Adapting CROPGRO for Simulating Spring Canola Growth with Both RZWQM2 and DSSAT 4.0

S. A. Saseendran, D. C. Nielsen,* L. Ma, and L. R. Ahuja

ABSTRACT

Currently, canola (*Brassica napus* L.) is gaining importance as a potential feedstock in biodiesel production industries, increasing the demand for canola production acreage. Agricultural system models that simulate canola growth and yield will help to assess the feasibility of canola production under various agroclimatic conditions. In this study, we adapted the CROPGRO model for simulation of spring canola in both Root Zone Water Quality Model (RZWQM2) and Decision Support System for Agrotechnology Transfer (DSSAT 4.0). Soil water, phenology, leaf area index (LAI), biomass, plant height, and grain yield data from irrigation experiments conducted in 2005 on a Weld silt loam soil (fine, smectitic, mesic Aridic Argiustoll) in the semiarid climate at Akron, CO were used for model parameterization and calibration. Similar data from 1993, 1994, and 2006 were used for validation. Species and cultivar parameters for canola were developed using data from literature or by calibrating the existing CROPGRO-faba bean (*Vicia faba* L.) parameters. Grain yields across various irrigation levels and seasons were simulated reasonably well by RZWQM2 with root mean square error (RMSE) of 215 kg ha^{-1} and index of agreement (d) of 0.98. Seasonal biomass development was simulated with RMSEs between 341 and 903 kg ha^{-1}, d between 0.55 and 0.99, and R^2 between 0.85 and 0.98. The CROPGRO-canola parameters developed were also tested within the DSSAT 4.0 cropping systems model and found to produce results with similar accuracy.

Canola is a cool-season edible oil crop that may be suitable for crop production in the central Great Plains of the United States (Nielsen, 1997) although yield reductions are seen under deficit water and high temperature conditions (Faraji et al., 2009; Young et al., 2004).

Canola is grown in both Canada and United States as an alternative crop to winter wheat as well as a spring crop incorporated into the wheat–fallow system in the Great Plains (Brandt and Zentner, 1995; Nuttal et al., 1992; Nielsen, 1997). Interest in cultivation of canola is expanding primarily due to its potential use as a renewable energy crop for production of biodiesel (Pavlista and Baltensperger, 2007) to potentially offset the shortage of the conventional nonrenewable petroleum-based fuels. While the importance of canola as a potential oil seed crop in the Great Plains of the United States has been recognized in the past couple of decades (Minor and Meinke, 1990), the basic agronomic research trials for development of location-specific agromanagement needed for successful cultivation of this crop in the area are lacking (Vigil et al., 1997).

The climate of the semiarid Great Plains of the United States is characterized by high precipitation variability and high growing season temperatures. Winter wheat-based cropping systems incorporating summer fallow under conventional tillage (WF-CT) dominated agriculture in the Great Plains during the 20th century (Peterson et al., 1993; Derksen et al., 2002; Norwood et al. 1990). The WF-CT cropping system in the semiarid Great Plains can have serious adverse impacts on the soil environment due to potential wind and water erosion and subsequent losses of soil organic matter and productivity. Spring canola could replace summer fallow in this region when favorable soil water conditions exist at planting time. However, canola has been found to be susceptible to heat and water stress and as such, it is essential that it is planted at the right time to fit into the agroclimate of the area (Brandt and McGregor, 1997; Stoker and Carter, 1984; Nielsen, 1997). In the semiarid region of Western Australia, early sowing combined with early flowering cultivars increased canola production (Si and Walton, 2004).

While the increasing use of canola for biodiesel could reduce fossil fuel use, little is known about canola yield and quality responses to climate change and increasing atmospheric CO$_2$ concentrations. Development of agricultural system simulation models make it possible to integrate and synthesize the quantitative understanding of the genotype and environment, and edaphic control on crop growth and development (Ahuja et al., 2000; Jones et al., 2003; McCown et al., 1996; Meyer and Curry, 1981). Additionally, development of a canola model for use within cropping systems models such as the DSSAT 4.0 and RZWQM2 will generate valuable potential production data for canola grown in rotation with wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) and other crops under the varying water availability and temperature conditions of the Great Plains. These simulation results will be valuable for assessing the use of canola to

---

S.A. Saseendran, L. Ma, and L.R. Ahuja, USDA-ARS, Agricultural Systems Research, 2150 Centre Ave., Bldg. D, Fort Collins, CO 80526; D.C. Nielsen, USDA-ARS, Central Great Plains Research Station, 40335 County Rd. GG, Akron, CO. 80720. Received 16 June 2010. *Corresponding author (david.nielsen@ars.usda.gov).

Published in Agron. J. 102:1606–1621 (2010)

doi:10.2134/agronj2010.0277

Abbreviations: DSSAT 4.0, Decision Support System for Agrotechnology Transfer; LAI, leaf area index; LSGI, line-source gradient irrigation; RMSE, root mean square error; ROS, rainout shelter; RZWQM2, Root Zone Water Quality Model; WF-CT, wheat–fallow conventional tillage.

