



## Hand Planter for Maize (*Zea mays* L.) in the Developing World

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Journal:                      | <i>Journal of Plant Nutrition</i>   |
| Manuscript ID:                | LPLA-2014-0093  |
| Manuscript Type:              | Original Articles   |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | 13-Mar-2014   |
| Complete List of Authors:     | Omara, Peter; Oklahoma State University, Plant and Soil Sciences<br>Taylor, Randal<br>Koller, Adrian; Oklahoma State University, Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering<br>Lam, Eric; Oklahoma State University, Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering<br>Macnack, Natasha; Oklahoma State University, Plant and Soil Sciences<br>Ringer, Joshua; Indigdev,<br>Mullock, Jeremiah; Oklahoma State University, Plant and Soil Sciences<br>Dhital, Sulochana; Oklahoma State University, Plant and Soil Sciences<br>Raun, William; Oklahoma State University, Plant and soil Sciences |
| Keywords:                     | Nitrogen < Macronutrients, Fertilizers, Soil Fertility, Yield, Annual Crops, Precision Agriculture  |
|                               |   |

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## Hand Planter for Maize (*Zea mays* L.) in the Developing World

### Abstract

Maize (*Zea mays* L.) grain yields in the developing world hover near 2 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>. Planting maize involves placing two to three seeds per hill, with hills being roughly 30 cm apart. Variability in seeds per hill and distance between hills results in heterogeneous plant stands that lower yields. Oklahoma State University (OSU) has developed a durable hand planter with a reciprocating internal drum that delivers single maize seeds per strike and that can also be used for mid-season application of urea fertilizer. Our current prototype has been comprehensively tested and evaluated to deliver at least 80% single seeds (singulation), 0% misses, work well over a range of seed sizes (2652 to 4344 seeds kg<sup>-1</sup>), different operators, and can be used for mid-season fertilizer application.

*Keywords:* Hand planter, Maize, Plant population

### Introduction

Maize is one of the most important cereal crops in the world and serves as a source of food and income for many communities around the globe. In the developing world, maize is a staple caloric source accounting for as much as 50% of that consumed in some African countries (FAO, 2011). Current annual global maize production is estimated to be about 883 million MT of which roughly 180 million MT (20 % of world production) is produced in Latin America and Africa (FAO, 2011). Ray et al. (2013) noted that the production level in developing nations where maize is so important, needs to be doubled in order to meet the rising population demand by 2050. However, the development of soil fertility and improved production techniques have fallen behind in many of these countries, resulting in average yields near 1.8 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup> (FAO, 2011). Adoption of more efficient production practices are needed to overcome the low

1  
2  
3 productivity commonplace in developing nations (Du Plessis, 2003). In some developing  
4  
5 countries, an increased focus on higher yielding varieties has come at the expense of improved  
6  
7 agronomic practices. Bekele et al. (2011) noted that using high yielding varieties will not  
8  
9 necessarily increase maize yields, unless complemented with needed agronomic practices . In  
10  
11 addition, Heisey and Mwangi (1996) noted that yield increases rather than area expansion will  
12  
13 become progressively more important for increasing crop production as agricultural land is  
14  
15 becoming scarce in Sub-Saharan Africa.  
16  
17  
18

