Nebraska Soybean radiation-use efficiency in high yield production environments Jincoln

Nicolas Cafaro La Menza^{*}, John L. Lindquist, Tim Arkebauer, James E. Specht, George Graef, Patricio Grassini Department of Agronomy and Horticulture, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE. *e-mail: ncafarolm@gmail.com

Background and objective

 \checkmark Soybean is a key component of global food security because of the use of its seeds for \checkmark Analysis of radiation-use efficiency (RUE) in soybean is very difficult due to its high synthesis of protein and lipids during the seed filling phase. protein and oil for food and feed, accounting for 56% of global oilseed production. The objective of this study is to determine the efficiency of capture and use of solar \checkmark Efficiency in the capture and use of seasonal solar radiation to produce biomass and \checkmark seed yield has not been studied in soybean crops that approach yield potential. radiation in producer soybean fields that approach the yield potential.

Materials and methods

✓ Replicated experiments were installed in four producer irrigated fields Heat of combustion of each plant organ was measured with a bomb calorimeter to calculate energy-corrected ADM. in Nebraska (USA) planted with soybean in 2015. These fields had Comparison among locations was made possible by defining three consistently achieved yields >5 Mg ha⁻¹ (75 bu ac⁻¹) in previous \checkmark developmental stages (DS = 0, 1, and 2, corresponding to VE, years, equivalent to >90% of their yield potential. \checkmark Sensors were installed to measure incident, absorbed, transmitted, beginning of pod setting [R3], and physiological maturity [R7]), based photosynthetically active radiation on thermal units accumulated between stages. (PAR). reflected and Measurements were taken every second during the entire crop Seasonal dynamics of LAI, ADM, and fraction of absorbed PAR season, from emergence (VE) to physiological maturity (R7). (fAPAR) were described using exponential cubic models ($R^2 \ge 0.96$) ADM and APAR derived from fitted curves were used to determine \checkmark Plant samples were collected weekly to determine phenology, \checkmark RUE between sampling times and for the whole season.



aboveground dry matter (ADM), and green leaf area index (LAI).



Results

 \checkmark Seed yield ranged from 5.1 to 5.9 Mg ha⁻¹ across fields, which were within ±15% of \checkmark Soybean crops absorbed 2/3 of cumulative incident PAR between emergence and their respective simulated yield potential based on site-specific weather. (*Figure 1*) physiological maturity. (*Figure 2*)



between emergence and physiological maturity.



Conclusions

- ✓ Measured RUE in high-yield soybean crops (5-6 Mg ha⁻¹) did not exceed RUE values reported in the literature.
- Instead, high-yield soybean exhibited a very high capture (ca. 66%) of incident solar radiation during the growing season.
- \checkmark Energy-corrected biomass helped to explain part, but not all, of the decline in RUE during the seed filling, suggesting that other factors may be involved, such as declining leaf N content and respiratory load

| | | | | | | | | | | | - | | • • • | | | <i>c</i> | |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|---|--|------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|---|--|
| ✓ Decline in RUE during | | 0 | 200 | 400 | 600 | 800 | 0 | 200 | 400 | 600 | 800 | associated | with bioma | ss remobiliz | ation | trom | |
| the seed-filling was not | | Cumulative APAR (MJ m ⁻²) | | | | | | | | | | | vegetative organs to seed. | | | | |
| fully explained by seed | Figure | 3: (A) Above | eground dry ma | atter (ADM) a | nd (B) energy | /-corrected Al | DM as a fun | ction of cumu | lative absorbe | d PAR (APAF | Rc). Each line | ✓ Efficiency of | converting in | cident PAR to | phytoer | nergy | |
| oil and protein | represe Tables | ents a línear re indicate seas | egression fitted | l for each loca use efficiency | tion over the (RUF) deriv | range of APA | Rc in which k slope of fitte | biomass was i d linear reare | responsive to i ssions (R²≥0 9 | ncreasing leve 06 P<0.001 | vels of APARc. with different | in high-yield | soybean syst | ems was, on a | average |), 1% | |
| synthesis (Figure 3R) | letters i | indicating sta | tistically signifi | cant differenc | es between l | locations. In (| B), RUE wa | s estimated a | as: ADM energ | y content / A | $APARc \times 100.$ | (seed-yield ba | asis) and 2% | (total-biomass | basis). | | |
| Synthosion(I iguic CD) | Figures | s in insets sho | ow the seasona | al dynamic in l | RUE, with the | latter calculat | ted for the tin | ne intervals b | etween biomas | ss sampling tir | imes. | ✓ These effic | iencies rep | resent bencl | nmarks | for | |
| ✓ Seasonal trends in RUE, | calcu | lated for | r the time | intervals | s betwee | en sampli | ing date | s, indica | te change | es with c | ontogeny. | maximum pr | oductivity in | well-managec | J. hiah- | -input | |
| (insets in Figure 3) | | | | | | | | | | | | sovbean syst | iems. | 5 | , 3 | | |
| ✓ Measured energy in end- | of-sea | son ADM | /I and see | d yield re | epresente | ed, on av | erage, 2 | 2% and 1 | % of the t | total incid | dent PAR | | | | | | |
| during the crop season (a) | ssumi | na root b | piomass to |) represe | nt 15% c | of ADM). | | | | | | | This project | was supported by the | Soyb | eans | |
| 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | | 5 | | | | /- | | | | | | | Nebrasł | a Soybean Board | Nebraska Sor | ybean Board | |
| synthesis.(<i>Figure 3B</i>) ✓ Seasonal trends in RUE, (<i>insets in Figure 3</i>) ✓ Measured energy in end-c during the crop season (a | Ietters in Figures calcu of-seas ssumi | indicating sta in insets sho lated for son ADM ng root b | <i>tistically signific ow the seasona</i> I the time A and see Diomass to | <i>cant differend</i> <u>al dynamic in i</u> intervals d yield re o represe | es between le RUE, with the S betwee opresente nt 15% c | ocations. In (<u>latter calculat</u> on sampli ed, on av of ADM). | (B), RUE wa ted for the tin ing date erage, 2 | s estimated a <u>ne intervals be</u> S, indica ⁻ 2% and 1 | es: ADM energy etween biomas te change % of the f | es sampling tin es with c | APARc x 100. imes. Ontogeny. | ✓ These effic maximum press Soybean syst | asis) and 2% iencies rep oductivity in ems. This project Nebrasl | (total-biomass esent bench well-managec was supported by the a Soybean Board | basis). Imarks I, high- | for -input CONS CONS Cybean Bod s. Driven by Results | |