

Soil fertility evaluation based on the sugeno fuzzy logical model

Davron Ziyadullaev^{1,*}, *Dilnoz Mukhamedieva*¹, *Umirzoq Xoliyorov*¹, *Nodira Shanasirova*¹, *Ulmasjon Hudayberdiyev*², *Dilshod Eshmuradov*³, and *Aksulu Dzholdasbaeva*³

¹Tashkent Institute of Irrigation and Agricultural Mechanization Engineers National Research University, 100000 Tashkent, Uzbekistan

²Tashkent State University of Economics, 100066 Tashkent, Uzbekistan

³Tashkent University of Information Technologies named after Muhammad al-Khwarizmi, 100200 Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Abstract. With the improvement of soils, the productivity of agricultural crops and the efficiency of mineral fertilizers increase; though for individual types of fertilizers the changes take different ways. In different types of soil, different interactions between soil and fertilizers are observed; various crop varieties react differently to them, because each variety was bred under one of these interaction conditions, and its influence is phenotypically fixed in it. It was established that the fertility of different types of soils is quantitatively best characterized by stored soil moisture, bulk density, and it is closely related to such generally recognized fertility components as the amount of humus, nitrogen, phosphorus, etc. The main aim of the article is to build a Sugeno fuzzy logical model for assessing soil fertility.

1 Introduction

A stereotyped attitude to soil conditions means that a genetically fixed adaptation to certain soil conditions is then artificially destroyed [1–3]. This is what prevents the variety from showing its potential yield and high quality. Therefore, the existing varieties of cotton should be studied when grown on different soils, applying different forms, and doses of fertilizers in different ways and at different times in order to find the interaction between the variety, soil, and fertilizers that is optimal for a particular variety [4–5]. With prolonged use of phosphorus fertilizers in soils of all types and soil phases, the content of mobile forms of phosphorus increases. Therefore, the efficiency of newly introduced phosphate fertilizers decreases [6]. As soils are improved, the efficiency of potassium fertilizers increases against the background of nitrogen and phosphorus fertilizers [7–8].

An important task is to build a fuzzy model based on experimental data and improve the construction of Sugeno's fuzzy logical model to assess soil fertility. The solution to problems of data mining is characterized by the insufficiency of numerical calculations and the incompleteness of important information about the problem conditions [9–11].

* Corresponding author: dziyadullaev@inbox.ru

2 Methods and models

To build a model for assessing soil fertility, experts proposed a sampling (X_r, y_r) , $r = \overline{1, M}$, where $X_r = (x_{r,1}, x_{r,2}, \dots, x_{r,n})$ is the input vector of the r -pair and y_r is the corresponding output vector.

Our task is to build a fuzzy model in the following form:

$$\bigcup_{p=1}^{k_j} \left(\bigcap_{i=1}^n x_i = a_{i,jp} - \text{with weight } w_{jp} \right) \rightarrow y_j = b_{j,0} + b_{j,1}x_1 + \dots + b_{j,n}x_n + \dots + b_{j,n+1}x_1^2 + \dots + b_{j,2n}x_n^2 + \dots + b_{j,n+l-1}x_1^l + \dots + b_{j,ln}x_n^l \quad (1)$$

When constructing this model, the case for $l=0$ is considered a Singleton form model [12]. The linear model in the Sugeno representation, which consists of fuzzy rules inferences for the case $l=1$, was studied in [13]. The case for $l=2$ was considered in [14].

In the process of model construction, it is necessary to find the values of the coefficients of the fuzzy rule inference as follows

$$B = (b_{1,0}, b_{2,0}, \dots, b_{m,0}, b_{1,1}, b_{2,1}, \dots, b_{m,1}, \dots, b_{1,n}, b_{2,n}, \dots, b_{m,n}, \dots, b_{1,ln}, b_{2,ln}, \dots, b_{m,ln}),$$

$$i = \overline{1, n}, j = \overline{1, m}$$

and minimize the following function:

$$\sum_{r=1, M} (y_r - y_r^f)^2 \rightarrow \min \quad (2)$$

where y_r^f is the output of the input data in the r -row of the sampling (X_r) in the fuzzy knowledge base as a b -parameter.