19  
20 In developed countries, maize is planted using mechanized planters that deliver single  
21  
22 seeds at equal depths and spacing resulting in homogenous plant stands and increased yields.  
23  
24 Alternatively, production practices currently used for maize planting in developing countries are  
25  
26 labor intensive and inefficient (Pradhan et al., 2011). The poor socio-economic conditions of  
27  
28 farmers in most developing countries, has limited maize planting mechanization; in many of  
29  
30 these countries maize planting is associated with the use of a heavy stick planter and hand hoes  
31  
32 (Adjei et al., 2003). The planting stick consists of a wooden shaft with a pointed metal tip to  
33  
34 penetrate the soil thus making a hole/depression for seed placement (FAO, 2010). Traditional  
35  
36 planting techniques consist of placing two to three seeds within the hole (shaft/tip depression  
37  
38 created when striking the ground, commonly referred to as ‘hill’) and then seeds are covered by  
39  
40 the surrounding soil. The process is labor intensive, results in multiple seeds emerging per hill,  
41  
42 and non-uniform plant stands (Aitkins et al., 2010).  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 Non-uniform plant stands can increase inter-plant competition and decrease yields  
49  
50 (Nafziger et al., 1991). Boomsma et al. (2011) noted that high plant densities result in reduced  
51  
52 per-plant resource availability, increased plant competition, decreased productivity,  
53  
54 developmental variability, and ultimately lower yields. Work by Chim et al. (2013) showed that  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 1 seed per hill at 0.16 m spacing, increased yields by 0.2-0.9 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup> compared to planting 2-3  
4 seeds at 0.32 and 0.48 m plant spacing. Doerge et al. (2002) reported that for each inch  
5  
6 improvement in the standard deviation of equidistant plant spacing, yields can be increased up to  
7  
8 0.25 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup>. This work also reported that when plants were within 0.05 to 0.07 meter spacing,  
9  
10 maximum by-plant yields were achieved.  
11  
12

13  
14  
15 In addition to potential yield and economic losses, seeds are often pre-treated with  
16  
17 fungicides, introducing a health risk to the farmer when seeds are handled by hand. These factors  
18  
19 and the high price that producers pay for acceptable maize seed, make the improved use of this  
20  
21 resource a necessity.  
22  
23

24  
25 The development of a planter with the ability to make a hole and release a single seed  
26  
27 upon penetration of the soil would improve homogeneity of the plant population, decrease plant  
28  
29 to plant competition and improve yield potential. The objective of this work was to design and  
30  
31 test a hand operated, light-weight planter that could reliably deliver one seed per strike in various  
32  
33 soil textures and tillage systems, regardless of seed size and operator.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

## 40 **Materials and Methods**

### 41 **Prototype Development**

42  
43  
44 Development and evaluation of the OSU hand planter has required testing of various  
45  
46 designs. Initially a square housing with an external spring was used to rotate a reciprocating  
47  
48 drum with a prefabricated cavity capable of holding 1 to 2 maize seeds (Figure 1). The current  
49  
50 design employs a round housing with an internal spring (Figure 2). The primary focus was to  
51  
52 develop a hand planter that delivers at least 80 percent single seeds, and no more than 5 percent  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

misses (no seed delivered). Seed metering performance of the planter depends on the drum and brush specifications.

### Prototype Description and Operation

The hand planter weighs 1.9 kg, with the capacity to contain > 1 kg of seed of various sizes. The seed reservoir is made of a polyvinyl chloride (PVC) round pipe with a diameter of 5.8 cm. Attached to the reservoir is a seed metering delivery system which consists of a short tube containing a reciprocating drum, spring, and brush. A sharp pointed tip/shovel is attached to the metering device that can plant seed to a depth of 5 cm in no-till and tilled soils when the planter tip penetrates the soil (Figure 3). Actual depth of placement depends on the force exerted by the planter operator.

Drum cavity depth and angle are crucial for determining the number of seeds that are released with each strike. Representative rotating drums that were tested, accommodating differing seed sizes, are shown in Figure 4. During operation, the drum cavity is overladen with seed that feeds from the vertical hopper, and via a reciprocating drum, receives one seed at a time using a brush that passes over the cavity removing excess seeds (Figure 5). Brushes of differing tensile strength can be used as necessary for differing seed sizes and shapes. The movement of the drum is facilitated by the force applied on the spring when the planter is pressed downward.