Table 1. Management details for four canola water use/yield studies conducted at Akron, CO.

Study designation	Year	Replications	Water treatments	Irrigation amounts	Irrigation method	Plot size	Row spacing	Variety	Planting date	Final population	Fertilizer
				mm		m by m	cm			plants ha^{-1}	kg N ha^{-1}
ROS†	1993	3	four growth stage timing treatments	234 for each treatment	flood	2.74 by 2.66	30	'Westar'	20 April	1,092,000	67
ROS	1994	3	four growth stage timing treatments	234 for each treatment	flood	2.74 by 2.66	30	'Westar'	7 April	1,092,000	67
LSGI	1993	4	four gradient irrigation treatments	42, 113, 202, 264	sprinkler	6.1 by 24.4	19	'Westar'	3 May	1,037,000	69
LSGI	1994	4	four gradient irrigation treatments	36, 118, 220, 263	sprinkler	6.1 by 24.4	19	'Westar'	22 April	1,037,000	94
LSGI	2005	4	four gradient irrigation treatments	0, 61, 134, 207	sprinkler	6.1 by 24.4	19	'Hyola'	8 April	630,000	56
LSGI	2006	4	four gradient irrigation treatments	0, 30, 67, 121	sprinkler	6.1 by 24.4	19	'Hyola'	20 April	630,000	56

† ROS = rainout shelter experiment; LSGI = line-source gradient irrigation experiment.

create variable water availability conditions. A diagram of the LSGI plot layout is given in Nielsen (2004).

In all six studies, crop water use (evapotranspiration) was calculated by the water balance method using soil water measurements, precipitation amounts, and irrigation catch gauge amounts, and assuming runoff and deep percolation were negligible (plot area slope was <0.5%, and amounts of growing season precipitation were generally small). Soil water measurements were made weekly in the ROS experiments and biweekly in the LSGI experiments using a neutron probe at soil depths of 15, 45, 75, 105, 135, and 165 cm. Leaf area index, plant height, and biomass (1 m of one row sampled) were also measured periodically during the growing season. The LAI measurements were made with the LAI-2000 Plant Canopy Analyzer (Li-Cor, Inc., Lincoln, NE). Biomass and LAI were not measured in the LSGI experiments in 1993 and 1994. However, grain yield and biomass were measured at plant maturity.

Adaptation of CROPGRO-Faba Bean Module for Canola Simulation in Root Zone Water Quality

To parameterize CROPGRO for canola in RZWQM2, we adopted the procedures recommended by Boote et al. (2002) for adapting the CROPGRO-dry bean model for simulation of faba bean. Boote et al. (2002) stated that the advantages of adapting a mechanistic process-oriented model like CROPGRO to a new crop included being able to use existing modular subroutines that describe the basic processes of photosynthesis, respiration, plant N and C balance, and soil water and N balance while also being able to use the weather handling and standard input-output file conventions of DSSAT.

The CROPGRO module simulates different crop species using external species, ecotype, and cultivar parameter files (Jones et al., 2003). The species file describes various plant physiological process sensitivities to environment, and the cultivar parameters describe cultivar differences in environmental effects on growth

Table 2. Precipitation received at the experimental site during 1993, 1994, 2005, and 2006, and long-term means (1908–2008). Data presented as annual and monthly totals, as well as total precipitation for the canola growing season (April–July) and the May through September period.

	1993	1994	2005	2006	1908–2008
			mm		
January	6	10	3	1	9
February	14	5	3	2	9
March	13	2	11	16	20
April	47	53	42	23	42
May	27	29	62	37	74
June	45	6	86	18	62
July	114	70	75	58	66
August	24	30	94	87	56
September	23	8	10	29	30
October	95	73	75	16	23
November	26	26	19	2	13
December	12	13	6	26	11
Annual	446	325	486	315	415
April–July	233	158	265	136	244
May–Sept.	233	143	327	229	288

Table 3. Species-specific parameters developed for simulation of canola with CROPGRO-faba bean parameters as a starting point.

