

Application of a knowledge-based decision support model for soil tilth assessment

Abbas OM and Mohammed HI

Department of Agricultural Engineering, College of Agricultural Studies,
Sudan University of Science and Technology, Sudan

Corresponding author: hassantal@gmail.com

Received on: 24/01/2022

Accepted on: 23/08/2022

Published on: 14/09/2022

ABSTRACT

Aim: The main objective of the study was to apply a developed knowledge-based decision support model for soil tilth assessment, based on the "tilth index", to help to select the suitable method for conducting tillage operation.

Materials and Methods: A field experiment was conducted using a randomized design with a strip-plot arrangement, and three replications to quantify the effects of four tillage implements (chisel, disc harrow, disc plow, ridging and split ridging, and wide level disc), on soil physical properties, tilth index of seedbed preparation of Sesame crop (*Sesamum indicum* L.), in El Seleit Irrigation Scheme in Botana area, during seasons 2018 and 2019.

Results: The highest values of moisture content were at Wide Level Disc and the lowest values were with Chisel. The highest values of soil bulk density were under Disc Harrow tillage which was more than Chisel strips, and the lowest values were under Ridging and Wide Level Disc. The highest values of soil porosity were under Chisel plow and at the Wide Level Disc and the lowest values were under Disc Harrow which was less than Chisel strips. The highest values of soil penetration resistance were under the Mould board, and Chisel plow, and the lowest values were under the Mould board. The tillage methods significantly affected the plant yield. The highest value of Sesame yield was at the Disc Harrow and the lowest value was at Chisel. The tillage operations followed the same trend of polynomial relation operation with crop yields.

Conclusion: It was concluded that shallow and intermediate tillage treatments along with disc harrow and wide level disc operation were found inferior in improving soil physical properties. Tilth index rank top the non-soil inversion operations (Chisel plow and double disc).

Keywords: Tillage, Tilth index, Soil physical property, Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP).

How to cite this article: Abbas OM and Mohammed HI (2022). Application of a knowledge-based decision support model for soil tilth assessment. *J. Agri. Res. Adv.*, 04(03): 01-10.

Introduction

Soil tillage is usually carried out to change the soil's physical properties to provide a good seedbed and to enable the plants to reach their full productivity potential. Field crops in Sudan are cultivated in vast areas mainly under different types of soils and crops, with millions of ha in the irrigated sector (Gezira, New Halfa, Rahad, Suki, Blue Nile, White Nile, Sundose, El Select, and Sugar projects), and 10.5 million ha in the rain-fed sector (mechanized rain-fed "7.14 million ha", and traditional agriculture "8.4-10.5 million ha"). They produce sugar, cotton, sorghum, millet, sesame, sunflower, groundnut, and vegetables and fruits (Mohamed and Farah, 1999).

Copyright: Abbas and Mohammed. Open Access. This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made.

The seedbed for these crops is prepared by different types of implements. It is thus necessary to develop and apply a knowledge-based decision-aid model to help in selecting the most effective implement to till each type of soil to maximize the productivity of grown crops. The determination of the performance of tillage implements and their effect on soil physical properties is of vital importance to alleviate the prevailing land deterioration. The analysis of soil before and after tillage might be a useful tool to determine the optimum tillage requirement. This, however, requires specification of the functional relations of the best soil indicators that can best describe the properties of the soil, the crop, and the capabilities of the implement. Copec et al (2015) indicated that changes in the soil physical properties (aggregate size, moisture content, penetration resistance, and bulk density) resulting from soil tillage treatment influence yield levels of grown crops. Rasmussen (1999)

observed that different tillage methods produced different yields, which appeared to relate to the soil tilth produced by tillage methods.

Chen (1994) showed that evaluating the effect of three tillage systems, (strip-tillage chisel plow and no-tillage systems) showed no significant differences in soil moisture status, although changes in soil moisture storage were much greater with strip-tillage and chisel plow than no-tillage. Lal (1999) studied the effects of three tillage methods (no-till (NT), chisel plowing (CP), and moldboard plowing (MP).) and two working depths on the physical properties of clay soil in northwestern Ohio. The results had a significant effect on soil bulk density with tillage methods, but bulk density is not significantly different with depth, showing trends in order of $NT > MP > CP$ for 0 to 10 cm depth and $NT > CP > MP$ for 10 to 20 cm depth. The data on saturated hydraulic conductivity (Ks) were highly variable and treatments did not affect it. Moisture retention characteristics differed significantly among depths but not among tillage treatments. Celik, (2011) stated that the soil bulk density was determined before and after tillage operation, results show the soil bulk density decreased with increasing the number of blades and plow speed while soil bulk density decreased with increasing the plowing depth also, the hydraulic conductivity increased with increasing of deep tillage. Aqeel and Nassir (2018) showed that the tractor and implement performance are closely related to soil physical properties such as bulk density, texture, and moisture content. Pagliani et al (2004) and Guerif et al (2001) indicated that tillage improves the seedbed conditions and soil structure, resulting in improved soil moisture. Field experiment (2006 and 2007) was conducted by Ozpinar (2010) in the Marmara Region of Western Turkey to study the effect of two types of conservation or reduced tillage [shallow tillage (ST) with a rototiller and chisel tillage (CT)] and conventional tillage with a moldboard plow (MT) on bulk density, penetration resistance, water content, oxygen diffusion rate and crop yields in a clay loam soil. The result of Ozpinar's (2010) study shows that shallow tillage with rototiller (ST) produced grain yield as much as conventional tillage with a moldboard plow (MT) in 2006, while there were no significant differences among tillage systems in 2007. Soil water content was greater under ST than under MT. ST is also No difference was found among

