Impact of in-situ moisture conservation and sulphur nutrition on yield, quality and nutrient uptake by groundnut

P. M. Vaghasia, V. D. Khanpara* and R. K. Mathukia

Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, Junagadh Agricultural University, JUNAGADH (GUJARAT) INDIA

ABSTRACT

A field study was conducted during the rainy (*kharif*) seasons of 2002 and 2003 at Junagadh (Gujarat, India) to evaluate subsoiling, land configuration and sulphur nutrition effects on yield, quality and nutrient uptake by groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L). The results explicate that between-row subsoiling and broad bed and furrow significantly increased pod and haulm yield along with higher protein content and N content in pod over flat bed control. The contents of P, K and S in haulm were significantly less with between-row subsoiling and broad bed and furrow as compared to flat bed whereas, N content in haulm, P content in pod and haulm, K and S content in pod remained unaffected due to moisture conservation practices. Significantly higher uptake of N, P, K and S by pod and haulm were recorded with between-row subsoiling over flat bed. Application of sulphur @ 50 and 25 kg ha⁻¹ significantly increased pod and haulm yields over control. Sulphur fertilization significantly enhanced the oil and protein content as well as N content in pod, K and S content in pod and haulm over control, whereas depressed the P content in pod and haulm. Sulphur nutrition significantly accelerated the uptake of N, K and S by pod and haulm over control, but did not influence P uptake.

Key words : Moisture conservation, Sulphur, Groundnut, Soil profile.

INTRODUCTION

The presence of hard pan in soil profile impedes root growth and exploitation of water and nutrients. Subsoil tillage shatters the hard pan and increase infiltration of rainwater in soil. Broad bed and furrow (BBF) configuration maintains loose and porous soil condition. Both these practices result in better storage of rainwater and extensive root system and there by better water and nutrient uptake by crop. Sulphur as a plant nutrient is becoming increasingly important in dryland agriculture as it is the master nutrient of all oilseed crops and pulses and is rightly being called the "Fourth Major Nutrient". With these points in view, the present experiment was undertaken to evaluate subsoiling, BBF and sulphur effects on yield, quality and nutrient uptake by groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field investigation was carried out during rainy (kharif) seasons of 2002 and 2003 at Department of Agronomy, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh. The soil was clayey in texture and slightly alkaline in reaction (pH 8.0 and EC 0.28 dS m⁻¹) with available N 258 kg ha⁻¹, available P_2O_5 27.5 kg ha⁻¹, available K₂O 236 kg ha⁻¹ and available S 19.5 kg ha⁻¹. Field capacity and permanent wilting point were 28.4 and 12.8%, respectively, whereas bulk density was 1.42 Mg m⁻³ with 45.3% porosity. There were 5 main plots assigned to moisture conservation practices viz., M1flat bed (FB), M₂- alternate between-row subsoiling (ABRS), M_3 - between-row subsoiling (BRS), M_4 - in-row subsoiling (IRS) and M₅- broad bed and furrow (BBF) and 3 sub-plots allocated to sulphur levels viz., 0, 25 and 50 kg ha⁻¹. The experiment was laid out in split plot design with 4 replications. Subsoiling to a depth of 30 cm was carried out by subsoiler, while a bed of 150 cm width with furrow of 30 cm width and 15 cm depth was formed by BBF former after

* Author for corrospondence.

preparatory tillage and before sowing. The crop was fertilized with 12.5 kg N and 25 kg P_2O_5 ha⁻¹. Sulphur in the form of gypsum was applied at sowing in furrows as per treatments. The groundnut variety 'GG 20' was sown at a row spacing of 60 cm on 1st July, 2002 and 20th June, 2003 and harvested on 22nd October, 2002 and 15th October, 2003. The total seasonal rainfall of 540 and 1275 mm was received in 22 and 42 rainy days during 2002 and 2003, respectively. The oil content of seed was determined using Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Spectrophotometer (Model Oxford 4000 NMR analyzer). The content of N, P₂O₅, K₂O and S in seed and stalk was analysed by modified Kjeldahl's method, Vanadomolybdo phosphate yellow colour method, flame photometric method and turbidimetric method, respectively.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION Moisture conservation practices

The between-row subsoiling (M₃) and broad bed and furrow (M_5) , both being statistically alike, produced significantly higher pod and haulm yields (Table 1) over flat bed (M₁). Despite moisture conservation practices did not influence the oil content, between-row subsoiling (M_3) recorded significantly the highest protein content but it was at par with in-row subsoiling (M_4) and broad bed and furrow (M₅). The N content in pod as well as contents of P, K and S in haulm were significantly less with between-row subsoiling (M_3) as compared to flat bed (M_1) due to dilution effect of higher yield. Whereas, N content in haulm and contents of P, K and S in pod remained unaffected due to moisture conservation practices. Significantly higher uptake of N, P and S by pod and haulm as well as total uptake of these nutrients (Table 2) were recorded with between-row subsoiling (M₃) and broad bed and furrow (M₅) over flat bed (M_1) . The K uptake by pod followed the same trend,

HIND AGRI-HORTICULTURAL SOCIETY

Table 1 : Effect of moisture conservation practices and sulphur nutrition on yield, quality and nutrient uptake by groundnut (pooled over two years)