Parameter	Value	Guidance from literature or calibration
KCAN- Canopy light extinction coefficient for daily PAR, for equidistant plant pacing, modified when in-row and between row spacing are not equal.	0.75	Gabrielle et al. (1998b).
CCMP- Canopy CO_2 compensation point (CO_2 at which daily gross photosynthesis is 0.0), mg/kg	72	Herath and Ormrod (1972)
FNPGT(I) Critical values of temperature for the functions to reduce canopy PG under nonoptimal temperatures (in function CURV)	5.00 20.0, 28.0, 40.0	Polowick and Sawhney (1988), Morrison et al. (1989), Bunce (2008)
XLMAXT- Temperature effects on maximum leaf photosynthesis (LMXREF).	0.0 5.0 28.0 29.0 40.0 60.0	Morrison et al. (1989), Bunce (2008), Vigil et al. (1997), Angadi et al. (2000), Nanda et al. (1995)
PCH2O Respiration loss due to storage/mobilization of CH_2O [kg(CH_2O)/kg(CH_2O)]	0.70	Calibrated.
PROLFI Maximum protein composition in leaves during growth with luxurious supply of N	0.244	Sidlauskas and Bernotas (2003)
PROLFG Normal growth protein composition in leaves during growth [kg(protein)/kg(leaf tissue)]	0.194	Sidlauskas and Bernotas (2003)
PROLFF- Minimum leaf protein composition after N mining (kg[protein]/kg[leaf])	0.092	Sidlauskas and Bernotas (2003)
NVSMOB Relative rate of N mining during vegetative stage to that in reproductive stage	0.25	Calibrated
YSTEM values- Partitioning fraction to stem at different V-stages (stages correspond to the number of leaf nodes on the main stem of the plant) (kg[stem]/kg[veg. plant])	0.06, 0.36, 0.20, 0.20, 0.30, 0.30, 0.43.	Calibrated
WTFSD Relative weight of seed compared to maximum (fraction)	0.90	Calibrated
SLAPAR Coefficient in exponential equation to reduce SLA as PAR increases (leaf curvature)	−0.045	Calibrated
TURSLA Water stress effects on leaf area expansion, factor.	1.20	Calibrated
SLAMAX The maximum specific leaf area (SLA) for new leaves when grown under low (nearly zero) radiation but optimum water and temperature for the standard cultivar. (cm^2/kg)	925	Calibrated
SENRTE Factor by which protein mined from leaves each day is multiplied to determine leaf senescence. [kg(leaf)/kg(protein loss)]	0.90	Calibrated
SENRT2 Factor by which leaf weight is multiplied to determine senescence each day after NR7 (day when 50% of the plants have yellowing or maturing pods) [g(leaf)]	0.25	Calibrated
SENDAY Maximum fraction of existing leaf weight which can be senesced on day N as a function of severe water stress 4 d earlier. [g(protein loss)]	0.26	Calibrated
T base, T optimum 1, T optimum 2, and T maximum for vegetative development.	1.0, 16.0, 25.0 and 40.0	Morrison et al. (1989), Bunce (2008), Vigil et al. (1997), Angadi et al. (2000), Nanda et al. (1995), Kiniry et al. (1995)
Node number on main stem and corresponding internode length (m) in pairs	0:0.11, 1:0.025, 4:0.036, 6:0.06, 8:0.082, 0:0.093, 14:0.087, 17:0.071, 22:0.049, 40:0.004.	Calibrated



Fig. 1. Cardinal temperatures of faba bean modified for simulation of temperature effects on photosynthesis and vegetative growth stage of canola.

Table 4. The ecological group-specific parameters developed for simulation of canola with CROPGRO-faba bean parameters as a starting point.

Parameter	Value	Guidance from literature or calibration
THVAR- Minimum rate of reproductive development under long days and optimal temperature	0.15	Calibrated
PL-EM Time between planting and emergence (V0) (thermal days)	5.0	Vigil et al. (1997).
EM-V1 Time required from emergence to first true leaf (V1), thermal days	4.0	Calibrated
V1-JU Time required from first true leaf to end of juvenile phase, thermal days	0.0	Calibrated
JU-R0 Time required for floral induction, equal to the minimum number of days for floral induction under optimal temperature and day lengths, photothermal days	2.0	Calibrated
PM06 Proportion of time between first flower and first pod for first peg (peanut only)	0.0	Calibrated
PM09 Proportion of time between first seed and physiological maturity that the last seed can be formed	0.48	Calibrated
LNGSH Time required for growth of individual shells (photothermal days)	17.5	Calibrated
R7-R8 Time between physiological (R7) and harvest maturity (R8) (thermal days)	09.0	Calibrated
FL-VS Time from first flower to last leaf on main stem (photothermal days)	44.00	Calibrated
TRIFOL Rate of appearance of leaves on the main stem (leaves per thermal day)	0.35	Nanda et al. (1995)
RWIDTH Relative width of this ecotype in comparison to the standard width per node (YVSWH) defined in the species file (*.SPE)	0.40	Calibrated
RHGHT Relative height of this ecotype in comparison to the standard height per node (YVSHT) defined in the species file (*.SPE)	1.2	Calibrated
THRESH The maximum ratio of (seed/(seed+shell)) at maturity. Causes seeds to stop growing as their dry weights increase until shells are filled in a cohort	70.0	Calibrated
SDPRO Fraction protein in seeds [kg(protein)/kg(seed)]	0.210	Hocking et al. (1997a), Hocking et al. (1997b)
SDLIP Fraction oil in seeds [kg(oil)/kg(seed)]	0.410	Brennan et al. (2000), Robertson et al. (2004)
R1PPO Increase in daylength sensitivity after R1 (CSDVAR and CLDVAR both decrease with the same amount) (h)	0.000	Calibrated
OPTBI Minimum daily temperature above which there is no effect on slowing normal development toward flowering (°C)	0.0	Calibrated
SLOBI Slope of relationship reducing progress toward flowering if TMIN for the day is less than OPTBI	0.000	Calibrated

Development of Cultivar Parameters

In the CROPGRO model, 15 parameters define cultivar specific traits of the crop (Table 5). As little information on these parameters was available in the experiments or literature, they were mostly calibrated through trial and error to match simulations with measurements. However, the parameters SIZLF [maximum size of full leaf, cm^2], WTPSD [maximum weight per seed, g], SDPDV [average seed per pod under standard growing conditions (no./pod)] were calibrated based on available literature information. Robertson et al. (2002) observed leaf areas up to 155 cm^2 in irrigated canola. However, to more accurately match LAI simulations with measured values, we used a calibrated value of 220 cm^2 for SIZLF.