tillage treatments in terms of bulk density and penetration resistance at the topsoil. None of the tillage systems did show non-significant differences in terms of maize yield.

Dahab and Elzain (2011) investigated the effect of three types of tillage implements (chisel, offset disc harrow, and ridger) on bulk density, porosity, aggregate stability, and penetration resistance of sandy clay soils and clay soil at two locations in Khartoum state. The study reveals that the bulk density of the soil surface layer was reduced by all tillage treatments compared to no-till, and the values were higher for the clay soil. Soil porosity for all treatments decreased with depth. Bulk density and porosity were generally interrelated, and simple regression analysis showed a high correlation between the two parameters in both soils for the different treatments. A highly significant difference at the 1 % level was observed between the effects of different tillage treatments on average porosity percentages. The offset disc harrow had the lowest aggregate stability percentages for both soils. Penetration resistance of the upper soil depth, 0-15 cm, was significantly reduced by tillage treatments compared to no-till in both soil types. The highest reduction was with the offset disc harrow as 31 % in sandy clay soil and 52 % in clay soil. In general, soil penetration resistance increased with depth, and the values were higher in clay soil.

Abdalla et al studied at the University of Khartoum Demonstration Farm (2015), the performance of two tillage implements: (disc and chisel plow) and their effect on some soil physical properties. The study result showed that disc and chisel plow decreased the soil bulk density, while particle size was not affected by both implements. The soil porosity values were also increased for both implements. The soil moisture content recorded in 30 cm soil profile depth was higher for the chisel plow as compared to the disc plow. The infiltration rate obtained by the disc plow was slightly higher than the chisel plow.

Several attempts have been made by many soil scientists and agricultural engineers to quantitatively describe soil tilth by formulating indices, which are sometimes correlated to crop yields. The soil tilth index (TI), originally developed by Singh et al. (1992) is the pioneering work which subsequently modified by Tapela and Colvin (1998). They developed the tilth index to quantify soil tilth using coefficients based on

five soil physical properties (bulk density, cone index, uniformity coefficient, organic matter content, and plasticity index). The index ranged from 0 for conditions unusable by plants to 1 for non-limiting soil. The field test studies were conducted near Ames, Iowa, and Waseca, Minnesota for continuous corn rotation, and soybean-corn rotation in seasons 1998 and 1999. The tilth index was reported to be more responsive to tillage and provided better correlations with crop yield as compared to a modified productivity index. The tilth index was found to significantly increase by tillage and planting operations and then decrease with time until harvest. The relations were tested on a limited amount of data and assumed to be used as an initial guideline. Singh et al. (1992) concluded that attempts should be made to generalize the relations by extensive data collection over a wide range of soil, climatic, and management conditions.

Bockari-Gevao et al (2006) investigated the effects of different speeds of rotary tillage and a tractor on some soil physical properties (bulk density, cone index, plasticity index, aggregate uniformity coefficient) and organic matter, and they developed and evaluated a soil tilth index based on the model developed by Singhi et al (1992) changes in these soil properties in Malaysian paddy fields. The results of the experiment conducted by Bockari-Gevao, et al (2006) indicated a significant decrease in bulk density of the soil due to rotary tillage. The other soil parameters were not significantly affected by the tillage operation. Analysis of variance indicated a significant difference ($p < 0.01$) among the rice yield means. Bulk density was identified to have a high positive correlation with the rice yield. A tilth index consequently developed with only three soil property indicators (bulk density, cone index, and plasticity index) which gave better predictability ($r = 0.56$) of rice yield than when individual soil properties were considered. Results of the study suggest that the tilth index may be used as a tool to assist in yield prediction. El-Nady, et al (2009) calculated tilth index (T1) from a field experiment of two tillage practices, the traditional tillage, using different chisel plowing passes, and the moldboard plow and two crops wheat and faba bean, to determine the optimum tilth index value for maximum yield of crops. Five soil physical properties, i.e. soil bulk density, cone index, aggregate uniformity

coefficient, organic matter content, and plasticity index, were determined for each tillage system to quantify T1 according to the model. The results of the experiment indicated the increase of tilth index as plowing passes increased in the range of 0.52 to 0.67, and the index varies with tillage implement, with the highest value obtained with a moldboard plow (0.71). The yield of wheat and faba bean also varied according to the tillage practices and to the T1 values.