The planter is designed for “up-stroke” seed release, where the operator creates a hole in the soil by pushing the tip into the ground. This movement compresses a spring and rotates the drum to capture each seed in the drum cavity. When the spring is released on the “up-stroke”, the drum rotates back to release the seed within the soil depression created by the tip. A down-

1  
2  
3 stroke release is also possible by rotating the lever attached to the drum (requires altered design  
4 not shown in Figures 2 or 3). The down stroke would release the seed as the planter tip is pushed  
5 into the ground.  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 **Testing and Evaluation**

11  
12  
13 Comprehensive field and laboratory testing was performed to evaluate the effect of  
14 various components on the planter's ability to deliver a single seed regardless of seed size and  
15 operator. During testing, operator, seed size, drum cavity depth, and brush were recorded. Many  
16 drums with varying cavity depth and angle (degrees) have been tested, together with brushes of  
17 varying stiffness.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

## 25 **Seed Size**

26  
27 The inherent differences in maize seed size, weight, and shape can significantly affect the  
28 performance of the planter. Initially, the weight of seeds per kg was used as the only criterion for  
29 determining performance of the drum. Tests were conducted on maize seed ranging from 2652 to  
30 4344 seeds  $\text{kg}^{-1}$  (Table 1). Some seeds have the same density (seeds  $\text{kg}^{-1}$ ) but have different  
31 shapes (medium flats, small round, large round, etc.). However, seed density and volume (seeds  
32  $\text{L}^{-1}$ ), determined via water displacement were found to have a 1:1 relationship (Figure 6). Thus  
33 either method can be used to determine drum size for differing seed sizes.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

## 45 **Field Testing**

46  
47 Field performance testing was conducted at OSU Agronomy Research Station at Efav  
48 Stillwater, Oklahoma to evaluate emergence of maize seeds. A randomized complete block  
49 design was used with 3 replications and 13 treatments; consisting of 2 housings (H1st and H1so),  
50 2 drum sizes (450s and 450b), and 3 seed sizes (3572, 3263 and 2652). All treatments were  
51 planted with Pioneer hybrid maize seed on tilled ground, and a 76 cm row spacing. Emergence  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 counts, including single and multiple seeds, were taken and percent emergence (%) for each  
4  
5 treatment was averaged from the three replications.  
6  
7

### 8 **Urea Application**

9  
10 An added benefit of the hand planter that has been developed is sidedress application of  
11 granular fertilizer. For the application of 50 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> as urea (by plant basis, 70,000 plants per  
12 hectare) an internal drum was easily modified to deliver 1.6 g per plant, per strike. The ability of  
13 the hand planter to deliver granular urea by-plant and corresponding effects on yield were tested  
14 in field experiments at Efaw and Perkins, near Stillwater, Oklahoma in 2013. The site at Efaw  
15 was located on an Easpor loam (Fine-loamy, mixed, thermic, Fluventic Haplustoll) and the site at  
16 Perkins was located on a Teller fine sandy loam (Fine-loamy, mixed, thermic, Udic argiustoll). A  
17 randomized completed block design was employed with 9 treatments and 3 replications. The  
18 fertilizer sources used were urea and urea ammonium nitrate (UAN) (28-0-0). Fertilizer was  
19 either broadcast, dribbled, or side dressed with the hand planter at V12 growth stage (Ritchie et  
20 al., 1997). At maturity, ears of the two middle rows were harvested by hand and shelled, after  
21 which the grain weight was recorded for each plot. Grain yield for each treatment was averaged  
22 over three replications.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

## 45 **Results**

### 46 **Drum Cavity Depth and Angle**

47  
48 Results for seed counts presented in Table 2 combined two cavity angles (20 & 25  
49 degrees) for each cavity depth (5.96 and 6.60 mm). With constant modification and  
50 development, the number of misses has been reduced and the singulation percentage has  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 increased. Drums with increased cavity depth and angle had more strikes with multiple seeds  
4 delivered and fewer misses while drums with a smaller cavity had a higher percentage of misses.  
5  
6