Table 5. The cultivar specific parameters developed for simulation of canola with CROPGRO-faba bean parameters as a starting point.

Parameter	Value	Guidance from literature or calibration
CSDL Critical Short Day Length below which reproductive development progresses with no daylength effect (for short day plants) (hr)	24.00	Calibrated
PPSEN Slope of the relative response of development to photoperiod with time (positive for short-day plants) (1/hr)	–0.03	Calibrated
EM-FL Time between plant emergence and flower appearance (R1)(photothermal days)	16.50	Calibrated
FL-SH Time between first flower and first pod (R3) (photothermal days)	6.00	Calibrated
FL-SD Time between first flower and first seed (R5) (photothermal days)	13.00	Calibrated
SD-PM Time between first seed (R5) and physiological maturity (R7)(photothermal days)	22.79	Calibrated
FL-LF Time between first flower (R1) and end of leaf expansion (photothermal days)	55.00	Calibrated
LFMAX Maximum leaf photosynthesis rate at 30 C, 350 $\mu L\ L^{-1}\ CO_2$, and high light (mg CO_2/m^2-s)	0.90	Calibrated
SLAVR Specific leaf area of cultivar under standard growth conditions (cm^2/kg)	420.00	Calibrated
SIZLF Maximum size of full leaf (three leaflets) (cm^2)	220.00	Robertson et al. (2002)
XFRT Maximum fraction of daily growth that is partitioned to seed + shell	0.900	Calibrated
WTPSD Maximum weight per seed (g)	0.006	Hocking et al. (1997a); Chay and Thurling (1989)
SFDUR Seed filling duration for pod cohort at standard growth conditions (photothermal days)	24.00	Calibrated
SDPDV Average seed per pod under standard growing conditions (no./pod)	27.70	Chay and Thurling (1989), and Angadi et al. (2003)
PODUR Time required for cultivar to reach final pod load under optimal conditions (photothermal days)	9.00	Calibrated

Table 7. Evaluation statistics for CROPGRO-canola in Root Zone Water Quality Model (RZWQM2) simulations of total profile soil water, leaf area index (LAI), biomass, and plant height against measured values in the 1993, 1994, 2005, and 2006 canola irrigation experiments at Akron, CO.

Year-Treatment	Total profile(0–180 cm) soil water			LAI			Biomass			Plant height		
	RMSE†	R^2	d	RMSE	R^2	d	RMSE	R^2	d	RMSE	R^2	d
	$\mathrm{m^3\ m^{-3}}$						$\mathrm{kg\ ha^{-1}}$			cm		
1993-ROS1‡	3.87	0.97	0.89	1.11	0.90	0.76	–	–	–	–	–	–
1993-ROS2	3.60	0.88	0.89	0.73	0.94	0.83	–	–	–	–	–	–
1993-ROS3	2.94	0.93	0.95	1.05	0.59	0.62	–	–	–	–	–	–
1993-ROS4	2.79	1.00	0.89	0.94	0.79	0.59	–	–	–	–	–	–
1993-LSGI1§	2.14	0.86	0.98	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1993-LSGI2	2.76	0.56	0.99	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1993-LSGI3	3.10	0.92	0.99	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1993-LSGI4	1.41	0.72	1.00	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
1994-ROS	4.33	0.99	0.86	1.15	0.65	0.83	–	–	–	–	–	–
1994-ROS2	6.21	0.99	0.79	1.38	0.60	0.86	–	–	–	–	–	–
1994-ROS3	5.03	0.96	0.80	1.28	0.58	0.74	–	–	–	–	–	–
1994-ROS4	3.90	0.96	0.80	1.59	0.78	0.73	–	–	–	–	–	–
2005-LSGI1¶	2.45	0.95	0.84	0.80	0.78	0.93	836	0.85	0.94	10	0.92	0.96
2005-LSGI2¶	1.91	0.96	0.94	0.81	0.79	0.94	604	0.94	0.94	11	0.92	0.96
2005-LSGI3¶	1.02	0.90	0.97	0.77	0.89	0.93	341	0.98	0.99	9	0.94	0.97
2005-LSGI4¶	2.14	0.78	0.93	0.53	0.95	0.98	396	0.96	0.95	9	0.94	0.95
2006-LSGI1	3.68	0.63	0.71	0.42	1.00	0.77	463	0.92	0.59	8	0.91	0.94
2006-LSGI2	3.99	0.77	0.73	0.15	1.00	0.97	903	0.96	0.55	7	0.90	0.95
2006-LSGI3	4.05	0.90	0.77	0.81	1.00	0.89	510	0.95	0.89	9	0.86	0.96
2006-LSGI4	5.84	0.95	0.78	0.61	1.00	0.95	777	0.93	0.95	13	0.78	0.94

† RMSE = root mean square error, d = index of agreement, and R^2 = coefficient of determination.

