

Use of Remote Sensing in Cotton to Accurately Predict the Onset of Nutrient Stress

Tyson B. Raper, Dr. Derrick M. Oosterhuis, and Dr. Leo Espinoza

Department of Crop, Soil, and Environmental Sciences University of Arkansas Fayetteville, AR

OUTLINE

- Intro
 - N in cotton
 - K in cotton
 - Spatial, temporal variability in production fields
 - Spectral response to N, K
- Objective
- Methods
- Results
- Conclusions





INTRODUCTION

Nitrogen in Cotton Production

- Overall most yield restricting nutrient
 - Limits yield, lowers quality
- Excessive N Causes-
 - Rank growth, boll rot, harvesting difficulties
 - Increased need for growth regulators, insecticides, and defoliants
 - Carryover N environmental hazard
- Applied in the largest quantities
 - Composes a large % of input costs
 - Coupled to energy costs





INTRODUCTION

Cotton and K

- Relatively less efficient at extracting K from soil than several other row crops
- Deficiencies often in upper leaves
 - Possibly due to higher yielding, short-season varieties
 - Sink demand of bolls
- Deficiencies often occur:
 - Under sufficient soil conditions
 - Cassman et al. (1986)
 - Cope (1981)
 - Unpredictably
 - Oosterhuis and Weir (2010)



DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE RESEARCH & EXTENSION

INTRODUCTION

Cotton Production

Temporally, Spatially Variable ٠



INTRODUCTION



NASA defines remote sensing as, "the art of identifying, observing, and measuring an object without coming into direct contact with it."

- Remote Sensing
 - If we can correlate reflectance with chlorophyll content, N status
 - Measure cotton N status in real-time
 - Advantages over soil and tissue testing
 - Distribute fertilizer N, K based on spatial demand



0.4

0.04









BACKGROUND





BACKGROUND

- Index Development/Testing
 - Raper et al. (submitted)
 - Average over three years of data, physiological periods

 N=190
 - Examine relationships between indices and parameters of interest

Average response across the 3rd week of flower bud formation and first week of flowering (end of timely fertilizer application period) in several selected indices to changes in selected cotton growth parameters.





OBJECTIVE

Determine if currently available, N-sensitive indices calculated from active sensors are sensitive to:

- K deficiencies
- Differences in popular cotton cultivars

METHODS

Location

- Lon Mann Cotton Research Station

• Marianna, AR



METHODS

- Location
 - Long-term cotton fertility trail, maintained by Dr. Leo Espinoza



METHODS

- Cultural
 - Strip trial
 - 4 row plots, 50' length
 - Planted @ 3.5 plants/ft, 38" beds
 - Furrow irrigated, as needed (generally on a weekly basis)
 - Fertilizer N applied uniformly
 - Split, 60/40 @ emergence/first square
- Treatments
 - K_2O rate
 - 0, 30, 60, 90 lb K₂O/acre
 - Cultivar
 - Phytogen 499 WRF
 - Stoneville 5458 B2RF
 - DeltaPine 0912 B2RF



METHODS

- Measurements
 - Soil samples
 - Bed shoulder at 6" depth
 - Mehlich 3 extraction
 - Processed and analyzed by the University of Arkansas Soil Testing Laboratory
 - Marianna, AR
 - Tissue
 - Leaf N, K
 - Petiole N, K
 - Flower N,K
 - Reflectance
 - Crop Circle ACS-470
 - Single unit
 - Height of 36"
 - First sensing by hand
 - Second sensing using Spider Sprayer
 - If visual deficiencies present, starting at Early Flower
 - 1 week before, 1 week after peak flower





• Analysis

RESULTS

- Available K₂O was calculated in lieu of applied K₂O due to differences in initial K concentrations
- Available K_2O was defined as:

[(ppm soil test K × 2 × 1.2) + lb K₂O fertilizer/acre]

- Regression analysis was conducted in JMP 10 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC)
 - Independent variables in model included block, available k, cultivar, and interaction between available k and cultivar

Table 1: Soil test K (Mehlich 3) results and calculated available K_2O concentrations from soil samples in Marianna, AR .

	Mehlich-3-extractable soil potassium (ppm)				
	Min	Mean	Maximum		
Rep					
1	63	86	135		
2	67	95	133		
3	96	122	139		
4	80	109	147		
	Calculated available soil potassium (lb K ₂ O/acre) ^a				
	Min	Mean	Maximum		
Rep					
1	181	259	349		
2	160	258	349		
3	260	341	391		
4	232	316	442		

TABLE 1. Interpretation of soil-nutrient concentration most row crops and forages. The interpretation

DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE RESEARCH & EXTENSION

Soil Test Level	Expected Yield Potential [†]	Ρ	K [Most Crops]		
Very Low§	<65%	<16	<61		
Low§	65 - 85%	16 - 25	61 - 90		
Medium§	85 - 95%	26 - 35	91 - 130		
Optimum	100%	36 - 50	131 - 175		
Above Optimum (High)	100%	>50	>175		

*Expected yield potential without fertilization.

*Recommendations are not provided for these nutrients. The listed v SThe soil test levels of "Very Low," "Low" and "Medium" are consider







Stoneville 5458 B2RF

DeltaPine 0912 B2RF







MEMPHIS SILT LOAM,	1-3% SLOPES MEMPHIS SILT I	.OAM, 1
Sec. Of Contract of States		
	* * * *** _ ******* * ****************	
and a second	AND AND A REPORT OF A REPORT O	
LONG_TERM_K_FERT_PLOTS	1 * 1.5 V. J. of Construction of the public and the second of the second of the public and the second of the secon	
And the second s	And a state of the	





NDVI=0.85 CCCI=0.82

NDVI=0.87 CCCI=0.82







NDVI=0.84 CCCI=0.84

NDVI=0.87 CCCI=0.83







NDVI=0.87 CCCI=0.84

NDVI=0.87 CCCI=0.83















CONCLUSIONS

- K and Reflectance
 - Decrease in NDVI with K deficiency
 - Potential to drive foliar K applications
 - Limited response of CCCI with K deficiency
- Cultivar and Reflectance
 - PHY499 had sig higher NDVI, CCCI values
 - ST5458 and DP0912 very similar
- CCCI
 - Significant response to cultivar



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- Fluid Fertilizer Foundation
- Cotton Incorporated
- Western Laboratories





University of Arkansas System