Treatments	Pod yield	Haulm yield (q ha ⁻¹)	Oil (%)	Protein (%)	Nitrogen (%)		Phosphorus (%)		Potassium (%)		Sulphur (%)	
	(q ha⁻¹)				Pod	Haulm	Pod	Haulm	Pod	Haulm	Pod Haulm	
Moisture con	servatio	n practice	es									
M₁- FB	14.23	23.02	49.11	20.43	3.764	1.236	0.217	0.096	0.437	0.497	0.149 0.189	
M ₂ - ABRS	15.45	24.91	49.51	20.53	3.788	1.250	0.217	0.095	0.430	0.488	0.149 0.186	
M ₃ - BRS	17.48	27.92	50.12	22.04	4.029	1.253	0.209	0.093	0.422	0.463	0.147 0.183	
M₄- IRS	15.64	25.61	50.01	22.00	4.029	1.170	0.212	0.090	0.417	0.423	0.146 0.180	
M₅- BBF	17.13	27.42	49.83	21.57	3.987	1.190	0.211	0.087	0.414	0.411	0.144 0.178	
CD (P=0.05)	1.16	1.95	NS	0.73	0.127	NS	NS	0.003	NS	0.025	NS 0.006	
Sulphur (kg l	ha⁻¹)											
S ₁ - 0	15.05	24.71	48.51	20.36	3.737	1.215	0.225	0.095	0.411	0.435	0.143 0.177	
S ₂ - 25	16.37	26.10	49.71	21.48	3.962	1.220	0.210	0.091	0.430	0.465	0.148 0.186	
S ₃ - 50	16.53	26.51	50.93	22.09	4.059	1.225	0.204	0.090	0.431	0.469	0.150 0.187	
CD (P=0.05)	0.56	1.27	0.63	0.50	0.082	NS	0.005	0.002	0.014	0.013	0.003 0.004	

whereas, significantly higher uptake of K by haulm and total K uptake were registered with between-row subsoiling (M_3) and alternate between-row subsoiling (M_2) over flat bed (M_1) . Navade and More (1993) and Rao (2001) also evidenced similar results in groundnut.

Sulphur levels

Application of sulphur @ 50 kg ha⁻¹ (S_3) and 25 kg ha⁻¹ (S₂) being at par significantly increased pod and haulm yields (Table 1) over control (S₁). Significantly higher contents of oil and protein were recorded with application of 50 kg S ha¹ (S₃). Sulphur fertilization significantly enhanced N content in pod as well as K and S content in pod and haulm, whereas depressed the P content in pod and haulm. Sulphur levels did not exert their significant influence on N content in haulm. Consequent to higher pod and haulm yields, application of sulphur @ 50 kg ha⁻¹ (S_3) and 25 kg ha⁻¹ (S_2) significantly accelerated the uptake of N, K and S by pod and haulm (Table 2) over control (S_1) . However, P uptake remained uninfluenced due to sulphur nutrition. The results are in agreement with report of Reddy et al. (1992) and Rao and Shakhawat (2002).

Table 2 : Effect of moisture conservation practices and sulphur nutrition on uptake of nutrients by groundnut (pooled over two years)

Treatments	Nitrogen uptake (kg ha ⁻¹)			Phosphorus uptake (kg ha ⁻¹)			Potassium uptake (kg ha ⁻¹)			Sulphur uptake (kg ha ⁻¹)		
		Haulm	Total	Pod	Haulm	Total	Pod	Haulm	Total	Pod	Haulm	Total
Moisture conservation practices												
M ₁ - FB	53.77	28.72	82.49	3.07	2.17	5.23	6.21	11.56	17.77	2.13	4.35	6.48
M ₂ - ABRS	58.81	31.15	89.96	3.30	2.33	5.63	6.63	12.24	18.87	2.31	4.62	6.92
M ₃ - BRS	70.52	35.01	105.53	3.62	2.55	6.17	7.40	13.06	20.46	2.57	5.08	7.65
M ₄ - IRS	62.99	29.97	92.96	3.29	2.26	5.55	6.53	10.87	17.40	2.29	4.59	6.87
M₅- BBF	68.54	32.72	101.26	3.56	2.34	5.90	7.10	11.38	18.48	2.48	4.86	7.35
CD (P=0.05)	5.22	2.76	6.22	0.25	0.21	0.35	0.67	1.17	1.65	0.16	0.41	0.49
Sulphur (kg ha ⁻¹))											
S ₁ - 0	56.58	30.12	86.71	3.35	2.31	5.66	6.16	10.75	16.90	2.16	4.33	6.50
S ₂ - 25	64.89	31.88	96.77	3.41	2.34	5.75	7.04	12.18	19.22	2.43	4.84	7.27
S ₃ - 50	67.31	32.54	99.85	3.35	2.33	5.68	7.14	12.52	19.66	2.48	4.92	7.40
CD (P=0.05)	2.47	1.71	1.23	NS	NS	NS	0.33	0.67	0.88	0.09	0.25	0.29

REFERENCES

Navade, S. K. and More, S. D. (1993). Effect of land configurations on yield and nutrient content by groundnut cultivars in medium black soils. *Journal of Maharashtra Agriculture University*, **18(3)**: 498-499.

Rao, G.S. (2001). Effect of land configurations, mulches and nutrient management on *in situ* moisture conservation, growth and yield of *kharif* groundnut. Ph.D. Thesis, Gujarat Agricultural University, Sardarkrushinagar.

Rao, S. S. and Shakhtawat, M. S. (2002). Effect of organic manure, phosphorus and gypsum on groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea*) production under rainfed condition. *Indian Journal of Agronomy*, **47(2)**: 234-241.

Reddy, S. K., Sriramamurthy, V.M.M. and Shantaram, M. V. (1992). N, P and S nutrition of groundnut grown in alfisols. *Journal of Oilseeds Research.*, 9(2): 189-195.

Received : February, 2006; Accepted : October, 2006