

Captions

Table 1 Field data

Table 2 Analysis of results - year one

Table 3 Soil moisture content at different application times

Fig. 1. Alternative commercial injectors: (a) shallow I (C2); (b) slipperfoot (C1)

Fig. 2. Single piece tine with leg profile III and 40 mm wing or single piece tine (S5)

Fig. 3. Plot layout - year one trials

Fig. 4. Plot layout - year two trials

Fig. 5. General layout of implement onto which shallow I injector tines (C2) were attached

Fig. 6. Umbilical hose trials

Fig. 7. Weather conditions: (a) rainfall; (b) evaporation

Fig. 8. Soil conditions at different application times - year one trials: (a) Ivy Ground - clay - Evesham; (b) Avenue - sandy loam - Cottenham

Fig. 9. Relative damage behind injector & wheel: (a) winter wheat - clay soil; (b) winter rape - sandy loam soil

Fig. 10. Effect of application technique and time on winter wheat yield - year one trials

Fig. 11. Effect of application technique & time on rape yield - year one trials: (a) effect of application technique and time; (b) effect of application time

Fig. 12. Average yield results obtained from the umbilical hose tests: (a) winter wheat - clay soil; (b) winter rape - sandy loam soil

Fig. 13. Final yield results - year two trials: (a) Showground - sandy loam soil; (b) Home Close - clay soil

Fig. 14. General view at flowering of rape plots treated at different times with the slipperfoot injector: (a) November; (b) December; (c) February; (d) March; (e) April; (f) May

Fig. 15. Comparison of the crop damage caused by different application techniques at two application times in winter wheat: (a) shallow I (C2) - June; (b) shallow I (C2) - July; (c) slipperfoot (C1) - June; (d) slipperfoot (C1) - July; (e) dribble (C2D)-June; (f) dribble (C2D)

Table 1
Field data

Year one					Year two				
Field	Ivy Ground		Avenue		Showground			Home Close	
Soil type	Clay		Sandy Loam		Sandy Loam			Clay	
Soil series	Evesham**		Cottenham**		Cottenham**			Evesham**	
Field capacity (%)*	55.6		20.0		20.0			55.6	
Upper plastic limit (%)	61.9		-		-			61.9	
Lower plastic limit (%)	32.5		-		-			32.5	
Cropping									
Previous crops	1993/94 Winter wheat 1994/95 Winter rape		1993/94 Winter rape 1994/95 Winter wheat		1995/96 Winter rape			1995/96 Winter wheat	
Crop type/variety	Winter wheat Brigadier		Winter rape Express		Winter wheat Brigadier			Winter wheat Riband	
Planting	21/09/95		20/09/95		19/09/97			28/10/97	
1st granular fertiliser	02/02/96		30/01/96		10/03/97			10/03/97	
2nd granular fertiliser	29/03/96		28/03/96		04/04/97			04/04/97	
Sludge									
Code	Date	Total N, kg/ha	Date	Total N, kg/ha	Code	Date	Total N, kg/ha	Date	Total N, kg/ha
a	09/11/95	67.3	09/11/95	67.3	a	12/12/96	108.2	12/12/96	108.2
b	12/12/95	102.0	12/12/95	102.0	b	04/02/97	119.1	04/02/97	119.1
c	28/02/96	115.9	14/02/96	100.8	c	27/03/97	87.1	27/03/97	87.1
d	29/04/96	119.1	12/03/96	109.2	d	07/03/97	91.0	07/03/97	91.0
e	03/06/96	102.8	18/04/96	101.0	b/c	04/02/97	119.1	04/02/97	119.1
f	04/07/96	78.7	10/05/96	95.5		27/03/97	87.1	27/03/97	87.1


* Gravimetric MC (%) at 2 pF, ** King 1969.

Table 2
Analysis of results - year one

<i>Comparisons</i>	<i>Clay Ivy Ground - Wheat</i>		<i>Sandy loam Avenue - Rape</i>	
	<i>F pr.</i>		<i>F pr.</i>	
Control versus rest of experiment	<0.001	***	0.570	NS
Fertilised and unfertilised controls versus rest of experiment	0.455	NS	0.535	NS
Controls versus treatments with and without sludge	1.44	NS	0.712	NS
Controls versus application technique	<0.001	***	0.738	NS
Controls versus application time	<0.001	***	<0.001	***
Controls versus technique and time of application	<0.001	***	0.320	NS
Controls versus technique with and without sludge	0.348	NS	0.485	NS
Controls versus application time with and without sludge	00.619	NS	0.319	NS
Controls versus technique/time of application with/without sludge	0.868	NS	0.515	NS

Table 3
Soil moisture content at different
application times

<i>Date</i>	<i>Sandy loam Showground</i>	<i>Clay Home Close</i>
12/12/96	21.6 %	41.7 %
14/02/97	20.8 %	39.1 %
27/03/97	13.3 %	30.0 %
07/05/97	14.6 %	28.9 %



(a)

(b)

Fig. 1. Alternative commercial injectors: (a) shallow I (C2); (b) slipperfoot (C1)



Fig. 2. Single piece tine with leg profile III and 40 mm wing or single piece tine (S5)




Fig. 3. Plot layout - year one trials




Fig. 4. Plot layout - year two trials



Fig. 5. General layout of implement onto which shallow I injector tines (C2) were attached



Fig. 6. Umbilical hose trials




Fig. 7. Weather conditions: (a) rainfall; (b) evaporation





Fig. 8. Soil conditions at different application times - year one trials:
(a) Ivy Ground - clay - Evesham; (b) Avenue - sandy loam - Cottenham





Fig. 9. Relative damage behind injector & wheel: (a) winter wheat - clay soil; (b) winter rape - sandy loam soil




Fig. 10. Effect of application technique and time on winter wheat yield - year one trials





Fig. 11. Effect of application technique & time on rape yield - year one trials: (a) effect of application technique and time; (b) effect of application time




Fig. 12. Average yield results obtained from the umbilical hose tests: (a) winter wheat - clay soil; (b) winter rape - sandy loam soil




Fig. 13. Final yield results - year two trials: (a) Showground - sandy loam soil; (b) Home Close - clay soil



Fig. 14. General view at flowering of rape plots treated at different times with the slipperfoot injector: (a) November; (b) December; (c) February; (d) March; (e) April; (f) May



Fig. 15. Comparison of the crop damage caused by different application techniques at two application times in winter wheat: (a) shallow I (C2) - June; (b) shallow I (C2) - July; (c) slipperfoot (C1) - June; (d) slipperfoot (C1) - July; (e) dribble (C2D) - June; (f) dribble (C2D)



DSPACE

<https://dspace.org/>

Injecting bio solids into grass and arable crops. Part II: Development of a shallow application technique

Pullen, D. W. M.; Godwin, R. J.; Grundon, P.; Hann, Michael J.

2004-04

Elsevier

<http://hdl.handle.net/1826/811>

D. W. M. Pullen , R. J. Godwin , P. Grundon and M. J. Hann, Injecting bio solids into grass and arable crops. Part II: Development of a shallow application technique, Biosystems Engineering, Volume 87, Issue 4, April 2004, Pages 393-406