Lars et al (2019) reported that "Although tilth concept dated back 1920s, for millennia there has been a strong focus both in practice and in research on developing tillage tools that create suitable growing conditions for different crops, soil types, and climatic conditions, and it still needs to be quantified to practically use it to evaluate tillage quality and to select effective implement to reach the goal of improving the productivity of crops by reaching a high tilth index".

The work conducted by Meidani, (2014), Bockari-Gevao et al (2006), Colvin et al (1984) Tapela and Colvin (1998) Kiniry et al (1983) Gantzer and Mccarty (1987), Gale et al (1991) is directed to develop soil productivity index rather than quantifying the quality of tillage and its impacts on soil productivity. Recently, Musa and Mohamed (2021) developed a knowledge-based decision support model to determine a more representative tilth index. The developed model is based on correcting the limitations present in the tilth index procedures made by Singh et al. (1992), Bockari-Gevao, et al (2006), and El-Nady, et al (2009). The tilth index adjustment model calculates the tilth index of the soil at a particular time, estimates crop yield, and provides suggestions for sustaining or improving the tilth. The scheme utilizes the analytical hierarchy procedure to develop a tilth adjustment factor which is based on a combined weight to capture the effects of both the implement and the soil properties. The newly developed model is verified using data published by both Singh et al. (1992), and Bockari-Gevao, et al (2006).

Against this background the objectives of this study are- to develop the functional relations of the soil property indicators by investigating the performance, and effects of five tillage methods on some soil physical properties and yield of rainfed Sesame crop; to apply a developed knowledge-based decision support model for soil tilth assessment to aid in ranking and selecting

the suitable implement for conducting tillage operation, and finally to predict crop yields from knowledge of the developed adjusted tilth index

Materials and Methods

Data Collection and Analysis

The experiment was carried out at El Seleait Project which is located in northeast Khartoum State, about 40 km distance from the city center. The site is typical of rain-fed cultivation in the Butana area with same arid climate, cracking clay soil and rain-fed cultivation practices (Table 1).

Table 1: Some selected physical and chemical properties of the study soil

Soil property	Mean Value
Na value	15.8
P2O5 (ppm)	115
N (ppm)	530
C (%)	0.42
Clay (%)	67
Nitrate (ppm)	3.4
PH glass electrode (1:5)	7.5
Exchangeable Ca (mg/100 gm)	19.5
Salts (%)	0.05

The experiment was laid out as a randomized strip plot design with three replications, and five different tillage implements Chisel plow, Ridging, Spilt Ridging, Moldboard plow, Disc harrow plow, and wide level disc. A soil depth in the range of 10cm to 20 cm is maintained using a 72-horse power tractor. The land was divided into three blocks the tillage treatments are arranged in five random strips in each replication block at horizontal direction parallel to a field ditch and s three water moisture regimes (fully-irrigated, one supplemental irrigation, and rain-fed) in the vertical direction, in two seasons 2018 and 2019. Data for four soil properties (Bulk density, Soil moisture content, soil porosity, and Penetration resistance) were measured following each tillage operation in each strip; Bulk density (Mgm-3) is measured by the core method following Blake (1965). Soil moisture content (%) was measured by oven dry method according to Khan, et al, (2014). The moisture content in soil was determined by taking a soil sample from 0-20 cm and 20-40 cm, placing fresh soil in an oven at 105 C° for 24 hours. Any loss in soil sample weight after drying was considered as moisture content. Moisture content % = (((Wet soil weight)-(Oven dry soil weight))/ Oven dry soil weight) × 100.

Soil porosity (%) as the ratio of the volume of pores (cm³) to its total volume of the soil (cm) is calculated from bulk density and particle density measurements. Penetration resistance (KPa) was measured by cone penetrometer with length 13mm, diameter 9 mm, and net weight of 1.134 kg. Sesame (*Sesamum indicum* L.) crop planting was carried out in the third two weeks of July due to delay of onset of effective rainfall; weeding was carried out whenever necessary. The supplementary irrigation water was applied during periods of drought when the soil started to crack. Generally, the provision of irrigation water was applied in the second half of pod-setting. Cultural practices for variety Khidir recommended by Agricultural Research Corporation are followed. At harvest, two rows were harvested each six meters long to determine the seed yield in Mg /ha.

