



Yield Performance of *Zea Mays (L.)* Varieties under Irrigation in Debub Omo, Southern Ethiopia

Tekle Yoseph*

*Southern Agricultural Research Institute, Crop Science Research Directorate, Jinka Agricultural Research Center, Jinka, Ethiopia.

Corresponding author: Tekle Yoseph, Southern Agricultural Research Institute, Crop Science Research Directorate, Jinka Agricultural Research Center, Jinka, Ethiopia, Tel: +21-9-16-86-65-89; E-mail: tekleyoseph486@gmail.com

Abstract

Maize (*Zea mays L.*) is one of the most important cereal crops in Ethiopia. The low productivity of maize has been partly due to the use of drought susceptible local varieties. The trials were executed at Dasenech, Gyngatom and Hammer woredas, Debub Omo Zone of Southern Ethiopia using four released and one farmer maize varieties under irrigated conditions in 2019. Four improved (Melkass-4, Melkassa7, MH140, MH6Q, and one local) maize varieties were involved in the treatment. The trial was carried out using a randomized complete block design with three replications under irrigation at Dasenech, Gyngatom, and Hammer during the 2019 cropping season. The combined result showed significant differences observed among the varieties for the traits under study. A maximum plant height of 196.33 cm was recorded in the local check, while the minimum plant height of 167.78 cm was noted for Melkassa-4. Ear length ranged from 21.667 cm in the local check to 27.778 cm in MH140. Hundred seed weight ranged from 28.889 g in the local check to 34.444 g for MH6Q. Seed yield ranged from 2653.9 kg ha⁻¹ in the local check to 4977.4 kg ha⁻¹ for MH6Q. Maize varieties MH6Q 4977.4 kg ha⁻¹ and Melkassa-4 3922.6 kg ha⁻¹ could be recommended for the study areas and other similar agro-ecologies for improved maize production and productivity.

Keywords: Improved maize, Local maize, Yield components, Varieties, Seed yield

INTRODUCTION

Maize is one of the most important cereals after wheat and rice in world agriculture and is widely distributed in the world [1]. It is originated in Central America and introduced to West Africa in the early 1500s by Portuguese traders [2]. Maize is the most important cereal food crop in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), particularly in eastern and southern Africa where it accounts for 53% of the total cereal area [3], and about 30-70% of the total caloric consumption obtained from maize [4]. Maize was introduced to Ethiopia during the 1600-the 1700s [5]. It is currently grown across 13 agro-ecological zones which together cover about 90% of the country. Moreover, it is an increasingly popular crop in Ethiopia. For many years, maize in Ethiopia has been the first in production and second next to tef (*Eragrostis tzeanensis* (Zuccagni) Trotter) in the area of cultivated land [6]. The importance of maize in the country's agricultural economy and household-level food security calls for increasing its production and productivity through the use of modern technologies [7].

Maize is one of the most important cereal crops in Ethiopia, ranking second in area coverage and first in total production. Although it is one of the strategic crops for the achievement of food security in the country, more than 90% of the production is handled by small-scale farmers under rain-fed growing conditions. About 40% of the total maize growing area is also located in low-moisture stress areas, where it contributes less than 20% to the total annual production. The

low yield in these areas, like other sub-Saharan African countries, is mainly attributed to recurrent drought, low levels of fertilizer use, and low adoption of improved varieties.

Maize is one of the most important cereal crops in the Southern region in general and the Debub Omo Zone in particular. Even though maize is important in the study area, several factors constrained its productivity. This is due to the lack of improved varieties associated with biophysical factors that have been appreciated as one of the primary sources of lower maize production. There had no trend of using improved maize varieties in the existing production system so it is the bottleneck problem in the target area. Therefore, this study is initiated to select the best-performing maize varieties in the study area.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Area Description

Field experiments were carried out in 2019 cropping season

Received: November 09, 2022; **Revised:** November 18, 2022; **Accepted:** November 21, 2022

Citation: Yoseph T. (2022) Yield Performance of *Zea Mays (L.)* Varieties under Irrigation in Debub Omo, Southern Ethiopia. *J Agric For Meteorol Stud*, 1(1): 1-4.

Copyright: ©2022 Yoseph T. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

at Dasenech, Hammer, and Nyangatom districts under irrigated conditions in Debub Omo Zone. The altitude of the areas varies between 353 m and 606 m for Dasenech (gives GPS coordinates, longitude and latitude of the areas), 371 m and 2084 m for Hammer (GPS coordinates), and 380 m and 497 m for Nyangatom (longitude and latitude of the areas), respectively.

Treatments and Experimental Design

Five maize (Melkassa-4, MH140, MH6Q, Melkassa-7 improved, and a local check) were included in the study. Field experiments were laid out in a randomized complete block design with three replications. Maize was sown in ten rows per plot with a spacing of 75 cm between rows and 25 cm between plants with a gross plot area of (7.5 m x 10 m = 75 m²).

