



## Short Communication

### Effect of Nutrient Management on Yield of Bt Cotton under Dry Farming Conditions in North Saurashtra Agro-climatic Zone

V.D. Vora\*, D.S. Hirpara, P.D. Vekariya, F.G. Vala and V.L. Modhvadiya

Main Dry Farming Research Station, Junagadh Agricultural University, Targhadia 360 003, India

Received: February 2019

Cotton 'the king of apparel fibers' is an important cash crop and it supplies a major share of raw material for the textile industry while playing a key role in the economic and social affairs of the world (Anonymous, 2010; Hosamani *et al.*, 2013). It is grown primarily for its fiber which is used in the manufacture of cloths, making of threads and extraction of oil from cotton seed (Deshmukh *et al.*, 2013). It is grown throughout India under both rainfed and irrigated conditions on an area of about 9.5 million ha (Mayee *et al.*, 2008; Yang *et al.*, 2014). India ranks first in area but production is far below the world average of over 600 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (Gadhiya *et al.*, 2009). At present acute problems of reddening of cotton are observed due to lack of proper nutrient management practices (Das *et al.*, 2004). Keeping in view, an experiment was planned to study the effect of nutrient management on Bt cotton under dry farming condition, at Dry Farming Research Station, Junagadh Agricultural University, Jamkhambhalia, Gujarat.

A field experiment was conducted during kharif 2011-12 to 2015-16 at Dry Farming Research Station, Junagadh Agricultural University, Jamkhambhalia under North Saurashtra Agro-climatic Zone. The soil of the experimental field was medium black having good drainage and high moisture retention capacity. Some important characteristics of the soil were pH 8.30, EC 0.35 d Sm<sup>-1</sup>, organic carbon 0.41%, available N, P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, K<sub>2</sub>O and S were 230.3, 28.6, and 336 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and 17.8 ppm, respectively and micronutrient Fe, Mn and Zn were 10.19, 12.84 and 0.66 ppm, respectively. The experiment comprised of total 9 treatments i.e. T<sub>1</sub> - 80 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>2</sub> - 80 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> + 20 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> + 40 kg K<sub>2</sub>O + 20 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>3</sub> - 80 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> + 20 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> + 40 kg K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> + 40 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>4</sub> - 80 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> + 20 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>

ha<sup>-1</sup> + 80 kg K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> + 20 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>5</sub> - 80 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> + 20 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> + 80 kg K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> + 40 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>6</sub> - 80 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> + 40 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> + 40 kg K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> + 20 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>7</sub> - 80 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> + 40 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> + 40 kg K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> + 40 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>8</sub> - 80 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> + 40 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> + 80 kg K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> + 20 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>9</sub> - 80 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> + 40 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> + 80 kg K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> + 40 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup> in randomized block design, replicated thrice. Bt cotton variety BG-II G.Cot. Hy. 8 was sown and the 80 kg nitrogen ha<sup>-1</sup> was applied in three splits i.e. 25% as basal, 50% as top dressing at 35-40 days and 25% as top dressing at 60-65 days and all the agronomic practices were adopted as per need of the crop. The growth and yield parameters, seed cotton and stalk yield of cotton were recorded. After harvest of crop, soil samples were collected and analyzed for EC, pH, OC, available NPK status in soil using standard methods (Jackson, 1973).

The pooled results presented in Table 1 revealed that significantly higher values for plant height, number of branches per plant and number of bolls per plant of cotton were recorded with treatment T<sub>9</sub> (80-40-80-40 NPKS kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) over treatment T<sub>1</sub> (80 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>). This might be due to application of NPKS fertilizers at higher dose which supplied the required nutrients for the plant growth. Similar results were also observed by Gadhiya *et al.* (2009), Sakarvadia *et al.* (2009) and Vora *et al.* (2015). On the basis of pooled results (Table 1), maximum seed cotton yield (1798 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) was recorded with T<sub>9</sub> (80-40-80-40 NPKS kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) which was significantly higher than treatment T<sub>1</sub> (80 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>) and T<sub>6</sub> (80-40-40-20 NPKS kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and statistically at par with other treatments. The pooled results in Table 1 showed that significantly higher stalks yield (3536 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) of cotton was recorded with T<sub>9</sub> (80-40-80-40 NPKS kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) over treatments T<sub>1</sub> to T<sub>4</sub> & T<sub>6</sub>, and statistically at par with treatments