### 7 8 **Seed Size** 9

10 For a fixed cavity size, smaller seeds ( $>4000$  seeds  $\text{kg}^{-1}$ ) had more multiples with fewer  
11 misses compared to larger seeds ( $<3000$  seeds  $\text{kg}^{-1}$ ). With cavity size, depth, and angle design  
12 improvements, the number of singles was significantly improved, and the number of multiples  
13 and misses were reduced with repeated modification of the seed metering unit.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

### 19 20 **Field Testing** 21

22 Field performance and emergence testing showed that the internal housing with the soft  
23 brush (H1so) combined with drum 450s resulted in the highest percentage of singles (85%) with  
24 smaller seed (3572 seeds  $\text{kg}^{-1}$ ) having more multiples and less misses than the larger seed (3263  
25 seeds  $\text{kg}^{-1}$ ) (Figure 7). In the process of drum modification, more multiple seeds per strike have  
26 been allowed in order to obtain fewer strikes with no seeds delivered. This should also assist in  
27 decreasing variability in percent emergence.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 Results for the urea trial for both the Efaw and Perkins locations showed that by-plant  
38 delivery of urea with the hand planter improved yields by 20 to 36% compared to yields  
39 achieved by dribbling urea on the surface. Grain yields were increased by as much as 50 to 75%  
40 when urea was applied with the hand planter compared to treatments where urea was broadcast  
41 applied (Table 3). This can be attributed to reduced ammonia volatilization when urea is sub  
42 surface applied versus surface applications (Jones et al., 2007).  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

### 51 **Up -stroke and Down- stroke** 52

53 The number of multiples and misses using the 'up-stroke' release design have been  
54 reduced through continuous evaluation and modification. However, the up-stroke design is more  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 cumbersome as it involves a back and forward planter motion to create an adequate hole for the  
4  
5 single seed planting. Observations from field testing indicate that the 'down-stroke' releasing  
6  
7 drum design has more promise. Although this design still has lower singulation, it is easier to  
8  
9 use, does not involve a back and forward motion and has less soil clogging in the planter tip.  
10  
11 Current work is focused on improving singulation and reducing misses in the 'down-stroke'  
12  
13 design. Once this design is fully vetted, it will be evaluated under various field conditions,  
14  
15 modifying the planter tip to allow for the best soil-seed contact.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

### 23 **Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations**

24  
25  
26  
27 Significant progress has been made in planter design and singulation results. Current  
28  
29 OSU hand planter models have surpassed the initial target goal of 80 percent singulation. Drum  
30  
31 cavity size and depth have been shown to be crucial in determining the number of seeds that are  
32  
33 released with each strike of the planter. Inherent differences in maize seed make it hard to have a  
34  
35 universal drum that works for the array of seed sizes found around the world. Future users of the  
36  
37 hand planter are encouraged to first evaluate the drum cavity using seed within their region.  
38  
39 Cavity size and depth can then be altered to accommodate the seed used within each production  
40  
41 region so as to optimize seed singulation. Furthermore, field observations have shown ergonomic  
42  
43 differences among operators. This has impacted planting depth and the precision with which  
44  
45 seeds are planted in the soil. Simple training is required for users allowing for more precise  
46  
47 delivery of maize seed into the soil.  
48  
49  
50  
51

52  
53 Notwithstanding, the planter in its current design has shown to be a promising tool to  
54  
55 improve current maize production practices in developing countries. This conclusion is based on  
56  
57 acquired attributes developed during testing that include at least 80% singulation over a range of  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 seed sizes, is light weight, accommodates mid-season application of granular fertilizer, and has a  
4  
5 versatile internal drum that can be modified for seed size and/or seed type. .  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 11 **References**

