

Order Number 8903737

**Computer simulation modeling of the growth and development
of the potato crop under different water regimes**

Pinto, Pedro Jorge Cravo Aguiar, Ph.D.

University of California, Davis, 1988

U·M·I

300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Table of contents

1.	Introduction.....	1
2.	The quantification of crop-environment relationships.....	5
2.1.	Weather variability in the origins of agriculture?.....	5
2.2.	The empirical recognition of weather variability on food production.....	6
2.3.	The first organized observations.....	6
2.4.	The first quantitative measurements.....	7
2.4.1.	Reaumur's degree-day.....	7
2.4.2.	Humboldt's vegetation types.....	7
2.4.3.	Plant distribution with temperature.....	7
2.5.	Assessment of climatic potential.....	8
2.5.1.	Climatic classifications.....	8
2.5.2.	Azzi's meteorological equivalents.....	9
2.5.3.	Agroclimatic indices.....	10
2.5.3.1.	Environmental Potential Index (EPI).....	10
2.5.3.2.	Climatic normals.....	10
2.6.	Crop productivity assessment.....	11
2.6.1.	Growing Degree Day.....	12
2.6.1.1.	MGDD - Modified Growing Degree Day.....	12
2.6.1.2.	Nuttonson's photo-thermal unit (PTU).....	12
2.6.1.3.	Other temperature-related indices.....	13
2.6.2.	Biometeorological time.....	13
2.6.3.	Stress-Degree day.....	14
2.6.4.	Modeling methods.....	15

2.6.4.1.	Deterministic approach	16
2.6.4.2.	Stochastic approach	16
2.6.4.3.	The systems approach.....	19
2.6.4.3.1.	Dynamic simulation modeling.....	20
3.	Overview of the POTATO model.....	23
3.1.	Canopy climate.....	26
3.2.	Plant water balance.....	27
3.3.	Plant photosynthesis.....	27
3.4.	Growth and development.....	28
3.5.	Carbon balance and distribution.....	30
4.	The POTATO model version 2.0.....	34
4.1.	Overview of model organization	36
4.2.	Simulation of canopy weather	39
4.2.1.	Calculation of air temperature.....	39
4.2.2.	Calculation of soil temperature.....	42
4.2.3.	Calculation of hourly solar radiation.....	46
4.2.3.1.	Radiation partitioning between crop and soil surface absorption.....	50
4.3.	The soil-plant water balance.....	54
4.3.1.	Infiltration.....	58
4.3.2.	Evapotranspiration.....	59
4.3.2.1.	Partitioning of evapotranspiration.....	61
4.3.2.1.1.	Soil evaporation.....	65
4.3.2.1.2.	Transpiration.....	69
4.3.2.2.	Water uptake by roots.....	70

4.4.	The fibrous root growth submodel	75
4.4.1.	Root growth submodel in POTATO.1	76
4.4.2.	Simulation of root growth	78
4.4.2.1.	Rooting depth	79
4.4.2.2.	Root growth within a layer	79
4.4.2.3.	Root growth into other layers	81
4.4.2.4.	Root suberization	82
4.4.3.	Root uptake capacity. The effective length of fibrous roots	83
4.5.	Other modifications in POTATO.2	86
4.5.1.	Irrigation management	86
4.5.2.	Mother tuber contribution to the growing potato plant	87
4.5.3.	The effect of reduced transpiration on photosynthesis rate	89
4.5.4.	Mass balance checks	91
4.5.5.	Model output	91
5.	Performance of the model	93
5.1.	Model validation	93
5.1.1.	Wolfe's field study	93
5.1.2.	Comparison with field results	97
5.1.2.1.	Total plant and tuber dry weights	97
5.1.2.2.	Stem and leaf dry weight	100
5.1.2.3.	Leaf area index	100
5.1.2.4.	Harvest index	103

5.1.2.5.	Water-use efficiency	103
5.2.	Behavior analysis.....	104
5.2.1.	Root growth.....	105
5.2.1.1.	Root distribution profiles	106
5.2.2.	Water uptake	109
5.2.2.1.	Water uptake profiles.....	109
5.2.2.2.	Seasonal patterns of water uptake	112
5.2.3.	Soil water content.....	112
5.2.4.	Evapotranspiration.....	115
5.2.5.	Net photosynthesis.....	115
5.2.6.	Control variables.....	118
5.2.7.	Organ initiation.....	118
5.2.8.	Hourly behavior	120
5.2.9.	Model behavior with variations in plant density	123
6.	Utilization of the model.....	132
6.1.	Optimal density	132
6.2.	Irrigation scheduling.....	133
6.3.	Relationship between water use and plant density	136
7.	Conclusions	138
7.1.	Positive conclusions.....	138
7.2.	Future directions.....	140
8.	References.....	141
Annex A.1.	Dictionary of variables used in POTATO.2	159
Annex A.2.	POTATO.2 program listing.....	179
Annex A.3.	Standard input files.....	247