The Tilth Index Model

The Knowledge-based tilth index determination model developed by Musa and Mohammed (2021) in a companion paper is adopted to estimate the tilth index for each of the studied tillage operations from the data of seasons 2018 and 2019 and by following the procedure depicted in the general flow chart of Figure 1.0. The steps of determination are as follows:

Step 1: Scooping of indices:

The purpose of the scooping step is to propose a set of candidate soil properties that need to be maintained by tillage operations for improving crops yield. These candidate soil property indicators are expected to reflect soil functions and purposes of conducting tillage activities. Guided by published literature the raw initial set of proposed soil attributes to express tilth quality and diagnose impacts of tillage operations on quality of seedbed preparation are suggested in this study to include: (1) bulk density, (2) soil depth (3) infiltration, (4) penetration resistance "cone index", (5) soil porosity, (6) plasticity index, (7) soil roughness, (8) clod size "or aggregate uniformity coefficient", (9) organic matter, (10) weeding efficiency, and (11) water holding capacity " or water content", and (12) soil compaction. These soil properties shall be short-listed to have an amenable size.

Step 2: Screening and pairwise comparison

Following Musa and Mohammed (2021) tilth index decision support model the initial list of soil properties is to be reduced by a screening scheme depending on five criteria combined in

the relation: $(A = (\sum(S, U, M, I, R)/total))$ given by Cameron et al. (1998) Where: A = Acceptance score; S = Sensitivity to soil degradation; U =Ease of understanding of its value. M: measurement cost-effectiveness; I: Influence on soil, and plant productivity; R: Relationship to ecosystem processes, Total basic scores. Each parameter in the equation is given a score (1 to 5) based on the user’s knowledge and experience. The sum of the individual scores to the sum of basic scores (25) gives the level of acceptance (A) score which can be ranked in comparison to other potential indicators, such that if the values of individual scores are less than 0.5 it will be rejected.

Step 3: The Establishment of Indicators

Indicator Functional Relationships: In the model, the indicator to express each soil attribute can be defined quantitatively from the measured soil data of each parameter by employing a polynomial relationship (tilth coefficient) following the principle of diminishing return for crop growth rate by the following general relation format (Singh et al,1992);

$$CF(x) = A_0 + A_1 * X + A_2 * X^2 + \dots + A_n * X^n, \dots (2)$$

Where: CF(x) = tilth coefficient for the soil property attribute (X), and A₀, A₁,, A_n = empirical constants.

The functional polynomial relationship relation for the evaluation indicators of the selected to reflect soil properties are as:

1-Bulk density (BD in Mgm OM):

$$CF (BD) = 1.0, \text{ for } BD \leq 1.3 \text{ Mg/m}^3 \dots\dots (3)$$

$$CF (BD) = - 1.5 + 3.87 * BD - 1.5 * BD^2; \text{ for } 1.3 < BD \leq 2.1 \text{ Mg/m}^3 \dots\dots(4)$$

$$CF (BD) = 0.0, \text{ for } BD > 2.1 \text{ Mg/m}^3 \dots\dots (5)$$

2-Cone index (CI in MPa) or Penetration resistance:

$$CF (CI) = 1.0, \text{ for } CI \leq 1.0 \text{ MPa} \dots\dots\dots (6)$$

$$CF (CI) = 1.012 - 0.002 * CI - 0.01 * CP,$$

$$\text{For } 1.0 \leq CI \leq 10.0 \text{ MPa} \dots\dots\dots (7)$$

$$CF (CI) = 0.0, \text{ for } CI > 10.0 \text{ MPa} \dots\dots\dots (8)$$

3-Porosity (P in %): The total soil porosity is to be classified as a textural proxy-indicator to express soil depth, and water storage capacity. Porosity is measured as relative value depending on the actual percentage of pores occupied by air and water to the proportion of soil pores in ideal soil of 40%.

4-Soil moisture (%): This indicator is the relative value of actual soil moisture related to 80% of theoretical soil moisture at field capacity. The soil

moisture at field capacity can be taken as given by Allen et al (1998).

Step 4: Development of Combined Relative Weight

This step is based on running the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP), which is accomplished by generating entries of alternative tillage operations to the proposed tilth evaluation indicators in a pair-wise comparison matrix where elements are compared to each other. For each pair-wise comparison matrix, the decision-maker typically uses the eigenvector method (Saaty, 1977; Waisil et al 2003; Golden et al, 1989) to generate a priority vector that gives the estimated, relative weights of the elements at each level of the hierarchy. Weights across various levels of the hierarchy are then aggregated using the principle of hierarchic composition to produce a final combined weight or adjustment factor for each alternative tillage operation. To mask the subjectivity nature in giving weights by pair-wise comparison for the alternative tillage operations and the selected evaluation indicators the user must run the consistency and satisfaction tests. If they are positive the adjustment factors will be accepted otherwise weights generated by pair-wise comparisons need be revised to reach an acceptable adjustment factors (scores).