‡ ROS1, ROS2, ROS3, and ROS4 are irrigation treatments under a rainout shelter.

§ LSGI1, LSGI2, LSGI, and LSGI4 are irrigation treatments under a line-source gradient irrigation system.

¶ Calibration data.

Simulations of plant emergence were within 1 d of observed emergence across the four irrigation treatments (Table 6). Simulated flowering time was off by 1 to 3 d, first pod by 1 to 4 d, first seed by 0 to 2 d, and harvest maturity by 3 to 5 d.

Soil water simulations in individual soil layers (2005) had RMSEs ranging from 0.024 to 0.031 $\mathrm{m^3\ m^{-3}}$ (data not shown). The RMSEs of total soil profile (180 cm) water storage ranged from 1.02 to 2.45 cm in the four irrigation treatments of 2005 (Table 7). The d values between measured and simulated data were between 0.84 and 0.97, providing confidence in soil water simulation during canola growth. Simulations of LAI, plant heights, and biomass at about biweekly intervals had RMSEs ranging from 0.53 to 0.81 $\mathrm{m^2\ m^{-2}}$ (Fig. 2), from 9 to 11 cm (Fig. 3), and from 341 to 836 $\mathrm{kg\ ha^{-1}}$ (Fig. 4), respectively. The LAI simulations were sufficiently accurate with d ranging from 0.93 to 0.98, and R^2 ranging from 0.78 to 0.95. Biomass simulations were also reasonable with d and R^2 between 0.94 and 0.99, and between 0.85 and 0.98, respectively. Plant height simulations showed relatively larger errors with RMSEs between 9 and 11 cm and d values between 0.95 and 0.97. Grain yield simulations in the four irrigation treatments of the 2005 LSGI calibration set departed from the measured data between −13 and 9% (Fig. 5). Simulations of grain yield had RMSE of 102 $\mathrm{kg\ ha^{-1}}$ and d of 0.87 (data not shown).

Measured data on seed oil and protein contents were not available for comparison in 2005. However, the simulated seed oil contents at harvest were between 44 and 45%, which were within the literature reported values of seed oil contents from 34 to 48% (Brennan et al., 2000; Robertson et al., 2004) and those measured in the experiments (between 34 and 45%) in 1993 and 1994 (Table 8). Simulated seed protein contents were between 20 and 21% across irrigation treatments, which are slightly higher than the reported protein content of 18.6% by Hocking et al. (1997b) but similar to that reported by Brennan et al. (2000). Hocking et al. (1997b) reported seed weights between 0.00280 to 0.00347 g in canola, which are in agreement with simulated seed weights between 0.0031 and 0.0033 g in the four irrigation treatments.

Model Evaluation

Line-Source Gradient Irrigation Experiments in 2006

The calibrated model was first evaluated for canola grown in 2006, which was a continuation of the 2005 study. Crop phenology was simulated reasonably well with deviations of days to emergence within 1 to 2 d, flowering within 1 to 3 d, first pod within 1 to 5 d, and harvest maturity within 2 to 4 d from measured data across the four irrigation treatments (Table 6) (in the experiment harvest day only was reported, as such this may not accurately represent the physiological maturity growth stage). Soil water, evapotranspiration (estimated from soil water balance), LAI, crop height, biomass, and grain yield (data not shown) in the 2006 crop season were reasonably well simulated (Table 7). The RMSEs of total profile (180 cm) soil water simulations were between 3.68 and 5.84 cm across the four irrigation treatments. Soil water simulations in terms of RMSE in various soil layers across treatments ranged from 0.029 to 0.046 $\mathrm{m^3\ m^{-3}}$. Across treatments, the R^2 and d of total profile water contents were between 0.63 and 0.95, and between 0.71 and 0.78, respectively(Fig. 6).

Leaf area index measurements in the experiments were only made in the beginning of the season and therefore the statistics



Fig. 4. Comparison of measured and simulated canola biomass using CROPGRO-canola in Root Zone Water Quality Model (RZWQM2) in response to four irrigation treatments each in 2005 (calibration set) and 2006 line-source gradient irrigation experiments. Error bars indicate one standard deviation of the mean.

calculated from the data are not reliable (Fig. 2). However, across the four irrigation treatments, LAI simulations had RMSEs ranging from 0.15 to 0.81 m^2 m^{-2}, and d from 0.77 to 0.95 (Table 7, Fig. 2). Plant heights were simulated with RMSEs between 8 and 13 cm, R^2 between 0.78 and 0.91, and d between 0.94 and 0.96 (Fig. 3).