The solution to problem (1) corresponds to the solution of equation $Y = A \cdot B$, where

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_{1,1}, \dots, \beta_{1,m}, & x_{1,1} \cdot \beta_{1,1}, \dots, x_{1,1} \cdot \beta_{1,m}, & \dots, & x_{1,n} \cdot \beta_{1,1}, \dots, x_{1,n} \cdot \beta_{1,m} \\ \vdots \\ \beta_{M,1}, \dots, \beta_{M,m}, & x_{M,1} \cdot \beta_{1,1}, \dots, x_{M,1} \cdot \beta_{1,m}, & \dots, & x_{M,n} \cdot \beta_{M,1}, \dots, x_{M,n} \cdot \beta_{M,m} \end{bmatrix},$$

indiscrete case

$$\beta_{j,r} = \frac{\mu_{f_j}(X_r) \cdot f_j}{\sum_{k=1}^m \mu_{f_j}(X_r)}, \text{ and in continuous case } \beta_{j,r} = \frac{\mu_f(X_r) \cdot f_j}{\int_{f_-} \mu_f(X_r) df}$$

$f_j = b_{j,0} + b_{j,1}x_{r,1} + b_{j,2}x_{r,2} + \dots + b_{j,n}x_{r,n} + b_{j,n+1}x_{r,1}^2 + b_{j,n+2}x_{r,2}^2 + \dots + b_{j,2n}x_{r,n}^2 + \dots + b_{j,n+l-1}x_{r,1}^l + b_{j,n+l}x_{r,2}^l + \dots + b_{j,ln}x_{r,n}^l$ is the output of j -rule,

$\mu_{f_j}(x_r)$ is the membership function corresponding to each experimental data for each case:

$$y = -5,45 - 0,06 \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \mu(x_1^{1j})x_1^{1j}}{\sum_{j=1}^n \mu(x_1^{1j})} + 0,15 \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \mu(x_2^{1j})x_2^{1j}}{\sum_{j=1}^n \mu(x_2^{1j})} + 0,009 \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n \mu(x_3^{1j})x_3^{1j}}{\sum_{j=1}^n \mu(x_3^{1j})}.$$

4 Discussion

In an irrigated typical gray soil the soil is medium loamy with a content of coarse silt particles of 42.2 - 50.2%, which favors the physical and water-physical properties of soil. Sandy fractions here amount to 6.0 - 8.6% of the soil mass and physical clay fraction - to 41.8 - 45.1%. The density of the arable layer (0-30 cm) is the lowest - 1.27 g/cm since it has a loose structure. The subsurface layer is strongly compacted, and its density reaches 1.37 g/cm. The soil porosity in the arable layer is 52.6, in the subsurface layer, it is 49.1% of the total volume; the total moisture capacity is 46.3 and 45.2%, respectively, of the soil volume. In the loose subsurface layer, the lowest moisture capacity is 28.8, and in a highly compacted arable layer, it is 28% of the soil volume. At full moisture capacity, the air content in the arable layer of soil is 6.0% of its volume, and in the subsurface layer, it is 3.8%; at the lowest moisture capacity, the values are 23.6 and 21.8%, respectively.

In irrigated gray soil-meadow soils, the arable layer is loose and the subsurface layer is compacted. The loose structure of the arable layer increases the soil porosity to 53.0% of the volume; the compaction of the subsurface layer reduces it to 48.4%. In the loose arable layer of soil, the total moisture capacity is 45.6%, and the smallest moisture capacity is 30.8% of the volume, in the subsurface layer, the values are 47.2 and 30.4%, respectively. The air content at total moisture capacity is substantially reduced - in the arable layer to 7.5, in the subsurface layer to 1.0% of the volume, and at the smallest moisture capacity, it increases to 21.2% and 18.0%, respectively. The hydromorphic conditions of soil formation form specific agrochemical properties: the content of organic matter increases, the availability of mobile phosphorus is low, and that of mobile potassium is average.

