



Productivity and profitability of soybean (*Glycine max*) as influenced by site-specific nutrient management

NAVNEET KAUR, JANARDAN SINGH* and SHILPA

CSK Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishvavidyalaya, Palampur, Himachal Pradesh 176 062, India

Received: 09 May 2019; Accepted: 25 October 2019

Key words: Productivity, Profitability, Site specific nutrient management, Soybean

Soybean (*Glycine max* L.) is an important oilseed crop in Indian sub-continent. It is cultivated under a wide range of agro-ecological conditions in different cropping systems. The United States, Brazil and Argentina are the world's largest soybean producers and represent more than 80% of global soybean production (Anonymous, 2016a). In India, it is grown on an area of 11.18 million ha with production and productivity of 13.15 million tonnes and 1235 kg/ha, respectively (Anonymous 2016b). Soybean is a potential rainy season crop of mid-hills zone of Himachal Pradesh. It is grown as a sole as well as an intercrop with maize. The area under crop in the state is 0.6 thousand ha with an average production of 980 kg/ha (Anonymous, 2016c). Among the legumes, soybean is valued for its high protein (38-45%) as well as its high oil content (20 %). It supplies approximately 65% world meal and 22% of the world edible oil. It is soil building crop and requires less water as compared to other crops (Imran *et al.* 2017). Soybean has several advantages over other oilseed crops. It performs nitrogen fixation by establishing a symbiotic relationship with the bacterium *Bradyrhizobium japonicum*. It is also highly adaptable to varying soil and climatic conditions, giving high yields compared to other pulse crops. The growing concern about impaired soil health, declining productivity and nutrient use efficiency are compelling the farmers to use higher doses of fertilizers during last two decades. The low nutrient use efficiency and associated environmental pollution and global warming problems have raised serious concerns about the existing nutrient management practices. As such, it is high time to develop site-specific nutrient management technologies which are able to synergic crop-soil nutrient dynamics. It is an approach to feed crops with nutrients as and when needed. The application and management of nutrients are dynamically adjusted to crop needs of the location and season.

The field experiment was conducted during rainy season of 2018 at the Research Farm, Department

of Agronomy, Forages and Grassland Management, Chaudhary Sarwan Kumar Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishvavidyalaya, Palampur. The soil of the experimental site was silty clay loam with 5.41 pH, 0.55 % OC, 130.08 kg/ha available nitrogen, 13.08 kg/ha available phosphorus and 256.3 kg/ha available potassium. The meteorological data recorded during the crop season revealed that the weekly maximum and minimum temperature ranged from 23.57°C to 32.89 °C and 10.14 °C to 20.64 °C, respectively. The mean relative humidity ranged from 24.07 to 94.93% and total of 2619.4 mm rainfall was received during the crop season.

The experiment was laid out in randomized block design comprising of seven treatments [T_1 - $N_{43}P_{43}K_{50}$ (SSNM), T_2 - $N_{43}P_{43}K_0$ (K omission), T_3 - $N_{43}P_0K_{50}$ (P omission), T_4 - $N_0P_{43}K_{50}$ (N omission), T_5 - $N_{20}P_{60}K_{40}$ (RDF), T_6 - FYM@5 t/ha (Farmer's practice) and T_7 - $N_0P_0K_0$ (control)]. Treated seeds with bavistin were used. Different doses of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium, and farmyard manure were applied as per the respective treatment. Other package of practices recommended for the region was also followed. Data were recorded on yield attributes, yields and economics of soybean and subjected to analysis of variance with mean comparison of 5% level of significance.

Primary branches/plant, seeds per pod and test weight remained unaffected. However, numerically the highest values were noted in T_1 ($N_{43}P_{43}K_{50}$) and the lowest was in control. Similar results were also reported by Patil *et al.* (2018) in groundnut. Different treatments significantly affected number of pods per plant (Table 1). Significantly higher number of pods per plant was recorded in T_1 ($N_{43}P_{43}K_{50}$) which was statistically at par with T_5 (RDF). The lowest number of pods was recorded in absolute control. T_5 resulted in higher number of pods as compared to T_6 (farmer's practice). This might be due to fact that number of pods depends on number of branches per plant and number of flowering nodes per plant and its retention, greater photosynthesis enhanced by more nutrient uptake resulted in more flowering buds which ultimately produced more pods per plant. Chaturvedi and Chandel (2005) reported similar results in soybean.