Data collection

Seed Yield

Seed yield was measured from the central rows with plot areas (10 m x 4.5 m = 45 m²). Five plants were randomly selected from the sample rows to determine seed yield and yield components.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using the R statistical software version 3.4.1. Means were separated using Fisher's least significant difference (LSD) test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Plant height

The combined result revealed significant variations observed among the maize varieties for plant height (**Table 1**). This result is in line with the report of Tekle (2014) on lowland maize varieties, which coincides with results reported by Wedajo and Tekle (2014) on midland maize varieties. Similar results were reported by the previous findings [8,9] on maize, indicating that there existed significant variations among the maize varieties in this study. The maximum plant height of 241 cm was recorded for the local check at Gyngatom while the minimum of 143 cm was obtained for Melkassa-4 at Dasenech (**Table 2**). Plant height ranged from 167.78 cm for Melkassa-4 to 196.33 cm for the local check (**Table 3**).

Table 1. Mean Square Values for Plant Height, Ear Length, Hundred Seed Weight, and Seed Yield of Maize at Debub Omo Zone, in 2019.

Source of Variations	DF	PH (cm)	EL (cm)	HSW (gm)	GY (kg ha ⁻¹)
Rep	2	214.47*	9.34*	36.60*	247146*
Variety	4	1112.81*	46.80***	48.14*	6887973***
Location	2	1346.47	16.16	8.60	596099
Location*Variety	8	241.66	16.60*	11.54	515431
Error	28	364.80	6.1175	12.12	326368

Note that: *, ** and *** indicate significance at $p < 0.05$, $P < 0.01$ and $P < 0.001$, respectively.

Table 2. Mean Values of Plant Height, Ear Length, Hundred Seed Weight, and Seed Yield of Maize at Debub Omo Zone, in 2019.

Varieties	PH (cm)	EL (cm)	HSW (gm)	GY (kg ha ⁻¹)
Melkassa-4	167.78b	26.33a		3922.6b
MH140	186.22ab	27.78a	30.11ab	3168.9c
MH6Q	181.56ab	24.78ab	34.44a	4977.4a
Mekkassa-7	173.44ab	25.67a	29.56b	3759.7b
Local	196.33a	21.67b	28.89b	2653.9d
Mean	181.07	25.24	30.400	3696.5
CV (%)	10.55	9.80	11.45	15.45
LSD (0.05)	26.232	3.40	4.78	784.61

Table 3. Mean values for Plant Height, Ear Length, Hundred Seed Weight, and Seed Yield of Maize at Dasenech, Hammer and GYngatom Districts, in 2019.

LSD _(0.05)	CV (%)	Local	Melks.7	MH6Q	MH140	Melks.-4	PH (cm)				EL (cm)				HSW (g)				GY (kg ha ⁻¹)											
							Dasenech	Hammer	Gynagatom	Mean	Dasenech	Hammer	Gynagatom	Mean	Dasenech	Hammer	Gynagatom	Mean	Dasenech	Hammer	Gynagatom	Mean								
8	4	182	175	154	163	143	182	182	209	180	163	143	182	182	209	180	163	143	182	182	209	180	163	143	182	182	209	180	163	143
41	12	182	185	209	180	161	182	185	209	180	161	161	182	185	209	180	161	161	182	185	209	180	161	161	182	185	209	180	161	161
18	4	241	197	204	219	193	241	197	204	219	193	193	241	197	204	219	193	193	241	197	204	219	193	193	241	197	204	219	193	193
22	7	202	186	189	187	165	202	186	189	187	165	165	202	186	189	187	165	165	202	186	189	187	165	165	202	186	189	187	165	165
1	3	23	29	24	30	27	23	29	24	30	27	27	23	29	24	30	27	27	23	29	24	30	27	27	23	29	24	30	27	27
2	5	22	21	27	24	23	22	21	27	24	23	23	22	21	27	24	23	23	22	21	27	24	23	23	22	21	27	24	23	23
2	3	27	29	25	29	26	27	29	25	29	26	26	27	29	25	29	26	26	27	29	25	29	26	26	27	29	25	29	26	26
2	4	17	26	25	28	25	17	26	25	28	25	25	17	26	25	28	25	25	17	26	25	28	25	25	17	26	25	28	25	25
2	5	31	32	32	35	37	31	32	32	35	37	37	31	32	32	35	37	37	31	32	32	35	37	37	31	32	32	35	37	37
2	3	25	25	32	30	24	25	25	32	30	24	24	25	25	32	30	24	24	25	25	32	30	24	24	25	25	32	30	24	24
3	5	32	37	40	34	38	32	37	40	34	38	38	32	37	40	34	38	38	32	37	40	34	38	38	32	37	40	34	38	38
2	5	29	31	34	33	33	29	31	34	33	33	33	29	31	34	33	33	33	29	31	34	33	33	33	29	31	34	33	33	33
844	23	3162	4163	5070	3761	5068	3162	4163	5070	3761	5068	5068	3162	4163	5070	3761	5068	5068	3162	4163	5070	3761	5068	5068	3162	4163	5070	3761	5068	5068
588	12	2667	1725	3958	2081	2647	2667	1725	3958	2081	2647	2647	2667	1725	3958	2081	2647	2647	2667	1725	3958	2081	2647	2647	2667	1725	3958	2081	2647	2647
715	10	1692	4848	5660	3770	4190	1692	4848	5660	3770	4190	4190	1692	4848	5660	3770	4190	4190	1692	4848	5660	3770	4190	4190	1692	4848	5660	3770	4190	4190
715	15	2507	3579	4896	3204	3969	2507	3579	4896	3204	3969	3969	2507	3579	4896	3204	3969	3969	2507	3579	4896	3204	3969	3969	2507	3579	4896	3204	3969	3969

