## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	. i
ABSTRACT	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	<b>x</b>
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	. 4
SYSTEMS AND SIMULATION MODELS	. 4
CROP MODELS	. 5
MODEL VALIDATION	. 8
CHAPTER 3: THE CERES-RICE MODEL	. 11
GENERAL FEATURES OF CERES-RICE MODEL	. 13
MODEL INPUTS	. 13
GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT	. 16
Phasic Development	. 16
BIOMASS PRODUCTION AND PARTITIONING	. 18
Germination	. 18
Leaf area and dry matter production	18
Dry matter partitioning	. 18
ROOT SYSTEM DYNAMICS	19
GRAIN YIELD	. 20
SOIL WATER BALANCE	. 20
NITEDOCEN COMPONENT	00

CHAPTER 4: MATERIALS AND METHODS
MODEL CALIBRATION
Field experiment
Climatic data
Soil data
<u>Crop data</u>
DETERMINATION OF GENETIC COEFFICIENTS
MODEL VALIDATION
DATA ANALYSIS
CHAPTER 5 : RESULTS
OBSERVED PHENOLOGICAL EVENTS
CALIBRATION AND DETERMINATION OF GENETIC COEFFICIENTS 32
MODEL TESTING
Phenological Simulations
Heading date
Duration of grain filling (heading to maturity) 39
Number of tillers m <sup>-2</sup>
Leaf Area Index (LAI)
Above Ground Biomass Production 54
Grain Yield and Yield Components
MODEL VALIDATION
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION
REFERENCES
APPENDICES
CURRICULUM VITAE

## LIST OF TABLES

					-	age
Table	1.	General processes diagram for CERES-Rice model.		•	•	12
Table	2.	Phenology and growth genetic coefficients used in the CERES-Rice model version 2.10		•	•	15
Table	3.	Phenological stages of the CERES-Rice model	•		•	17
Table	4.	Treatment combination used in the experiment				24
Table	5.	Soil data for San Sai Series, as employed in the model testing				26
Table	6.	Planting, Transplanting, Heading and Harvesting dates from the experiments of RD7, NSPT and KDML105 at San Pa Tong Rice Experiment Station in 1989 -1991		9		29
Table	7. 2	Soil data for Hang Dong Series, as employed in the model validation	•	5		30
Table	8.	Observed phenological events of rice planted at Multiple Cropping Centre Experiment Station	•	•	7	32
Table	9.	Genetic coefficients of RD7, NSPT and KDML105 obtained from Jintrawet (1991)	1			33
Table	10.	Genetic coefficients of the RD7, NSPT and KDML105 obtained after calibration of Jintrawet's (1991) coefficients	<i>&gt;</i>	\ /	•	38
Table	11.	Simulated and observed heading date for RD7, NSPT and KDML105	•			40
Table	12.	Simulated and observed duration of grain filling (Heading to maturity) of RD7, NSPT, and KDML105.				41
Table	13.	Statistical analysis results of model performance for tiller numbers m <sup>2</sup> of RD7, NSPT, and KDML105	9		0	47
Table	14.	Statistical analysis results of model performance for LAI of RD7, NSPT and KDML105	n	<u>.</u>	٧E	<b>53</b>
Table	15.	Statistical analysis results of model performance for above ground biomass (g m <sup>2</sup> ) of RD7				60
Table	16.	Statistical analysis results of model performance for above ground biomass (g m <sup>-2</sup> ) of NSPT	•	•	•	68
Table	17.	Statistical analysis results of model performance for above ground biomass (g m <sup>2</sup> ) of KDML105				75

Table 18.	components of three rice varieties at five different planting dates
Table 19.	Analysis of variance for observed grian yield 80
Table 20.	Simulated and observed heading and maturity dates (Julian day) and grain yield (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) of RD7, NSPT and KDML105



ลิขสิทธิ์มหาวิทยาลัยเชียงใหม่ Copyright<sup>©</sup> by Chiang Mai University All rights reserved