Biomass and grain yields in response to the four irrigation treatments were fairly well simulated with biomass R^2 and d values ranging from 0.92 to 0.96 and from 0.55 to 0.95, respectively (Table 7, Fig. 4). Biomass was consistently underestimated before 60 d after planting. The RMSE values for biomass simulation ranged from 463 to 903 kg ha^{-1}. The model exhibited an inability to accurately capture severe water stress effects on yield when irrigation was low. While water stress in the low irrigation treatment resulted in no actual harvested grain yield, the model simulated 328 kg ha^{-1} (Fig. 5) In the treatment with 4.0 cm irrigation, the model simulated 683 kg ha^{-1} when the measured amount was 228 kg ha^{-1}. In the 7.9 and 13.1 cm water treatments, the model simulated grain yield better with 891 and 1613 kg ha^{-1} against the measured values of 724 and 1801 kg ha^{-1}.



Fig. 5. Comparison of measured and simulated canola grain yield using CROPGRO-canola in Root Zone Water Quality Model (RZWQM2) in response to four irrigation treatments each in 1993, 1994, 2005 (calibration set), and 2006. Data in 1993 and 1994 consisted of treatments grown under both a rainout shelter (ROS) and a line-source gradient irrigation (LSGI) system. Error bars indicate one standard deviation of the mean.



Fig. 6. Comparison of measured and simulated total soil profile water under canola using CROPGRO-canola in RZWQM2 in response to four irrigation treatments each in 1993 and 1994 (under a rainout shelter (ROS), and in 2005 (calibration set) and 2006 (under a line-source gradient irrigation (LSGI) system).

Table 9. Measured (M) and simulated (S) [using CROPGRO-canola in DSSAT] phenology for 2005 (line-source gradient irrigation experiment, LSGI), 2006 (LSGI), 1993 (rainout shelter experiment, ROS) and 1994 ROS) irrigation experiments at Akron, CO.

2005 (LSGI)†			2006 (LSGI)			1993 (ROS)			1994 (ROS)		
Stage	DAP‡		Stage	DAP		Stage	DAP		Stage	DAP	
	M	S		M	S		M	S		M	S
Planting (8 April)			Planting (20 April)			Planting (20 April)			Planting (7 April)		
					Treatment 1						
Emergence	14	9	emergence	13	10	emergence	9	7	emergence	–	14
Flowering	59	54	flowering	46	46	flowering	52	46	flowering	56	53
First pod	66	62	first pod	50	52	first pod	64	59	first pod	65	59
First seed	73	70	first seed	–	60	first seed	–	62	first seed	–	67
Harvested day	101	102	harvested day	92	90	harvested day	100	99	harvested day	95	98
					Treatment 2						
Emergence	14	9	emergence	10	7	emergence	9	11	emergence	–	14
Flowering	59	54	flowering	46	46	flowering	52	49	flowering	56	55
First pod	66	62	first pod	50	53	first pod	64	59	first pod	65	61
First seed	73	70	first seed	–	60	first seed	–	62	first seed	–	69
Harvested day	104	106	harvested day	97	96	harvested day	100	96	harvested day	95	98
					Treatment 3						
Emergence	14	9	emergence	13	10	emergence	9	7	emergence	–	14
Flowering	59	54	flowering	46	46	flowering	52	46	flowering	56	55
First pod	68	62	first pod	50	53	first pod	64	59	first pod	65	61
First seed	73	74	first seed	–	60	first seed	–	62	first seed	–	69
Harvested day	104	109	harvested day	97	95	harvested day	100	95	harvested day	95	97
					Treatment 4						
Emergence	14	9	emergence	13	7	emergence	9	11	emergence	–	14
Flowering	59	54	flowering	46	43	flowering	52	49	flowering	62	55
First pod	68	62	first pod	50	53	first pod	64	59	first pod	65	61
First seed	73	70	first seed	–	60	first seed	–	62	first seed	–	69
Harvested day	104	109	harvested day	97	98	harvested day	100	104	harvested day	95	99

† Calibration data.

‡ DAP = days after planting.

yield in both years. Profile soil (180 cm) water storage in 1993 was well simulated with RMSEs between 1.41 cm and 3.10 cm (Table 7). The R^2 and d of profile soil water storage simulations were between 0.56 and 0.92, and between 0.98 and 1.00, respectively. Simulated grain yields responded to the four irrigation levels well and deviated from measurements by −8 to −18% with a d value of 0.67 and R^2 of 0.93 in 1993, and by 0 and −5% with d of 0.99 and R^2 of 0.99 in 1994 (Fig. 5).

There were no measurements of LAI, biomass, or plant height in this experiment. Simulated seed weights ranged between 0.0031 and 0.0033 g per seed across treatments in the two crop seasons (1993 and 1994) (Table 8). Simulated seed oil contents were between 42 and 44% with REs between −4 and 10%. Simulated seed protein contents ranged between 20 and 26%.