Step 5: Development of Tilth Index:

To arrive to an overall tilth index for each tillage operation a linear multiplicative relation is to be used to express the functional relations for the proposed indices (tilth coefficient) and their sum is to be adjusted with the score developed in step four. However, the overall adjusted tilth index can be expressed as:

$$ATI = (CF(X_1) * CF(X_2) * C F(X_3) * \dots\dots CF (X_{n-1}) * C F (X_n)) * \text{Score} \dots\dots (3)$$

Where: ATI = overall adjusted tilth index for tillage operation; CF (xi) = tilth coefficients for each of n soil indicator, and Score = the combined relative weight for the soil indicator - implement type determined by AHP.

Results and Discussion

1- The Soil Physical Properties after tillage

The effect of different tillage operations on the measured physical properties during seasons 2018 and 2019 were given (Tables 2 and 3) respectively.

Table 2: The effect of different tillage operations on some physical properties during season 2018

Tillage Operation	Soil bulk density (Mgm-3)	Soil moisture content %	Soil porosity %	Penetration resistance KPa
Chisel Plow	1.302 b*	2.474 e	46.877 d	432.317 a
Double Ridging	1.214 e	2.650 d	50.179 a	247.997 b
Mould board plow	1.233 d	3.434 b	49.478 b	183.36 c
Wide Level Disc	1.295 c	3.597 a	47.117 c	443.203 a
Disc Harrow Plow	1.352 a	2.976 c	44.986 e	445.094 a

Table 3: The effect of different tillage operations on some physical properties during season 2019

Systems of tillage	Soil bulk density (Mgm-3)	Soil moisture content %	Soil porosity %	Penetration resistance KPa
Chisel Plow	1.436 b	3.338 e	34.817 d	601.017 a
Double Ridging	1.460 c	3.551 c	33.891 c	295.480 d
Mould board Plow	1.413 e	5.393 a	35.662 a	229.353 e
Wide Level Disc	1.368 d	4.468 b	37.380 b	485.940 c
Disc Harrow Plow	1.467 a	4.931 d	33.651 e	576.720 b

Bulk density ($Mg\ m^{-3}$): It showed that in season 2018 different tillage treatments result (Table 2) in a significant decrease in soil bulk density (Lal, 1999; Dahab and Elzain, 2011; Aqeel and Nassir, 2018; Abdalla et al 2015) except the disc harrow which results in higher value, because of inverting of the hard subsoil to the upper layer by the discs (Ozpinnar, 2010; Aqeel and Nassir, 2018). The lowest value was obtained under Double Ridging which does not invert the soil and does not go deep into it as the chisel plow does and does it not invert the soil.

Soil moisture content (%): Table 2 shows that the different tillage treatments in season 2018 significantly affected the soil moisture content (Ozpiner 2005; Aqeel and Nassir (2018)). The highest value was found under wide level disc that may be due to high moisture stored in the soil deep layer not affected by the shallow discs (Alizadeh, and Allameh, 2015; Meena, et al 2011; Ahmad et al 2010; Barua, et al., 2014), and the lowest value was for chisel plow (Afyuni, 2006; Abdalla et al 2015). As given in table 3 data of soil moisture content is affected significantly by all tillage treatments compared with the wide level disc (Control as traditional practice in rain-fed areas). As shown in table 3 there are no significant differences between Disc Harrow plow, Mould board plow, and Wide Level Disc and they recorded higher values of soil moisture content. Similarly, there were no significant differences between Chisel plow and Double Ridging and they recorded the lowest values of soil moisture content.

Soil porosity (%): It showed that different tillage treatments significantly affected soil (Table 2)

porosity at all treatments in season 2018. The highest value is found by Double Ridging followed by Mould board plow and Chisel tillage, while the lowest values are given by Disc Harrow plow and then wide level disc. The low level of moisture content with those operations using disc may be attributed to the dryness of inverted pulverized soil by the disc. However, with Wide Level Disc moisture stored in the deeper layers is less affected. Table 3 shows soil porosity data for season 2019 where Mould board and Wide Level Disc significantly affected soil porosity (Dahab and Elzain, 2011; Abdalla et al 2015; Aqeel and Nassir, 2018), and disc harrow and ridging are affected negatively due to their high bulk density, the highest value was found under wide level and the lowest value was under disc harrow tillage.

