

RESEARCH NOTE

Response of chickpea to soil application of cured DAP and foliar nutrition under rainfed condition

N. MARUTHI, P. S. PATTAR, R. A. NANDAGAVI AND ARUN R. SATARADDI

Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture
Vijayapur - 586 101

University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad - 580 005
Karnataka, India

E-mails: maruthinamdari32@gmail.com, pattarps12702@gmail.com

(Received: November, 2021 ; Accepted: February, 2022)

Abstract: A field study on the effect of cured DAP and foliar nutrition on growth and yield of chickpea under rainfed condition during *rabi* 2020 at Regional Agricultural Research Station, Vijayapur, Karnataka revealed higher total dry matter per plant, number of nodules, chlorophyll content and leaf area in treatment DAP cured with vermicompost and foliar spray of 2 per cent DAP which was on par with soil application of DAP cured in FYM and foliar spray of 2 per cent DAP. Similarly, significantly higher number of pods per plant, grain weight per plant, grain yield, haulm yield and economics were recorded with soil application of DAP cured with vermicompost and foliar spray of 2 per cent DAP and it was on par DAP cured in FYM and foliar spray of 2 per cent DAP. Significantly higher net returns and BC ratio were realized in treatment combination of soil application of DAP cured with vermicompost and foliar spray of 2 per cent DAP.

Key words: Chickpea, Foliar nutrition, Growth attributes

India ranks first in area and production in the world, with an area of 10.56 m ha, production of 9.94 m.t and productivity of 1077 kg ha⁻¹ (Anon, 2020). Karnataka is one of the major chickpea producing states in the country and ranks fourth in area (8.64 lakh ha) with production of 6.75 lakh tonnes and the average productivity is 782 kg ha⁻¹ (Anon, 2020). The productivity of chickpea, however, is low due to inadequate application of nutrients. In chickpea crop, phosphorus has greater role in growth and development. Curing of phosphorus nutrients with organic manures and incubating for one week would help in better release of nutrients and in turn for its better absorption. Similarly, foliar fertilization is an economical way of supplementing the plant nutrients. Hence, the field trial was undertaken to study the effect cured DAP and foliar nutrition on growth and yield of chickpea (cv. JG 11) under rainfed conditions.

Investigation was carried out at Regional Agricultural Research Station (RARS), Vijayapur, Karnataka during *rabi*, 2020 on medium deep black soil (Vertisol) having a soil pH of 8.3 and EC of 0.24 dS/m. The soil was medium in organic carbon (0.5%), available N (168 kg/ha), P₂O₅ (31 kg/ha), and K (342 kg/ha). There were 15 treatment combinations laid out in randomized complete block design with three replications. The DAP fertilizer

was cured with different organics and incubated for one week and applied to soil at the time of sowing. Foliar spray with different nutrients was done at 45 days after sowing. During the experimental year a total rainfall of 867.7 mm was received in 50 rainy days from January to December and which was higher than the normal rainfall. The observations on total dry matter accumulation per plant, leaf area, number of nodules per plant, chlorophyll content, number of pods per plant, grain weight per plant, grain and haulm yield were subjected to statistical analysis

Results revealed that soil application of DAP cured with vermicompost to chickpea recorded significantly higher total dry matter accumulation per plant (15.01 g plant⁻¹) at harvest, leaf area (2.11 dm² plant⁻¹), chlorophyll content at 60 DAS (56.24) (Table 1). Similar findings were reported by Geeta (2014) in soybean.

Similarly, significantly higher number of pods per plant (36.58) at harvest was recorded with soil application of DAP cured with vermicompost (Table 1) probably due to increased availability of P with cured DAP. Higher yields were recorded with soil application of cured DAP with vermicompost and it was on par with DAP cured with FYM (Table 1). The higher grain yield recorded could be attributed to the improvement in number of pods plant⁻¹. Pattar *et al.* (2013) reported an higher yield and yield attributes of chickpea with treatment of DAP cured with FYM.

Further, foliar feeding of 2 per cent DAP recorded significantly higher total dry matter accumulation (14.65 g plant⁻¹ at harvest, leaf area (2.10 dm²), and chlorophyll content (55.65) at 60 DAS is probably due to the better availability of nutrients. Similar, observations were made by Pathak *et al.* (2012) and Ganga *et al.* (2014) in chickpea and Krishna and Kaleeswari (2018) in pigeonpea. Number of pods plant⁻¹ (35.71) followed similar trend (Table 1). Consequently, foliar feeding of 2 per cent DAP recorded significantly higher grain yield (1865 kg ha⁻¹) and haulm yield (2606 kg ha⁻¹), while foliar feeding of 1 per cent 19:19:19 was on par (Table 2). These findings were in line with the findings of Velayutham (2016) in blackgram.