\*E-mail: vdvora@jau.in

Table 1. Effect of nutrient management on yield attributes, yield of Bt cotton and economics (pooled data of 3 years)

Treatments	Plant height (cm)	No. of branches/plant	No. of bolls/plant	Seed Cotton yield (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Stalks yield (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Net monetary return (Rs. ha <sup>-1</sup> )
T <sub>1</sub> 80 kg N ha <sup>-1</sup>	86.6	13.13	26.75	1452	2569	42063
T <sub>2</sub> 80-20-40-20 NPKS kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	88.9	13.56	31.60	1754	3028	<b>52091</b>
T <sub>3</sub> 80-20-40-40 NPKS kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	91.0	14.66	29.44	1751	3141	51806
T <sub>4</sub> 80-20-80-20 NPKS kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	88.2	14.52	30.69	1705	2966	48918
T <sub>5</sub> 80-20-80-40 NPKS kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	92.3	15.32	32.32	1763	3306	51107
T <sub>6</sub> 80-40-40-20 NPKS kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	91.8	15.18	27.97	1676	3176	47695
T <sub>7</sub> 80-40-40-40 NPKS kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	92.3	15.98	32.44	1759	3402	50941
T <sub>8</sub> 80-40-80-20 NPKS kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	90.1	15.07	29.39	1696	3069	47558
T <sub>9</sub> 80-40-80-40 NPKS kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	<b>97.5</b>	<b>16.59</b>	<b>33.21</b>	<b>1798</b>	<b>3536</b>	51565
S.Em.±	2.7	0.70	2.1	40	115	
C.D. at 5%	7.9	2.04	6.1	113	337	
C.V.%	4.1	18.41	17.7	7.0	11.7	

T<sub>5</sub> (80-20-80-40 NPKS kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and T<sub>7</sub> (80-40-40-40 NPKS kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). The minimum seed cotton yield (1452 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and stalk yield (2569 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) were recorded under 80 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>1</sub>). Thus, the results clearly indicated that combine application of NPKS at high dose resulted in increased yield. The results are in concurrence with the work reported by Hulihalli and Patil (2008), Gadhiya *et al.* (2009) and Sakarvadia *et al.* (2009). With respect to economics, higher net realization (Rs. 52091 ha<sup>-1</sup>) was obtained with treatment T<sub>2</sub> (80-20-40-20 NPKS kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). The data given in Table 2 also revealed that pH, EC and organic carbon content of soil were unaffected due to different treatments. Available status of phosphorus, potassium and sulphur in soil was significantly affected due to

different treatments and maximum values were observed with T<sub>9</sub> (80-40-80-40 NPKS kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). The minimum values for availability of all the nutrients were found under recommended dose of fertilizer i.e. 80 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>1</sub>). The results are in agreement with the work of Ravikiran and Halepyati (2019), Sujatha and Vijayalakshmi (2013) and Vora *et al.* (2015).

On the basis of the findings of the present investigation, it can be concluded that the application of NPKS @ 80-20-40-20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in cotton crop resulted in higher cotton seed yield and net realization of about Rs. 10,000 ha<sup>-1</sup> more than from recommended dose for the Bt cotton under dry farming conditions in North Saurashtra Agroclimatic Zone.

Table 2. Effect of different treatments on post harvest soil fertility (at harvest 2015-16)