Performance of CROPGRO-Canola in DSSAT

As the above results indicated, using the RZWQM2 soil water and N routines with the CROPGRO-canola model developed in this study reasonably simulated the spring canola experiments conducted at Akron, CO in 1993, 1994, 2005, and 2006 under various levels of water availability. It may be of interest to some model users to see how CROPGRO-canola performs within DSSAT 4.0. Therefore, we repeated the above simulations using CROPGRO-canola within DSSAT 4.0 keeping all the parameters and calibrations unchanged. In general, we found that the canola model developed can simulate the above experiments with similar accuracy in DSSAT as well. For brevity, we present only the simulations of phenology, LAI, biomass, and grain yield as examples of the simulations (Table 9 and Fig. 7–9). Across the 1993, 1994, 2005, and 2006 crop seasons with a total of 24 irrigation treatments (including the ROS experiments in 1993 and 1994), simulated growth stages deviated from the measured data by 2 to 6 d for plant emergence, 0 to 7 d for flowering, 2 to 6 d for first pod, 1 to 3 d for first seed and 1 to 5 d for maturity (Table 9). RMSEs of simulations of LAI in various irrigation treatments in 2005 and 2006 were between 0.48 and 1.13 m^2 m^{-2} (Fig. 7). The LAI simulations in the ROS experiments in 1993 and 1994 showed higher deviations from measured (between 0.56 and 2.16 m^2 m^{-2}). Biomass simulations had RMSEs between 525 and 1024 kg ha^{-1} with d between 0.93 and 0.99 (Fig. 8). Grain yield simulations (pooled data for all treatments and years) showed an RMSE of 228 kg ha^{-1} and d of 0.97 (Fig. 9).

CONCLUSIONS

In the study, we adapted the existing CROPGRO-faba bean module to simulate spring canola with both RZWQM2 and DSSAT4.0 using available information on the various crop growth and development processes found in existing literature. However, we encountered lack of experimental data for defining many of the model parameters. In those situations, we calibrated the parameters available in the CROPGRO-faba bean model for simulation of canola. Overall, across irrigation treatments and crop seasons, simulations of biomass, LAI, grain yield, soil water, and ET were reasonable. A high degree of correspondence between measured and simulated results within both RZWQM2 and DSSAT 4.0 demonstrated that the CROPGRO model was adequately parameterized for canola. Accurate simulations of growth (e.g.: LAI, biomass, and grain yield) and development (growth stages) of the crop showed that the model has potential as a tool for development of decision support systems for canola management and for evaluation of canola as a potential alternative crop across the central Great Plains region. Further studies on simulating the crop across locations with contrasting climates can help in fine-tuning the model parameters developed and thereby increasing confidence in the model. Additional changes of the model, including accounting for vernalization, will be needed for simulations of winter canola.

REFERENCES

Ahuja, L.R., K.W. Rojas, J.D. Hanson, M.J. Shafer, and L. Ma (ed.). 2000. Root Zone Water Quality Model. Modeling management effects on water quality and crop production. Water Resources Publ., Highlands Ranch, CO.

Alagarswamy, G., K.J. Boote, L.H. Allen, Jr., and J.W. Jones. 2006. Evaluating the CROPGRO–soybean model ability to simulate photosynthesis response to carbon dioxide levels. Agron. J. 98:34–42.

Andersen, M.N., T. Heidman, and F. Plauborg. 1996. The effects of drought and N on light interception, growth and yield of winter oilseed rape. Acta Agric. Scand. B Soil Plant Sci. 46:55–67.

Angadi, S.V., H.W. Cutforth, B.G. McConkey, and Y. Gan. 2003. Yield adjustment by canola grown at different plant populations under semiarid conditions. Crop Sci. 43:1358–1366.

Angadi, S.V., H.W. Cutforth, P.R. Miller, B.G. McConkey, M.H. Entz, S.A. Brandt, and K.M. Volkmar. 2000. Response of three *Brassica* species to high temperature stress during reproductive growth. Can. J. Plant Sci. 8:693–701.

Boote, K.J. 1999. Concepts for calibrating crop growth models. p. 179–200. *In* G.Y. Tsuji et al. (ed.) DSSAT Version 3, Vol. 4–6. International benchmark sites network for agrotechnology transfer. Univ. of Hawaii, Honolulu.

Boote, K.J., J.W. Jones, and G. Hoogenboom. 1998. Simulation of crop growth: CROPGRO model. p. 651–692. *In* R.M. Peart and R.B. Curry (ed.) Agricultural systems modeling and simulation. Marcel Dekker, New York.

Boote, K.J., M.I. Minnguez, and F. Sau. 2002. Adapting the CROPGRO legume model to simulate growth of faba bean. Agron. J. 94:743–756.

Boote, K.J., and N.B. Pickering. 1994. Modeling photosynthesis of row crop canopies. HortScience 29:1423–1434.

Brandt, S.A., and D.I. McGregor. 1997. Canola response to growing season climatic conditions. p. 322–328. *In* Proc. Workshop on Soils and Crops 97, Saskatoon, SK, Canada. 20–21 Feb. 1997. Univ. Ext. Press, Saskatoon, SK, Canada.

Brandt, S.A., and R.P. Zentner. 1995. Crop production under alternative rotations on a Dark Brown Chernozemic soil at Scott, Saskatchewan. Can. J. Plant Sci. 75:789–794.