¹*Corresponding author e-mail: singhjdr@rediffmail.com

Table 1 Effect of different treatments on number of primary branches per plant, pods per plant, seeds per pod and test weight

Treatment	Primary branches/ plant	Pods/plant	Seeds/pod	Test weight (g)
T ₁ - N ₄₃ P ₄₃ K ₅₀ (SSNM)	6.5	70.9	3.0	193.0
T ₂ - N ₄₃ P ₄₃ K ₀ (T ₁ - K omission)	5.8	62.4	2.83	187.3
T ₃ - N ₄₃ P ₀ K ₅₀ (T ₁ - P omission)	5.8	61.2	2.67	188.6
T ₄ - N ₀ P ₄₃ K ₅₀ (T ₁ - N omission)	5.8	60.9	2.83	190.3
T ₅ - N ₂₀ P ₆₀ K ₄₀ (RDF)	6.5	66.8	3.0	193.0
T ₆ - FYM@5t/ha (Farmer's Practice)	6.3	65.7	2.83	191.0
T ₇ - N ₀ P ₀ K ₀ (control)	5.1	58.2	2.83	186.6
SEm±	0.3	1.6	0.2	2.5
CD (P=0.05)	NS	4.9	NS	NS

SSNM-Site specific nutrient management, RDF - Recommended dose of fertilizers

Table 2 Effect of different treatments on yield, productivity, harvest index, returns, benefit cost ratio and profitability

Treatment	Yield (t/ha)		Productivity (kg/ha/day)	Harvest Index (%)	Gross return (₹ × 10 ³ /ha)	Net return (₹ × 10 ³ /ha)	B:C	Profitability (₹/ha/day)
	Seed	Straw						
T ₁ - N ₄₃ P ₄₃ K ₅₀ (SSNM)	2.0	3.3	15.9	37.8	82.7	45.9	2.25	366.9
T ₂ - N ₄₃ P ₄₃ K ₀ (T ₁ -K omission)	1.5	2.8	11.9	34.4	63.1	27.2	1.76	217.8
T ₃ - N ₄₃ P ₀ K ₅₀ (T ₁ - P omission)	1.4	2.7	11.0	34.1	58.9	25.1	1.74	200.5
T ₄ - N ₀ P ₄₃ K ₅₀ (T ₁ - N omission)	1.4	2.5	11.5	35.6	60.3	24.1	1.66	192.6
T ₅ - N ₂₀ P ₆₀ K ₄₀ (RDF)	1.8	3.0	14.3	36.9	74.2	36.7	1.98	293.4
T ₆ - FYM@5t/ha (Farmer's Practice)	1.7	2.9	13.3	36.6	70.0	27.6	1.65	221.1
T ₇ - N ₀ P ₀ K ₀ (control)	0.8	1.7	6.7	33.1	36.3	3.9	1.12	31.2
SEm±	0.04	0.13	0.33	1.02	1.75	1.75	0.05	14.06
CD (P = 0.05)	0.13	0.41	1.03	3.14	5.41	5.41	0.15	43.32

SSNM-Site specific nutrient management, RDF - Recommended dose of fertilizers

Seed and straw yields were significantly affected by different treatments (Table 2). T₁ (N₄₃P₄₃K₅₀) resulted in the highest seed yield which was equal to the targeted yield (2 t/ha). The lowest seed yield was recorded in T₇. This shows that if nutrients are applied according to site specific needs targeted yield can be easily achieved. This might be due to fulfilment of nutritional needs of crop on that site. Kauraw *et al.* (2007) reported similar results in soybean. Similar results have also been reported by Patil *et al.* (2016) in soybean. Straw yield was significantly higher in T₁ which was at par with T₅ (RDF) and T₆ (Farmer's practice). The lowest straw yield was observed in control treatment. Similar results were also reported by Rana and Badiyala (2014) in soybean. The highest productivity and harvest index was also observed in T₁ while the lowest was in absolute control. This might be due to reason that balanced application of nutrients resulted in increasing the productivity of land area increasing its efficiency. Similar results have also been reported by Swati and Singh (2018) in soybean.

Gross return, net return, benefit cost ratio and profitability were significantly influenced by different treatments (Table 2). Significantly higher gross and net returns were observed in T₁. The lowest return was noted in control treatment. This might be due to higher yields at

higher nutrient level. Hellal and Abdelhamid (2013), Patil *et al.* (2018) and Billore and Srivastava (2015) reported similar results. Significantly higher B:C was observed in T₁ while the lowest was in control. Singh *et al.* (2013) also reported similar results in soybean. Significantly higher profitability was also recorded in T₁. The lowest profitability was recorded in control. This might be due to higher net return in T₁ resulted in higher profitability. Swati and Singh (2018) also reported similar results in soybean.