Among the interaction treatments, the dry matter (15.51 g plant⁻¹) accumulation and distribution was significantly higher with soil feeding of DAP cured in vermicompost and foliar spray of 2 per cent DAP (Table 1) Further, significantly higher grain yield (2,040 kg ha⁻¹) and haulm yields (2,882 kg ha⁻¹) were recorded with soil application of DAP cured with vermicompost (Table 1) and foliar feeding of 2 per cent DAP owing to higher number of pods plant⁻¹ (38.77) (9.54 g). Soil application of DAP cured with vermicompost recorded significantly higher gross (Rs.84084 ha⁻¹) and net returns (₹ 57772 ha⁻¹) due to the higher grain yield. The treatment

Table 1. Growth parameters, yield attributes and economics of chickpea as influenced by application of cured DAP and foliar nutrition.

| Treatments | TDM (g plant ⁻¹) at harvest | Chlorophyll content at 60 DAS (SPAD values) | Leaf area (dm ²) at 60 DAS | Number of pods plant ⁻¹ | Grain yield (kg/ha ⁻¹) | Haulm yield (kg ha ⁻¹) | Gross returns (₹ ha ⁻¹) | Net returns (₹ ha ⁻¹) | BC ratio |
|---|---|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|----------|
| Factor I: Curing with ogranics (M) | | | | | | | | | |
| M ₁ : DAP cured with FYM (1:10)1 | 14.24 | 54.85 | 2.05 | 35.37 | 1754 | 2474 | 80421 | 54406 | 2.98 |
| M ₂ : DAP cured with vermicompost (1:10) | 15.01 | 56.24 | 2.11 | 36.58 | 1812 | 2638 | 84084 | 57772 | 3.18 |
| M ₃ : Control (DAP without curing) | 12.71 | 49.52 | 1.78 | 29.70 | 1536 | 2234 | 68421 | 42209 | 2.23 |
| S.E.m ± | 0.13 | 0.65 | 0.04 | 0.41 | 20 | 38 | 1062 | 1049 | 0.04 |
| C.D. (p=0.05) | 0.39 | 1.88 | 0.12 | 1.19 | 59 | 111 | 3076 | 3040 | 0.12 |
| Factor II: Foliar spray (S) | | | | | | | | | |
| S ₁ : 2 % urea spray | 13.88 | 52.51 | 1.93 | 33.58 | 1620 | 2418 | 75226 | 48880 | 2.69 |
| S ₂ : 2 % DAP spray | 14.53 | 55.65 | 2.10 | 35.71 | 1865 | 2606 | 83620 | 55935 | 3.14 |
| S ₃ : 1 % KNO ₃ spray3 | 13.94 | 53.42 | 1.97 | 33.78 | 1680 | 2458 | 77296 | 51850 | 2.82 |
| S ₄ : 1 % 19:19:19 spray | 14.18 | 54.27 | 2.04 | 34.05 | 1730 | 2472 | 78635 | 52889 | 2.98 |
| S ₅ : Control (No spray) | 13.42 | 51.84 | 1.85 | 32.31 | 1607 | 2290 | 73436 | 47757 | 2.34 |
| S.E.m ± | 0.17 | 0.84 | 0.05 | 0.53 | 26 | 49 | 1371 | 1355 | 0.05 |
| C.D. (p=0.05) | 0.50 | 2.42 | 0.15 | 1.54 | 76 | 143 | 3972 | 3925 | 0.16 |
| Interaction | | | | | | | | | |
| M ₁ S ₁ | 14.87 | 53.8 | 2.08 | 35.4 | 1609 | 2226 | 76085 | 51073 | 2.82 |
| M ₁ S ₂ | 15.41 | 56.9 | 2.25 | 36.9 | 1909 | 2705 | 84908 | 57878 | 3.22 |
| M ₁ S ₃ | 14.73 | 54.1 | 2.10 | 35.3 | 1770 | 2549 | 80754 | 55742 | 3.14 |
| M ₁ S ₄ | 15.31 | 56.0 | 2.07 | 35.7 | 1834 | 2585 | 82652 | 56640 | 3.11 |
| M ₁ S ₅ | 14.81 | 53.5 | 2.02 | 33.6 | 1648 | 2308 | 77710 | 50698 | 2.59 |
| M ₂ S ₁ | 14.18 | 56.1 | 1.96 | 35.7 | 1746 | 2767 | 81362 | 54350 | 3.01 |
| M ₂ S ₂ | 15.08 | 57.7 | 2.12 | 38.8 | 2040 | 2882 | 93678 | 64666 | 3.53 |
| M ₂ S ₃ | 14.35 | 55.8 | 2.03 | 36.3 | 1740 | 2570 | 81106 | 55794 | 3.14 |
| M ₂ S ₄ | 14.37 | 56.3 | 2.18 | 36.8 | 1789 | 2634 | 83000 | 57788 | 3.14 |
| M ₂ S ₅ | 13.21 | 55.3 | 1.94 | 35.3 | 1745 | 2341 | 81276 | 56264 | 3.10 |
| M ₃ S ₁ | 12.60 | 47.6 | 1.74 | 29.7 | 1505 | 2262 | 68231 | 41219 | 2.23 |
| M ₃ S ₂ | 13.09 | 52.4 | 1.93 | 31.5 | 1647 | 2233 | 72275 | 45263 | 2.68 |
| M ₃ S ₃ | 12.75 | 50.4 | 1.78 | 29.7 | 1531 | 2256 | 70028 | 44016 | 2.19 |
| M ₃ S ₄ | 12.88 | 50.5 | 1.86 | 29.7 | 1569 | 2198 | 70253 | 44241 | 2.70 |
| M ₃ S ₅ | 12.25 | 46.7 | 1.59 | 28.0 | 1428 | 2220 | 61322 | 36310 | 1.34 |
| S.E.m. ± | 0.30 | 1.45 | 0.09 | 0.92 | 45 | 85 | 2374 | 2347 | 0.09 |
| C.D. (p=0.05) | 0.86 | NS | NS | 2.67 | 132 | 248 | 6879 | 6799 | 0.27 |