Melks.-4= Melkassa-4, Melks.7= Melkassa-7.

Ear length

The result exhibited that there were significant differences noted amongst the varieties for ear length (**Table 1**). Maximum ear length of 30 cm was recorded for MH140 at Dasenech while the minimum 21 cm was noted for Melkassa-7 at Hammer (**Table 3**). Ear length ranged from

21.66 cm for the local check to 27.78 cm for MH140 (**Table 2**).

Hundred seed weight

The result indicated that significant variations observed among varieties for hundred seeds weight (**Table 1**). The maximum hundred seeds weight of 40 g was noted for

MH6Q at Gyngatom while the minimum 24 g was recorded from Melkassa-4 at Hammer (**Table 3**). Mean values for hundred seeds weight ranged from 28.89 g for the local check to 34.44 g for MH6Q. Based on the present findings, it could be concluded that the highest 100 seeds weight observed from the improved varieties might be credited to the highest seed yield noted for the improved varieties over the local check.

Seed Yield

The result showed significant variations among the varieties for seed yield (**Table 1**). This result agreed with the report of Akbar [10], Ahmad [11], Hussain [9], McCutcheon [12]. While, contrasting result was reported by Olakojo and Iken [8]. The maximum seed yield of 5660 kg ha⁻¹ was recorded for MH6Q at Gyngatom and the minimum 1692 kg ha⁻¹ was noted for the local check at Hammer (**Table 3**).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The result indicated significant variations observed among the varieties for all the studied parameters. Based on the overall mean yield, the best-performing varieties such as MH6Q 4977.4 kg ha⁻¹ and Melkassa-4 (3922.6 kg ha⁻¹) would be recommended.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Jinka Agricultural Research Centre for its administrative facilitation throughout the experiment, and the Regional Pastoral Livelihoods Resilience Project (RPLRP) for its financial support through South Agricultural Research Institute.

REFERENCES

1. Crowley G (1998) Improving Yield and Quality of Forage Maize. Available online at: <https://tstor.teagasc.ie/handle/11019/1483>
2. Dowswell CR, Paliwal RL, Cantrell RP (1996) Maize in the Third World. Press, Boulder. Am J Palnt Sci 8: 268.
3. FAO (2010) FAO STAT. Available online at: <http://faostat.fao.org/>
4. Langyintuo AS, Mwangi W, Diallo AO, MacRobert J, Dixon J, Bänziger M (2010) Challenges of the maize seed industry in eastern and southern Africa: A compelling case for private-public intervention to promote growth. Food Policy 35: 323-331.
5. Huffnagel HP (1961) Agriculture in Ethiopia. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nation Organization, Rome. pp: 465.
6. Legese G, Langyintuo AS, Mwangi W, Moti J (2011) Determinants of Adoption of mproved Drought Tolerant Maize Varieties and Their Implication for Household Food Security in Drought Prone Areas. Ethiop J Agric Econ 8(1): 105-132.
7. Moti J, Chilot Y, Menale K, De Groote H, Bekele S (2013) Knowledge, Adoption and Use Intensity of Improved Maize Technologies in Ethiopia. Invited paper presented at the 4th International Conference of the African Association of Agricultural Economists, September 22-25, 2013, Hammamet, Tunisia. pp: 30.
8. Olakojo SA, Iken JE (2001) Yield performance and stability of some improved maize varieties. Moor J Agric Res 2: 21-24.
9. Hussain N, Khan MY, Baloch MS (2011) Creening Of Maize Varieties For Grain Yield At Dera Ismail Khan. J Anim Plant Sci 21(3): 626-628.
10. Akbar M, Saleem M, Ashraf MY, Hussain A, Azhar FM, Ahmad R (2009) Combining ability studies for physiological and grain yield traits in maize at two temperatures. Pakistan J Bot 41(4): 1817-1829.
11. Ahmad N, Waheed A, Hamid FS (2000) Performance of maize cultivars under late sowing conditions. Pakistan J Biol Sci 3(12): 2098-2100.
12. McCutcheon J, Siegrist H, Rzenwncki P (2001) Fair field, licking, and Perry counties - osu extension commercial corn hybrid side by side performance trials - special circular. Ohio Agric Res Dev Center 179: 54-56.