List of figures

Fig. 3.1 - The POTATO.1 computer program overview	26
Fig. 3.2 - BACROS rules of assimilate partitioning.....	32
Fig. 3.3 - The effect of RWCPL and PRES on growth.....	32
Fig. 3.4 - Relational diagram between leaf and root growth.....	33
Fig. 4.1 - Variation of total and tuber DW with plant density.....	35
Fig. 4.2.- The POTATO.2 computer program overview.....	38
Fig. 4.3 - Simulated hourly air temperature	42
Fig. 4.4 - Simulated air and soil temperature at various depths.....	45
Fig. 4.5 - Simulated soil temperature profile at different times	45
Fig. 4.6 - Incoming shortwave radiation as a function of solar height	49
Fig. 4.7 - Hourly fractions of solar radiation on two contrasting seasons.....	50
Fig. 4.8 - Fractions of total solar radiation absorbed by the plant canopy and the soil surfaces on overcast days	54
Fig. 4.9 - Van Keulen's simplified model of soil water distribution.....	59
Fig. 4.10 - Plant cover as a function of CMLAI.....	63
Fig. 4.11 - The relationship between air temperature and vapor pressure.....	64
Fig. 4.12 - GFUNCT as a function of crop height.....	64
Fig. 4.13 - HFUNCT as a function of windspeed.....	64
Fig. 4.14 - Fractions of the drying power of the air absorbed by the canopy and the soil.....	68
Fig. 4.15 - The effect of drought on soil evaporation as a function of time from last rain or irrigation.....	68

Fig. 5.4 - Simulated and observed stem+leaf dry weight for the Kennebec and White Rose cultivars and the three irrigation treatments.....	101
Fig. 5.5 - Simulated and observed leaf area indices for the Kennebec and White Rose cultivars and the three irrigation treatments.....	102
Fig. 5.6 - Simulated and observed harvest indices for the two cultivars and the two extreme irrigation treatments	104
Fig. 5.7 - Simulated and observed patterns of water-use efficiency for the two extreme irrigation treatments of both cultivars	104
Fig. 5.8. - a) Simulated root length ratio (W/L) and total root dry weight for the three irrigation treatments of the Kennebec cultivar. b) Simulated ratios of percent cover over effective root length per unit area.....	106
Fig. 5.9.- Effective root length distribution profiles for Kennebec and White Rose with the three irrigation treatments on selected days.....	108
Fig. 5.10 - Simulated daily soil water uptake profiles for Kennebec with all irrigation treatments.....	110
Fig. 5.11 - Simulated daily soil water uptake profiles for White Rose with all irrigation treatments.....	111
Fig. 5.12 - Simulated seasonal patterns of daily water uptake rate for the 100% ET irrigation treatment (Kennebec cv.).....	113

Fig. 5.13 - Simulated seasonal patterns of daily water uptake rate for the 33% ET irrigation treatment (Kennebec cv.)	113
Fig. 5.14 - Simulated variation in soil water content at different depths for the 100% ET irrigation treatment.....	114
Fig. 5.15 - Simulated variation in soil water content at different depths for the 33% ET irrigation treatment	114
Fig. 5.16 - Simulated seasonal time course of daily evapotranspiration for the three irrigation treatments	116
Fig. 5.17 - Simulated seasonal time course of net photosynthesis rates for the three irrigation treatments	117
Fig. 5.18 - Simulated seasonal time course of relative water content of the plant and assimilate-reserve status for the two extreme irrigation treatments.....	119
Fig. 5.19 - Simulated organ numbers for the 100% ET and 33% ET irrigation treatments with Kennebec	120
Fig. 5.20 - Hourly time course of relative water content of the plant (RWCPL) and transpiration rate for the two irrigation regimes on day 60	122
Fig. 5.21 - Hourly air temperature and evolution of the limiting effects of temperature and relative plant water content on photosynthesis rate for the two irrigation treatments on day 60.....	122
Fig. 5.22 - Hourly rate of assimilate transfer to growth and respiration and variation of assimilate-reserve level for the two irrigation regimes on day 60	122

Fig. 5.23 - Plant water and assimilate-reserve level limiters to leaf and root growth for the 100% ET (left) and 33% ET (right) irrigation treatments on day 60.....	123
Fig. 5.24 - Simulated final tuber and total dry weight per unit area and per plant as a function of plant density.....	126
Fig. 5.25 - Simulated time courses of leaf area index for plant densities of 2.5, 5, 7.5, 10, 15, and 20 plants. m ⁻² and respective leaf area durations.....	126
Fig. 5.26 - Simulated seasonal time courses of daily crop growth rate and daily transpiration rate for 2.5, 5, 10 and 20 plants.m ⁻² densities.....	128
Fig. 5.27 - Simulated cumulative soil water evaporation and plant transpiration for the plant densities of 2.5, 5, 10, and 20 plants.m ⁻² fully irrigated.....	130
Fig. 5.28 - Simulated time courses of WUE and transpiration-use efficiency for the plant densities of 2.5, 5, 10, and 20 plants.m ⁻² and 100 % ET irrigation.....	130
Fig. 5.29 - Simulated influence of plant density on the weight of plants at successive dates from emergence.....	131
Fig. 6.1 - Simulated density experiment with the White Rose and Kennebec cultivars.....	133
Fig. 6.2 - Influence of irrigation periodicity and soil texture on tuber yield, total dry weight and end-of-season LAI.....	135
Fig. 6.3 - Simulated seasonal irrigation, transpiration and evaporation for different irrigation frequencies and two soil types.....	135

Fig. 6.4 - Influence of planting density and level of applied water	
on tuber yield and plant dry weight.....	137

List of tables

Table 4.1 - Characteristics of the sine curves for the three	
daily periods.....	41
Table 4.2.- Hourly proportion of total solar radiation.....	50
Table 4.3 - Fractions of total solar radiation absorbed by the plant	
canopy and soil surfaces on clear days.....	53
Table 5.1 - Chronology of D. Wolfe's field trial.....	95