Penetration resistance (KPa): The data record for penetration resistance measured in season 2018 is depicted in Table 2, which shows a significantly high effect of Disc Harrow plow, Wide Level Disc, and Chisel plow as one group compared to the group of Double Ridging and Mould board plow, but there is no significant effect within each group. The highest value was under disc harrow tillage, and the lowest value was under Mould board operation. Table 3 shows the results of penetration resistance measured in season 2019. The table indicates that the tillage treatments affected significantly the soil penetration resistance at all treatments. The highest value was found for the chisel operation, and the lowest value was under the Mould board. (Ozpiner, 2005; Dahab and Elzain, 2011; Aqeel, and Nassir, 2018).

2-The Sesame yields (Mg/ha)

It was showed (Table 4) Sesame (*Sesamum indicum* L.), for seasons 2018 and 2019 for the studied tillage treatments. It indicates a significant difference in Sesame yield with tillage treatments compared with Wide Level Disc. Higher values were recorded for season 2018. The yield shows a similar trend with tillage treatments in the two seasons with the highest yield obtained with the Chisel plow operations and the lowest yield with Wide Level Disc operations in the two seasons (Copec et al, 2015).

Table 4: Crop Yield Data for Seasons 2018 and2019

Tillage Operation	Rainfed Yield (Mg/ha)	
	Season 2018	Season 2019
Chisel plow	0.700	0.294
Double Ridging	0.621	0.266
Mould board plow	0.570	0.264
Disc Harrow plow	0.528	0.269
Wide Level Disc	0.533	0.268

Table 5: Results of Application of Screening approach

Soil Property	S	U	M	L	R	Score	Decision
(1) bulk density	4	4	5	3	2	72	Accepted
(2) soil depth	3	2	1	3	2	44	Rejected
(3) infiltration	2	2	3	2	2	44	Rejected
(4) penetration resistance "cone index"	4	5	4	3	5	84	Accepted
(5) soil porosity	4	4	5	3	2	72	Accepted
(6) plasticity index	2	2	1	3	2	40	Rejected
(7) soil roughness	2	2	3	2	2	44	Rejected
(8) Particle size "or aggregate uniformity coefficient"	2	2	1	2	2	36	Rejected
(9) organic matter	2	1	1	2	2	32	Rejected
(10) weeding efficiency	2	2	3	2	3	48	Rejected
(11) moisture content	3	5	3	5	4	80	Accepted
S = Sensitivity to degradation	U =Ease of understanding					M =cost-effectiveness	
L = property influence on soil	R = Relation to Ecosystem					A = ∑(S, U, M, I, R)	

4)-Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP).

The adopted process is typical to the flow chart (Fig. 1) The calculation steps are:

1. Develop a pair-wise comparison matrix for each decision alternative for each criterion, using the scale of comparison (1 = Equal importance, 3= Moderate importance of one factor over, 5= Strong or essential importance, 7= Very strong importance, 8= Extreme importance, 2,4,6,8 Values for inverse comparison).

3-Determination of The Tilth Index

Model Application: The measured data for the impacts of tillage operations on the tested soil properties for season 2018 and (2019) shall be used as input data to run the tilth development model. The sequence of calculations is as follows:

1)-*Scooping:* As given in previously (Material and Methods-Tilth Index Model) eleven soil attributes are suggested to evaluate the performance of each tillage operation.

2)-*Screening:* The screening criteria proposed in the model are used to reach a shortlist of practical indicators as showed (Table 5).

It is evident from table 5 the most relevant soil properties to be included in the shortlist are: (1) bulk density (2) penetration resistance "cone index" (3) soil porosity, and (4) soil water content 3)-*Functional Relations:* The application of the polynomial functional relations for the selected soil attributes to generate the respective indicators is given for season 2018 and 2019 (Table 5 and 6) respectively.

2. Synthesization

- a. Sum each column value of the pair-wise comparison matrices.
- b. Divide each value in each column by its column sum.
- c. Average the values in each row of the normalized matrices.
- d. Combine the vectors of preferences for each criterion.

3. Develop a pair-wise comparison matrix for the criteria.
4. Compute the normalized matrix. Combine these two sets of preferences using eigen values to mathematically derive a composite score for each site. Select the site with the highest score.
5. Develop the preference vector.
6. Check Consistency and satisfaction level using a random index value table (Saaty, 1980). If the result is negative re-adjust the pair-wise comparison matrices (go to steps 1 & 3), otherwise go to step 5. There are 3 steps to arrive at the consistency ratio: a). Calculate the consistency measure. $CI = (\lambda_{max} - n) / (n - 1)$; b). Calculate the consistency index (CI); c). Calculate the consistency ratio (CI/RI where (RI) is a random index ($CR = CI / RI$)).