Brennan, R.F., M.G. Mason, and G.H. Walton. 2000. Effect of nitrogen fertilizer on the concentrations of oil and protein in canola (*Brassica napus*) see. J. Plant Nutr. 23:339–348.

Brown, J., L. Seip, J.B. David, D.A. Brown, and N. Baker. 2006. Registration of 'Premier' spring rapeseed. Crop Sci. 46:992–993.

Bunce, J.A. 2008. Acclimation of photosynthesis to temperature in *Arabidopsis thaliana* and *Brassica oleracea*. Photosynthetica 46:517–524.

Chay, P., and N. Thurling. 1989. Identification of genes controlling pod length in spring rapeseed, *Brassica napus* L., and their utilization for yield improvement. Plant Breed. 103:54–62.

Derksen, D.A., R.L. Anderson, R.E. Blackshaw, and B. Maxwell. 2002. Weed dynamics and management strategies for cropping systems in the northern Great Plains. Agron. J. 94:174–185.

Faraji, A., N. Latifi, A. Soltani, and A.H.S. Rad. 2009. Seed yield and water use efficiency of canola (*Brassica napus* L.) as affected by high temperature stress and supplemental irrigation. Agric. Water Manage. 96:132–140.

Farquhar, G.D., and S. von Caemmerer. 1982. Modeling of photosynthetic response to environment. p. 549–587. *In* O.L. Lange et al. (ed.) Encyclopedia of plant physiology. New series. Vol. 12B. Physiological plant ecology II. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.



Fig. 9. Comparison of measured and simulated canola grain yield using CROPGRO-canola in Decision Support System for Agrotechnology Transfer (DSSAT 4.0) in response to four irrigation treatments each in 1993, 1994, 2005 (calibration set), and 2006. Data in 1993 and 1994 consisted of treatments grown under both a rainout shelter (ROS) and a line-source gradient irrigation (LSGI) system. Error bars indicate one standard deviation of the mean.

Farquhar, G.D., S. von Caemmerer, and J.A. Berry. 1980. A biochemical model of photosynthetic CO_2 assimilation in leaves of C_3 species. Planta 49:78–90.

Farre, I., M.J. Robertson, G.H. Walton, and S. Asseng. 2002. Simulating phenology and yield response of canola to sowing date in Western Australia using the APSIM model. Aust. J. Agric. Res. 53:1155–1164.

Gabrielle, B., P. Denoroy, G. Gosse, E. Justes, and M.N. Andersen. 1998a. A model of leaf area development and senescence for winter oilseed rape. Field Crops Res. 57:209–222.

Gabrielle, B., P. Denoroy, G. Gosse, E. Justes, and M.N. Andersen. 1998b. Development and evaluation of a CERES-type model for winter oilseed rape. Field Crops Res. 57:95–111.

Godwin, D.C., and U. Singh. 1998. Nitrogen balance and crop response to nitrogen in upland and lowland cropping system. p. 55–77. *In* G.Y. Tsuji et al. (ed.) Understanding options for agricultural production. Kluwer Academic Publ., Dordrecht, the Netherlands.

Herath, H.M.W., and D.P. Ormrod. 1972. Temperature and sulfur nutrition effects on CO_2 compensation values in barley, peas, and rape. Plant Physiol. 49:443–444.

Hocking, P.J., J.A. Kirkegaard, J.F. Angus, A.H. Gibson, and E.A. Koetz. 1997a. Comparison of canola, Indian mustard and linola in two contrasting environments. I. Effects of nitrogen fertilizer on dry-matter production, seed yield and seed quality. Field Crops Res. 49:107–125.

Hocking, P.J., P.J. Randall, and D. DeMarco. 1997b. The response of dryland canola to nitrogen fertilizer: Partitioning and mobilization of dry matter and nitrogen, and nitrogen effects on yield components. Field Crops Res. 54:201–220.

Holland, J.F., M.J. Robertson, J.A. Kirkegaard, R. Bambach, and S. Cawley. 1999. Yield of canola relative to wheat and some reasons for variability in the relationship. *In* Proc. 10th Int. Rapeseed Congress, Canberra, Australia. Available at http://www.regional.org.au/au/gcirc/2/482.htm#TopOfPage (verified 2 Sept. 2010). The Regional Inst., Australia.

Husson, F., D. Wallach, and B. Vandeputte. 1998. Evaluation of CECOL, a model of winter rape (*Brassica napus* L.). Eur. J. Agron. 8:205–214.

Jones, J.W., G. Hoogenboom, C.H. Porter, K.J. Boote, W.D. Batchelor, L.A. Hunt, P.W. Wilkens, U. Singh, A.J. Gijsman, and J.T. Ritchie. 2003. The DSSAT cropping system model. Eur. J. Agron. 18:235–265.

Kiniry, J.R., J.R. Williams, D.J. Major, R.C. Izaurralde, P.W. Gassman, M. Morrison, R. Bergentine, and R.P. Zentner. 1995. EPIC model parameters for cereal, oilseed, and forage crops in the northern Great Plains region. Can. J. Plant Sci. 75:679–688.