## LIST OF FIGURES

				Page
Figure	1.	Grain yield during 1980/81 - 1990/91 growing season in the North region		. 2
Figure	2.	Observed growing season (days from sowing to maturity) of RD7, NSPT, and KDML105 as influenced by planting date treatments		33
Figure	3.	Comparison of observed and simulated days to heading and maturity of RD7 using genetic coefficients obtained from Jintrawet (1991)		35
Figure	4.	Comparison of observed and simulated days to heading and maturity of RD7 using new set of genetic coefficients which was obtained by calibrating Jintrawet's (1991) coefficients		35
Figure	5.	Comparison of observed and simulated days to heading and maturity of NSPT using genetic coefficients obtained from Jintrawet (1991)	<b>30</b> 5	36
Figure	6.	Comparison of observed and simulated days to heading and maturity of NSPT using new set of genetic coefficients which was obtained by calibrating Jintrawet's (1991) coefficients	<b>1</b>	36
Figure	7.	Comparison of observed and simulated days to heading and maturity of KDML105 using genetic coefficients obtained from Jintrawet (1991)		37
Figure	8.	Comparison of observed and simulated days to heading and maturity of KDML105 using new set of genetic coefficients which was obtained by calibrating Jintrawet's (1991) coefficients		37
Figure	9.	Comparison between simulated and observed tiller numbers m of RD7 transplanted in (a) May, (b) June, (c) July, (d) August, and (e) September. + — + and — represent simulated and	-	2
		observed data, respectively	.).	44
Figure	10.	Comparison between simulated and observed tiller numbers m <sup>2</sup> of NSPT transplanted in (a) May, (b) June, (c) July, (d) August, and (e) September. + — + and —— represent simulated and observed data, respectively	ve V	rsit
Figure	11.	Comparison between simulated and observed tiller numbers m <sup>-2</sup> of KDML105 transplanted in (a) May, (b) June, (c) July, (d) August, and (e) September. + — + and — represent		
		simulated and observed data, respectively.		46

Figure	12.	Comparison between simulated and observed LAI of RD7 transplanted in (a) May, (b) June, (c) July, (d) August, and (e) September. + — + and —— represent simulated and observed data, respectively	50
Figure	13.	Comparison between simulated and observed LAI of NSPT transplanted in (a) May, (b) June, (c) July, (d) August, and (e) September. + — + and — represent simulated and observed data, respectively	51
Figure	14.	Comparison between simulated and observed LAI of KDML105 transplanted in (a) May, (b) June, (c) July, (d) August, and (e) September. + *represent simulated and observed data, respectively	52
Figure	15.	Comparison between simulated and observed above ground biomass of RD7 at May planting date; (a) stem and leaf, (b) total dry weight and panicle	- 55
Figure	16.	Comparison between simulated and observed above ground biomass of RD7 at June planting date; (a) stem and leaf, (b) total dry weight and panicle	56
Figure	17.	Comparison between simulated and observed above ground biomass of RD7 at July planting date; (a) stem and \$kand panicle	57
Figure	18.	Comparison between simulated and observed above ground biomass of RD7 at August planting date; (a) stem and leaf, (b) total dry weight and panicle	58
Figure	19.	Comparison between simulated and observed above ground biomass of RD7 at September planting date; (a) stem and leaf, (b) total dry weight and panicle.	59
Figure	20.	Comparison between simulated and observed above ground biomass of NSPT at May planting date; otal dry weight and panicle.	62
Figure	21.	Comparison between simulated and observed above ground biomass of NSPT at June planting date; (a) stem and leaf, (b) total dry weight and panicle	63

Figure	22.	Comparison between simulated and observed above ground biomass of NSPT at July planting date; (a) stem and leaf, (b) total dry weight and panicle	64
Figure	23.	Comparison between simulated and observed above ground biomass of NSPT at August planting date; (a) stem and leaf, (b) total dry weight and panicle	65
Figure	24.	Comparison between simulated and observed above ground biomass of NSPT at September planting date; (a) stem and leaf, (b) total dry weight and panicle	6 <b>6</b>
Figure	25.	Comparison between simulated and observed above ground biomass of KDML105 at May planting date; (a) stem and leaf, (b) total dry weight and panicle	70
Figure	26.	Comparison between simulated and observed above ground biomass of KDML105 at June planting date; (a) stem and leaf, (b) total dry weight and panicle	71
Figure	27.	Comparison between simulated and observed above ground biomass of KDML105 at July planting date; (a) stem and leaf, (b) total dry weight and panicle	72
Figure	28.	Comparison between simulated and observed above ground biomass of KDML105 at August planting date; (a) stem and leaf, (b) total dry weight and panicle	73
Figure	29.	Comparison between simulated and observed above ground biomass of KDML105 at September planting date; (a) stem and leaf, (b) total dry weight and panicle	74
Figure	30.	Mean comparison of observed grain yield at various planting dates of RD7, NSPT, and KDML105	81
Figure	31.	Comparison between simulated and observed days to heading and maturity of RD7 during the 1989 to 1990 experiment at San Pa Tong Rice Experiment Station	82
Figure	32.		
		Experiment Station	82

Figure 33.	Comparison between simulated and observed days to heading and maturity of KDML105 during the 1989 to 1991 experiment at San Pa Tong Rice Experiment Station
Figure 34.	Comparison between simulated and observed grain yield of RD7, NSPT, and KDML105 during the 1989 to 1991
	141 UNIVERSI

ลิขสิทธิ์มหาวิทยาลัยเชียงใหม่ Copyright<sup>©</sup> by Chiang Mai University All rights reserved