The irrigated gray soil-meadow soil was formed on layered alluvial deposits, while the irrigated typical and newly irrigated light gray soil were formed on loess. Irrigated gray soil - meadow soil develops under the constant influence of a closely located layer of groundwater (2-1.5 m). In its profile at a depth of 80 cm there is a sign of gleying. The mechanical structure of the irrigated gray soil-meadow soil is a heavy loamy one, and that of the newly irrigated light gray soil is a light loamy one. Irrigated gray soil-meadow soils are characterized by a significantly higher moisture capacity and, conversely, a low air content; it has a higher content of humus, and total nitrogen, and less content in the subsurface layer but not as less as in irrigated typical and newly irrigated light gray soils. These indices are the lowest in newly irrigated light gray soil.

The irrigated gray soil-meadow soil and the newly irrigated light gray soil are medium-supplied in terms of the content of mobile potassium, while the irrigated typical gray soil is a low-supplied soil in terms of the content of mobile potassium.

5 Conclusion

Thus, the assessment of soil fertility shows that soils vary greatly along the depth of the groundwater table. In soils with a close occurrence of groundwater, in addition to gleying, there is a completely different water, air, and temperature regime, a different composition of microorganisms, a different ratio of ammonia and saltpetrous forms of nitrogen, phosphorus compounds and potassium. The influence of the soil water regime is so

strong that the soil, which shows nitrogen in the first minimum under certain moisture content, in other conditions shows phosphorus in the first minimum. The texture largely determines the specificity of soil conditions. A variety bred on light-textured soils, which have excellent water-air, temperature regimes, and nutrient status cannot be recommended for fine-textured soils since varieties reduce their productivity when they are in a completely different environment. In all coarse-textured soil zones, the efficiency of fertilizers, especially nitrogen and potassium fertilizers increases. Highly cultivated lands optimally combine factors and plants, using them most productively, and providing the highest possible yield. Therefore, a variety bred on medium and poorly cultivated soils will yield a reduced crop.

References

1. V. N. Romanov, V. K. Ivchenko, I. O. Ilchenko, M. V. Lugantsev, Achievements in science and technology of the agro-industrial complex **5**, 32-34 (2018)
2. R. Z. Naqvi, S. S. E. A. Zaidi, K. P. Akhtar et al., Scientific reports **7**, 15880 (2017)
3. D. M. Zhang, W. J. Li, C. S. Xin et al., Field crops research **138**, 63-70 (2012)
4. H. Zhang, H. Liu, C Sun et al., Water **9(7)**, 503 (2017)
5. B. I. Niyazaliev, Agrarian science **2**, 5-6 (2016)
6. S. A. Kazemeini, R. Moradi Talebbeigi, M. Valizade, Archives of Agronomy and Soil Science **62(3)**, 395-412 (2016)
7. J. Lofton, B. Haggard, D. Fromme, B. Tubana, Journal of Cotton Science **18(3)**, 376-384 (2014)
8. G. Z. Yang, H. Y. Tang, Y. C. Nie, European journal of agronomy **35(3)**, 164-170 (2011)
9. N. R. Hulugalle, B. McCorkell, V. F. Heimoana, L. A. Finlay, Journal of Cotton Science **20(4)**, 294-298 (2016)
10. M. A. Locke, L. J. Krutz, Steinriede R.W., S. Testa, Soil Science Society of America Journal **79(2)**, 660-671 (2015)
11. W. T. Pettigrew, H. A. Bruns, K. N. Reddy, Journal of Cotton Science **20(4)**, 299-308 (2016)
12. N. Egamberdiev, D. Mukhamedieva, U. Khasanov, Journal of Physics: Conference Series **1441(1)**, 012137 (2020)
13. D. Sh. Ziyadullaev, D. T. Mukhamedieva, G. Ye. Ziyodullaeva, Journal of Advanced Research in Dynamical and Control Systems – JARDCS **10(14)**, 1850 – 1854 (2018)
14. D. Sotvoldiev, D. T. Mukhamedieva, Z. Juraev, Journal of Physics: Conference Series **1441(1)**, 012171 (2020)
15. D. T. Mukhamedieva, International Journal of Mechanical and Production Engineering Research and Development, **9(2)**, 649–658 (2018)
16. Z. Abdullaev, D. Sh. Ziyadullaev, D. T. Muhamediyeva, IOP Publishing Journal of Physics: Conference Series **2176**, 012071 (2022)