5) The Overall Adjusted Tilth Quality Index

To determine the Overall Adjusted Tilth Quality Index the indicator tillage index (measured from functional relations of attributes) is multiplied with score values (adjustment factors measured by AHP) for each tillage operation in each season (vide table 5 and 6). The Overall Adjusted Tilth Quality Index is compared to the values of Sesame yield (Mg/ha) in each of the two seasons. Comparison of The Overall Adjusted Tilth Quality Index with crop yields for seasons 2018, and 2019 shown in Figure 3.0 reveals that although crop yield values are higher than the adjusted tilth index, they almost follow the same trend of polynomial relation with Correlation coefficient (R^2) of 0.996 for yield and 0.992 for tilth index in season 2018, while the values of the correlation coefficient (R^2) for season 2019 are 0.813 for yield and 0.852 for tilth index. The results of the two seasons indicate a similar ranking order for tillage operations and confirm the preference of those of non-soil inversion action (Chisel followed by double Ridging).

Conclusion

Tillage operation significantly affected soil physical properties showing an increase in soil moisture content, soil porosity, and decrease in soil bulk density and soil penetration resistance. The highest values of moisture content were at Wide Level Disc, and the lowest values were with Chisel. The highest values of soil bulk density were under Disc Harrow tillage which was more than Chisel strips, and the lowest values were under Ridging and Wide Level Disc. The highest values of soil porosity were under

Chisel plow and at the Wide Level Disc and the lowest values were under Disc Harrow which was less than Chisel strips. The highest values of soil penetration resistance were under the Mould board, and Chisel plow, and the lowest values were under the Mould board. The tillage methods significantly affected the plant yield. The highest value of Sesame yield was at the Disc Harrow and the lowest value was at Chisel.

The results of the two seasons indicate a similar ranking order for tillage operation and confirm the preference of those of non-soil inversion action (Chisel followed by double Ridging). The tillage operations almost follow the same trend of polynomial relation operation with crop yields.

References

- Abdalla OA, Elmahi AEM and Abbouda SK (2015). Performance of Disc and Chisel Plows and their Effects on Some Soil Physical Properties. U. of K. J. Agric. Sci. 23(1): 16-32.
- Afyuni M and Waggar MG (2006). Soil physical properties and bromide movement in relation to tillage system. Communications in soil science and plant analysis, 37(3-4): 541-556.
- Ahmad M, Abdullah H, Iqbal M, Umair M and Ghani MU (2010). Effect of deep tillage on soil properties and crop (wheat) yield. J Soil & Environ. 29(2): 177-180.
- Alizadeh MR and Allameh A (2015). Soil properties and crop yield under different tillage methods for rapeseed cultivation in paddy fields. J Agric Sci. 60(1): 11-22.
- Allen RG, Pereira LS, Raes D and Smith M (1998). Crop evapotranspiration Guidelines for computing crop requirements. Irrigation and Drainage Paper. No. 56, FAO, Rome, Italy 300 p.
- Aqeel J and Nassir (2018). Effect of Moldboard Plow Types on Soil Physical Properties Under Different Soil Moisture Content and Tractor Speed . Basrah J. Agric. Sci., 31 ISSN 1814 – 5868.
- Barua NG, Bora PK, Kurmi K, Karmakar RM and Paak PK (2014). Effect of tillage on soil moisture and energy conservation in production of toria in an inceptisol of Assam. Ind J of Dryland Agric Res and Development; 29(2): 78-82.