- 12  
13  
14 Adjei E.O., S.H.M. Atkins, P. Boahen, K. Chand, I. Dev, M. Lu, V. Mkrtumyan, S.D.  
15  
16 Samarweera and A. Teklu. 2003. Combining mechanization and conservation agriculture in  
17  
18 the transitional zone of Brong Ahafo Region, Ghana. ICRA Working Documents Series  
19  
20 108, International Centre for Development Oriented Research in Agriculture, Wageningen  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 Aikins, S. H. M., A. Bart-Plange and S. Opoku-Baffour. 2010. Performance evaluation of job  
26  
27 planters for maize planting and inorganic fertilizer application. J. Agr. and Bio. Sci. 1: 29-  
28  
29 33.  
30  
31  
32 Bekele, S., B. M. Prasanna, J. Hellin, and M. Banziger. 2011. Crops that feed the world 6. Past  
33  
34 successes and future challenges to the role played by maize in global food security. Food  
35  
36 Security 3: 307-327.  
37  
38  
39 Boomsma, C.R, J.P. Lynch and T.J. Vyn. 2011. Resource Availability and Plant-to-Plant  
40  
41 Competition in Maize: Implications for 21st Century Maize Genetic and Agronomic  
42  
43 Improvement. Proceedings of the 47<sup>th</sup> Illinois Corn Breeders School. University of Illinois  
44  
45 Urbana, IL.  
46  
47  
48 Chim, B.K., N. Macnack, P. Omara, and W. Raun. 2013. Effect of seed distribution and  
49  
50 population on maize (*Zea mays* L.) grain yield. (in preparation)  
51  
52  
53 Doerge, T., T. Hall, and D. Gardner. 2002. New research confirms benefits of improved plant  
54  
55 spacing in corn. Crop Insights. 12: 4. Pioneer Hi-Bred Int., Johnston, IA.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Du Plessis, J. 2003. Maize Production. Department of Agriculture, Directorate Agricultural  
4  
5 Information Services, Pretoria, South Africa.  
6  
7
- 8 FAO. 2010. Conservation Agriculture of Natural Resources for Sustainable Agriculture.  
9  
10 [http://www.fao.org/ag/ca/Training\\_Materials/guide\\_tools\\_equipment\\_animal.pdf](http://www.fao.org/ag/ca/Training_Materials/guide_tools_equipment_animal.pdf).  
11  
12 (accessed 16 Jul. 2013). FAO, Rome.  
13  
14
- 15 FAO. 2011. FAOSTAT: Statistics Database. [Online] [Subset Production Crops Database]  
16  
17 <http://faostat3.fao.org/home/index.html> (accessed 18 Feb. 2013). FAO, Rome.  
18  
19
- 20 Heisey, P.W. and W. Mwangi, 1996. Fertilizer Use and Maize Production in Sub-Saharan  
21  
22 Africa. CIMMYT Economics Program Working Paper 96-01. Mexico, D.F.: CIMMYT.  
23  
24
- 25 Jones, C. A., R. T. Koenig, J. W. Ellsworth, B. D. Brown, and G. D. Jackson. 2007. Management  
26  
27 of urea fertilizer to minimize volatilization. Montana State University Extension and  
28  
29 Washington State University Extension.  
30  
31
- 32 Nafziger, E.D., P.R. Carter and E.E. Graham. 1991. Response of corn to uneven emergence.  
33  
34 Crop Sci. 31:811-815.  
35  
36
- 37 Pradhan, P.L., J.N. Mishra, and S.K. Nanda. 2011. Development and evaluation of a power tiller  
38  
39 operated planter for maize. J. Agr. Mech. in Asia, Africa and Latin America. 42 : 67-71.  
40  
41
- 42 Ray, D.K., N.D. Mueller, P.C. West, and J.A. Foley. 2013. Yield Trends Are Insufficient to  
43  
44 Double Global Crop Production by 2050. PLoS ONE 8(6): e66428.  
45  
46 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0066428.  
47  
48
- 49 Ritchie, S. W., J.J. Hanway, and G.O. Benson. 1997. How a corn plant develops. Special report  
50  
51 no 48. Cooperative Extension Service, Ames, Iowa  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Table 1. Maize hybrids, density (seeds kg<sup>-1</sup>) and volume (ml kg<sup>-1</sup>) of maize seed used in this study

