;44(3):27.

Chauhan BS, Singh K, Ladha JK, Kumar V, Saharawat YS, Gathala M. Weedy rice: an emerging threat for direct-seeded rice production systems in India. Journal of Rice Research. 2013;1:106.

Chandra P, Khippal AK, Prajapat K, Barman A, Singh G, Rai AK, Ahlawat OP, Verma RP, Kumari K, Singh G. Influence of tillage and residue management practices on productivity, sustainability, and soil biological properties of rice-barley cropping systems in indo-gangetic plain of India. Frontiers in microbiology. 2023;14:1130397.

Dey A, Dwivedi BS, Bhattacharyya R, Datta SP, Meena MC, Das TK, Singh VK. Conservation agriculture in a rice-wheat cropping system on an alluvial soil of north-western Indo-Gangetic plains: Effect on soil carbon and nitrogen pools. Journal of the Indian Society of Soil science. 2016;64(3):246-54.

Dhanda S, Yadav A, Yadav DB, Chauhan BS. Emerging issues and potential opportunities in the rice–wheat cropping system of North-Western India. Frontiers in Plant Science. 2022 ;13:832683.

Gandhi N, Petkar O, Armstrong LJ. Rice crop yield prediction using artificial neural networks. In2016 IEEE Technological Innovations in ICT for Agriculture and Rural Development (TIAR). 2016 Jul 15; 105-110). IEEE.

Islam MA, Bell RW, Johansen C, Jahiruddin M, Haque ME, Vance W. Conservation agriculture effects on yield and profitability of rice-based systems in the Eastern Indo-Gangetic Plain. Experimental Agriculture. 2022;58:e33.

Jat HS, Kumar P, Sutaliya JM, Kumar S, Choudhary M, Singh Y, Jat ML. Conservation agriculture based sustainable intensification of basmati rice-wheat system in North-West India. Archives of Agronomy and Soil Science. 2019;65(10):1370-86.

Kaur R, Kaur S, Deol JS, Sharma R, Kaur T, Brar AS, Choudhary OP. Soil properties and weed dynamics in wheat as affected by rice residue management in the rice–wheat cropping system in south Asia: A review. Plants. 2021; 10(5):953.

Kumar N, Chhokar RS, Meena RP, Kharub AS, Gill SC, Tripathi SC, Gupta OP, Mangrauthia SK, Sundaram RM, Sawant CP, Gupta A. Challenges and opportunities in productivity and sustainability of rice cultivation system: a critical review in Indian perspective. Cereal research communications. 2022;50(4):573-601.

Kumar V, Gathala MK, Saharawat YS, Parihar CM, Kumar R, Kumar R, Jat ML, Jat AS, Mahala DM, Kumar L, Nayak HS. Impact of tillage and crop establishment methods on crop yields, profitability and soil physical properties in rice–wheat system of Indo‐Gangetic Plains of India. Soil Use and Management. 2019;35(2):303-13.

Leharwan M, Kumar Y, Kumar R, Kumar Saraswat P, Kumar R, Kumar ThaliyilVeetil A, Bhattacharjee S, Kumar A, Kumar S. Assessing the effects of conservation tillage and in-situ crop residue management on crop yield and soil properties in rice–wheat cropping system. Sustainability. 2023;15(17):12736.

Mahajan G, Kumar V, Chauhan BS. Rice production in India. InRice production worldwide. 2017;53-91. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Midya A, Saren BK, Dey JK, Maitra S, Praharaj S, Gaikwad DJ, Gaber A, Alsanie WF, Hossain A. Crop establishment methods and integrated nutrient management improve: Part i. crop performance, water productivity and profitability of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) in the lower indo-gangetic plain, India. Agronomy. 2021;11(9):1860.

Mishra AK, Maurya PK, Sharma S. Impact of different farming scenarios on key soil sustainability indicators driving soil carbon and system productivity of rice-based cropping systems. Frontiers in Plant Science. 2024;15:1408515.

Nandan R, Poonia SP, Singh SS, Nath CP, Kumar V, Malik RK, McDonald A, Hazra KK. Potential of conservation agriculture modules for energy conservation and sustainability of rice-based production systems of Indo-Gangetic Plain region. Environmental Science and Pollution Research. 2021;28(1):246-61.

Pervaiz R, Baloch R, Arshad MA, Abbas RN, Shahzad N, Hamid M, Batool Z, Maqbool MS, Masih A, Salam A, Akbar MM. Herbicide strategies for weed control in rice cultivation: Current practices and future directions. Haya: Saudi Journal of Life Sciences. 2024;9(4):114-29.

Sapkota TB, Jat RK, Singh RG, Jat ML, Stirling CM, Jat MK, Bijarniya D, Kumar M, Saharawat YS, Gupta RK. Soil organic carbon changes after seven years of conservation agriculture in a rice–wheat system of the eastern Indo‐Gangetic Plains. Soil Use and Management. 2017;33(1):81-9.

Sharma S, Thind HS, Sidhu HS, Jat ML, Parihar CM. Effects of crop residue retention on soil carbon pools after 6 years of rice–wheat cropping system. Environmental Earth Sciences. 2019;78(10):296.

Singh Y, Sidhu HS. Management of cereal crop residues for sustainable rice-wheat production system in the Indo-Gangetic plains of India. Proceedings of the Indian National Science Academy. 2014 ;80(1):95-114.

Song J, Sun Q, Li Q, Ashraf U, Hu X, Li L. Optimal soil, climate, and management factors for maximizing crop yield and soil nutrients in a rice–oilseed rotation system with straw return. Agriculture. 2024;14(3):414.

Thind HS, Sharma S, Sidhu HS, Singh V. Tillage, crop establishment and residue retention methods for optimising productivity and profitability under rice–wheat system. Crop and Pasture Science. 2023.

Tran DD, Park E, Van CT, Nguyen TD, Nguyen AH, Linh TC, Quyen PH, Tran DA, Nguyen HQ. Advancing sustainable rice production in the Vietnamese Mekong Delta insights from ecological farming systems in An Giang Province. Heliyon. 2024;10(17).

Upadhyay A, Singh UP, Singh NK, Mahajan NC, Verma K, Jha S, Singh RP. Effect of Crop Establishment Methods and Precision Nutrient Management on Growth, Yield Attributes and Yield of Rice under Rice-wheat System. International Journal of Plant & Soil Science. 2024;36(7):501-7.