SUMMARY

A field experiment was conducted during the rainy season of 2018 at CSK Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishvavidyalaya, Palampur to study the effect of site-specific nutrient management on yield attributes, productivity and profitability of soybean. The experiment was laid out in randomized block design comprising of seven treatments (N₄₃P₄₃K₅₀, N₄₃P₄₃K₀, N₄₃P₀K₅₀, N₀P₄₃K₅₀, N₂₀P₆₀K₄₀, FYM@5t/ha and N₀P₀K₀). Experimental site was silty clay loam in texture, acidic in reaction, low in available nitrogen, and medium in available phosphorus and potassium. The highest number of pods (71/plant), seed yield (2 t/ha), net return (45.9 × 10³ ₹/ha), benefit cost ratio (2.25) and profitability (366.9 ₹/ha/day) was recorded at N₄₃P₄₃K₅₀. Omission of nutrients significantly reduced productivity and

profitability of soybean. The lowest number of pods, seed yield, net return, benefit cost ratio and profitability was recorded in control treatment ($N_0P_0K_0$). Site specific nutrient management ($N_{43}P_{43}K_{50}$) proved to be the best treatment in enhancing the yield and profitability of soybean. The recommended dose of fertilizers ($N_{20}P_{60}K_{40}$) and farmer's practice (FYM@5t/ha) proved to be the second and third best treatment, respectively.

REFERENCES

- Anonymous. 2016a. United State Department of Agriculture (USDA) <http://www.usda.gov>
- Anonymous. 2016b. Indian Institute of Soybean Research (IISR) <https://iisrindore.icar.gov.in/pdfdoc/soybeanmonitorsep2017.pdf>.
- Anonymous. 2016c. Soybean Processors Association of India. www.sopa.org/crop.po.doc
- Billore S D and Srivastava S K. 2015. Integrated nutrient management in soybean varieties grown under different agro-climatic conditions of India. *Soybean Research* **13**(2): 26–42.
- Chaturvedi S and Chandel A S. 2005. Influence of organic and inorganic fertilization on soil fertility and productivity of soybean. *Indian Journal of Agronomy* **50**(4): 311–313.
- Hellal F A and Abdelhamid M T. 2013. Nutrient management practices for enhancing soybean (*Glycine max*) production. *Acta biologica Colomiana* **18**(2): 239–250.
- Imran J N and Khan A A A A. 2017. Grain yield, yield attributes of wheat and soil physiochemical characteristics influenced by biochar, compost and inorganic fertilizer application. *Agricultural Research and Technology: Open Access Journal* **10**: 555–795.
- Kauraw D L, Dwivedi A K and Chauhan S S. 2007. Influence of long-term use of organic fertilizers on soybean-wheat productivity in vertisols. (In) *Proceedings of International Conference on Sustainable Agriculture for Food, Bioenergy and Livelihood Security*, JNKVV, Madhya Pradesh, February 14–16, p 43.
- Patil A G, Halepyati A S and Chittapur B M. 2016. Influence of site-specific nutrient management on growth and yield of soybean in north eastern transitional zone of Karnataka. *Supplement on Agronomy* **11**(4): 2651–2654.
- Patil D H, Shankar M A, Krishnamurthy N, Shadakshari Y G and Parama V R. 2018. Studies on site specific nutrient management (SSNM) on growth and yield of groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea*) under irrigation in southern Karnataka. *Legume Research* **41**(5): 728–733.
- Rana R and Badiyala. 2014. Effect of integrated nutrient management on seed yield, quality and nutrient uptake of soybean (*Glycine max*) under mid hill conditions of Himachal Pradesh. *Indian Journal of Agronomy* **59**(4): 641–645.
- Singh R, Sharma H B, Kumar P, Paliwal DK and Kumar P. 2013. Effect of integrated nutrient management on growth, yield and nutrient uptake by soybean (*Glycine max*) cultivars. *Indian Journal of Agronomy* **58**(3): 379–383.
- Swati and Singh J. 2018. Productivity and profitability of soybean (*Glycine max* L.) as influenced by different fertility levels and seed rates under mid-hill conditions of Himachal Pradesh. *Indian Journal of Agronomy* **63**(3): 388–390.