- Blake GR (1965). Methods of soil analysis. Part 1 physical and mineralogical properties. *Am. Soc. of Agron. J.* 57: 373-390.
- Bockari-Gevao S, Ismail WI, Yahya A and Sung CTB (2006). A Modified Soil Tilth Index and Its Relationship with Rice Yield. *ScienceAsia* 32 (2006). Doi: 10.2306/scienceasia1513-1874.2006.32.025.
- Bockari-Gevao SM, Ismail W, Yahya A and Sung CTB (2006). A Modified Soil Tilth Index and Its Relationship with Rice Yield. *ScienceAsia* 32 (2006): 25-30. Doi: 10.2306/scienceasia1513-1874.2006.32.025.
- Celik I (2011). Effects of tillage methods on penetration resistance, bulk density and saturated hydraulic conductivity in a clayey soil conditions. *J AgricSci* 17, 143-156.
- Chen ZS (1994). Sampling design for studying the relationships between heavy metals in soils, sediments, and discharged waste waters. In: *Sampling of Environmental Materials for Trace Analysis*, B. Market (Ed.). VCH Publisher, Weinheim and New York, Chapter 19, pp. 365-378.
- Colvin TS, Erbach DC, Buchele WF and Cruse RM (1984). Tillage index based on created soil conditions. *Trans. of the ASAE* 27: 370-1.
- Colvin TS, Erbach DC, Buchele WF and Cruse RM (1984) Tillage index based on created soil conditions. *Trans. of the ASAE* 27: 370-1. 27.
- Dahab MH and Elzain SAM (2011). Effect of Selected Tillage Implements on Physical Properties of Two Types of Soils in Khartoum Area (Sudan). Vol.42 NO.2 2011. *Agricultural Mechanization in Asia, Africa, and Latin America*.
- El-Nady MA and Youssef MFA (2009). Quantifying soil tilth for wheat and Faba bean crops using tilth index. *Bulletin of Faculty of Agriculture, Cairo University* 2009 60(2): 220-225.
- Gale MR, Grigal DF and Harding RB (1991). Soil productivity index: predictions of site quality for white spruce plantations. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 55: 1701-8.
- Gantzer CJ and Mccarty TR (1987). Predicting corn yields on claypan soil using a soil productivity index. *Trans. of the ASAE* 30: 1347-52.
- Khan GD, Din S, Ramzan M, Hanif M and Hameed M (2014). Influence of Tillage and Mulching Practices on Soil Physical Properties under Semi-Arid Environment. *Journal of Environment and Earth Science*. Vol.4, No.9, 2014. ISSN 2224-3216 (Paper) ISSN 2225-0948 (Online).
- Khan GD, Din SU, Ramzan M and Akbar F (2014). Impact of selected soil physical properties on emergence of maize crop in Peshawar Valley. *J natural Sci Res* ISSN 2224-3186 (Paper) Vol.4, No.7.
- Kiniry LC, Scrivner CL and Keener ME (1983). A soil productivity index based upon predicted water depletion and root growth. *The University of Missouri-Columbia. Coll. Of Agr., Agr. Exp. Sta. Res. Bull.* 1051.
- Lal R (1994). Data analysis and interpretation. In: *Methods and Guidelines for Assessing Sustainable Use of Soil and Water Resources in the Tropics*, R. Lal (Ed.). Soil Management Support Services Technical. Monograph. No. 21. SMSS/SCS/ USDA, Washington D.C, pp. 59-64.
- Lal R (1999). Soil compaction and tillage effects on soil physical properties of a mollicochraqualf in Northwest Ohio. *J Sustainable Agric*, 14:4, 53-65.
- Lars J, Munkholm JL, Pulido-Moncada M and Obour PB (2019). Soil Tilth and Management. Published online: 26 April 2019; <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199389414.013.241>.
- Meena HM, Sharma SK and Meena MC (2011). Soil physical properties of vertisol affected due to different tillage and mulch practices under wheat (*Triticumaestivum* L.). *Ind J Dryland Agric Res Dev*, 26(1): 90-95.
- Mohamed MA and Farah SM (1999). Effect of sowing date on sesame. *Annual Report, Gezira Research Station(ARC), Sudan*
- Ozpinar S (2010). Changes in soil physical properties in response to maize tillage management on a clay loam soil. *Philipp agric scientist* ISSN 0031-7454 93(3): 337-345.

- Ozpinar S and Cay A (2005). Effects of minimum and conventional tillage systems on soil properties and yield of winter wheat (*Triticumaestivum* L.) in clay-loam in the Canakkale region. *Turk J Agric*, 29: 9-18.
- Ozpinar S (2010). Changes in Soil Physical Properties in Response to Maize Tillage Management on a Clay Loam Soil. *The Philippine Agri. Scientist*, 93(3): 337-345.
- Pagliani MN, Vignozzi N and Pellegrinis (2004). Soil structure and the effect of management practices. *Soil Till Res* 79: 131-143.
- Rasmussen KJ (1999). Impact of plowless soil tillage on yield and soil quality: A Scandinavian review. *Soil Till Res*, 53: 3-14.
- Saaty T (1977). A scaling method for priorities in hierarchical structures. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 15: 234-81.
- Saaty TL (1980). *The analytic hierarchy process*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Singh KK, Colvin TS, Erbach DC and Mughal AQ (1992). Tilth index: an approach to quantifying soil tilth. *Trans. of the ASAE* 35: 1777-85.
- Singh KK, Colvin TS, Erbach DC and Mughal AQ (1992). Tilth index: an approach to quantifying soil tilth. *Trans. of the ASAE* 35: 1777-85.
- Singh B and Malhi SS (2006). Response of soil physical properties to tillage and residue management on two soils in a cool temperate environment. *Soil Till Res*, 85: 143-153.
- Tapela M and Colvin TS (1998). The Soil tilth index: an evaluation and proposed modification. *Trans. of the ASAE* 41: 43-8.