Treatment	pH	EC (d Sm <sup>-1</sup> )	Org. C. (%)	Avail. P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Avail. K <sub>2</sub> O (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Avail. S (ppm)
Initial	8.30	0.35	0.411	28.6	366	17.8
T <sub>1</sub> 80 kg N ha <sup>-1</sup>	8.29	0.39	0.416	27.79	360	16.7
T <sub>2</sub> 80-20-40-20 NPKS kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	8.23	0.35	0.428	35.66	381	21.2
T <sub>3</sub> 80-20-40-40 NPKS kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	8.20	0.33	0.432	36.83	388	23.6
T <sub>4</sub> 80-20-80-20 NPKS kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	8.24	0.34	0.434	38.70	429	25.0
T <sub>5</sub> 80-20-80-40 NPKS kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	8.22	0.33	0.441	41.16	431	27.2
T <sub>6</sub> 80-40-40-20 NPKS kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	8.25	0.35	0.447	44.96	411	25.8
T <sub>7</sub> 80-40-40-40 NPKS kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	8.20	0.36	0.452	47.79	420	28.9
T <sub>8</sub> 80-40-80-20 NPKS kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	8.26	0.38	0.468	49.76	452	26.4
T <sub>9</sub> 80-40-80-40 NPKS kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	8.24	0.36	0.471	52.17	459	30.1
S.Em.±	0.06	0.02	0.02	2.14	11.04	1.6
C.D. at 5%	NS	NS	NS	<b>6.43</b>	<b>33.11</b>	<b>4.7</b>
CV%	1.32	8.60	6.69	8.92	4.61	10.87

## References

- Anonymous 2010. Annual report. All India Coordinated Cotton Improvement Project.
- Das, A., Prasad, M., Shivay, Y.S. and Subha, K.M. 2004. Productivity and sustainability of cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.) wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) cropping system as influenced by prilled urea, farmyard manure and *Azotobacter*. *Journal of Agronomy and Crop Science* 190: 298-304.
- Deshmukh, M.S., Patil, V.D., Jadhav, A.S., Gadade G.D. and Dhamak, A.L. 2013. Assessment of soil quality parameters and yield of rainfed Bt Cotton as influenced by application of herbicides in Vertisols. *International Journal of Agriculture Sciences* 3: 553-557.
- Gadhiya, S.S., Patel, B.B., Jadav, N.J., Pavaya, R.P., Patel, M.V. and Patel, V.R. 2009. Effect of different levels of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium on growth, yield and quality of Bt cotton. *Asian Journal of Soil Science* 4: 37-42.
- Hosamani, V., Halepyati, A.S., Shashikumar, M., Santhosh, U.N., Nataraja, M. and Manu, T.G. 2013. Quality, uptake of nutrients and economics of irrigated Bt cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.) as influenced by macro nutrients and liquid fertilizers. *Global Journal of Biology, Agriculture and Health Sciences* 2: 29-32.
- Hulihalli, U.K. and Patil, V.C. 2008. Yield and fiber quality of cotton as influenced by fertilizer levels and organic manure. *Annals of Arid Zone* 47(2): 201-204.
- Jackson, M.L. 1973. *Soil Chemical Analysis*. Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
- Mayee, C.D., Monga, D., Dhillon, S.S., Nehra, P.L. and Pundhir, P. 2008. Cotton-wheat production system in south Asia: A success story. Asia-Pacific Association of Agricultural Research Institutions, Bangkok, Thailand. pp. 48.
- Ravikiran, S. and Halepyati, A.S. 2019. Resources use efficiency in Bt-cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.) to nutrient management practices under supplemental irrigations. *International Journal of Chemical Studies* 7(3): 2529-2532.
- Sakarvadia, H.L., Polara, K.B., Parmar, K.B., Babariya, N.B. and Kunjadia, B.B. 2009. Effect of potassium and zinc on growth, yield, quality parameters and nutrient uptake by cotton. *An Asian Journal of Soil Science* 4(1): 24-26.
- Sujatha, T. and Vijayalakshmi, K. 2013. Soil fertility status of Bt cotton Cultivated fields and other soils of Khammam region in relation with available macro, micro nutrients and microbial count. *IOSR Journal of Environmental Science, Toxicology and Food Technology* 6: 13-18.
- Vora, V.D., Rakholiya, K.D., Rupapara, K.V., Sutaria, G.S. and Akbari, K.N. 2015. Effect of integrated nutrient management on Bt cotton and post-harvest soil fertility under dry farming agriculture. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Research* 1819-1894.
- Yang, F., Du, M., Tian, X., Eneji, A.E., Duan, L. and Li, Z. 2014. Plant growth regulation enhanced potassium uptake and use efficiency in cotton. *Field Crops Research* 163: 109-118.