| Hybrid    | Density (seeds kg <sup>-1</sup> ) | Volume (ml kg <sup>-1</sup> ) |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| DKC 62-09 | 4210                              | 5263                          |
| DKC 62-26 | 4344                              | 5556                          |
| DKC 63-55 | 3263                              | 4255                          |
| PO876HR   | 4050                              | 5263                          |
| P1395XR   | 3846                              | 4444                          |
| P1395YHR  | 2652                              | 3448                          |
| P1395AM1  | 3572                              | 4545                          |
| P1498HR   | 3017                              | 3846                          |

Table 2. Treatment means for brush (T4-T8) and drum combinations (235, 260) including misses, singles, and multiple seeds.

| Brush | Drum<br>inch (mm) | Misses    | Singles | Multiples |
|-------|-------------------|-----------|---------|-----------|
|       |                   | Means (%) |         |           |
| T4    | 0.235 (5.96)      | 6.5       | 90      | 3.5       |
| T4    | 0.260 (6.60)      | 3         | 85      | 12        |
| T5    | 0.235 (5.96)      | 6         | 64      | 30        |
| T5    | 0.260 (6.60)      | 5         | 65      | 30        |
| T6    | 0.235 (5.96)      | 4         | 76      | 20        |
| T6    | 0.260 (6.60)      | 2         | 64      | 34        |
| T7    | 0.235 (5.96)      | 5.5       | 89      | 5.5       |
| T7    | 0.260 (6.60)      | 4         | 78      | 18        |
| T8    | 0.235 (5.96)      | 14        | 84      | 2         |
| T8    | 0.260 (6.60)      | 8.5       | 85      | 5.5       |

0.235 and 0.260 are drum cavity depth in inches (mm), T4 to T8 are test brushes with varying location relative to the drum and stiffness.

Table 3. Treatments and grain yield means for  
Efaw and Perkins, Oklahoma 2013

| Methods                    | N rate              | Yield               |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
|                            | kg ha <sup>-1</sup> | Mg ha <sup>-1</sup> |
| Check                      | 0                   | 6.6                 |
| Hand planter (0.9 g/plant) | 30                  | 11.2                |
| Hand planter (1.8 g/plant) | 60                  | 10.6                |
| Broadcast                  | 30                  | 6.4                 |
| Broadcast                  | 60                  | 7.0                 |
| Dribble urea               | 30                  | 9.3                 |
| Dribble urea               | 60                  | 7.8                 |
| Dribble UAN                | 30                  | 7.3                 |
| Dribble UAN                | 60                  | 10.4                |
| SED <sup>†</sup>           |                     | 1.81                |

Plant density 70,000 seeds ha<sup>-1</sup>

† Standard Error of the Difference




Figure 1: Sequential development (left to right) of the hand planter showing design progress and tip modification 2011 through 2013.




Figure 2: Components of seed metering unit (left to right), including external housing, internal housing planter tip, rotating drum, rotating arm, connecting coupler, and internal spring, Oklahoma State University.




Figure 3: Side view of the hand planter showing (left to right, coupler, external housing, internal housing with rotating arm, spring and planter tip, Oklahoma State University.




Figure 4: Internal rotating drums with different cavity depths, size, and angle.




Figure 5: Position of the drum (1), brush (2), and rotating arm (3) during operation. Reciprocating drum in “relaxed” position (A). The drum rotating back as force is applied to the internal spring (B). Spring is fully compressed; drum cavity is exposed to seeds in seed hopper (C).




Figure 6: Regression analysis showing the relationship between volume, seeds L<sup>-1</sup> and density, seeds kg<sup>-1</sup>.






Figure 7: Field performance and emergence tests on seed-drum combinations (H1st, H1so, reflect stiff and soft brushes for the H1 internal housing, 450s and 450b were the two different drums used, and lower numbers are the seed densities, number per kg.).