also recorded significantly higher B:C ratio (3.18). Among foliar nutrition, significantly higher net returns (₹ 55,935 ha⁻¹) and benefit cost ratio (3.14) was obtained with foliar spray of 2 per cent DAP (Table 1). Increase in net returns with foliar nutrition were reported by Ramesh *et al.* (2016) in blackgram and Vighnesh *et al.* (2021) in cowpea. While, soil application of DAP cured with vermicompost and foliar spray of 2 per cent DAP together

recorded significantly higher net returns (₹ 64,666 ha⁻¹) and benefit cost ratio (3.53).

Hence, based on the results it was concluded that chickpea crop nutritionally nourished with soil application of recommended phosphorus through DAP cured in vermicompost along with foliar feeding with 2 per cent DAP helped in getting higher grain yield and realising higher net returns under rainfed condition.

References

- Anonymous, 2020, Agriculture statistics at a glance, Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, GoI, New Delhi.
- Ganga N, Singh R K, Singh R P, Choudhary S K and Upadhyay P K, 2014, Effect of potassium level and foliar application of nutrients on growth and yield of late sown chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *Environment and Ecology*, 32(1A): 273-275.
- Geeta G P, 2014, Phosphorus management in soybean under vertisols of northern transition zone of Karnataka (Doctoral dissertation, UASD).
- Krishna O N and Kaleeswari R K, 2018, Response of pulses to foliar application of multinutrients on yield, quality, uptake and soil nutrient status. *Madras Agriculture Journal*, 105 (1-3), p.1.
- Pathak G C, Gupta B and Pandey N, 2012, Improving reproductive efficiency of chickpea by foliar application of zinc. *Braz. Journal of Plant Physiology*, 24(3): 173-180.
- Pattar P S, Mansur C R, Alagundagi S C, Salimath P M and Manjunath H, 2013, Effect of different phosphorus sources and seed priming on growth, yield parameters and yield of chickpea. *Advance Research Journal for Crop Improvement*, 4(1):14-20.
- Ramesh T, Rathika S, Parthipan T and Ravi V, 2016. Productivity enhancement in black gram through refinement of nutrient management under rice fallow condition. *Legume Research*, 39(1): 106-109.
- Velayutham A, 2016, Yield attributes, yield and uptake of nutrients as influenced by basal and foliar application of nutrients on rice fallow blackgram. *Indian Journal of Agriculture Research*, 50(2): 122-125.
- Vighnesh S C, Harisha S and Kalyanamurthy K N, 2021, Effect of foliar nutrition on yield and nutrient uptake of cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata*). *Journal of pharmaceutical innovation*, 10 (9): 361-364.