Yield and Yield Attributes of Groundnut (Arachis Hypogaea L.) as Influenced by Organic Practices in Semi Arid Region

Yogendra Kumar, Rani Saxena*, K.C. Gupta and V.D. Fageria

Division of Agronomy, Rajasthan Agricultural Research Institute (SKRAU), Durgapura, Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

*Email: mathurrani@rediffmail.com

Paper No. 158 Received: August 17, 2013 Accepted: October 121, 2013 Published: November 29, 2013

Abstract

Field experiments were conducted during three consecutive kharif seasons of research farm of Rajasthan Agricultural Research Institute, Durgapura, Jaipur to study the effect of organic practices on the yield and yield attributes of groundnut in semi arid region with the treatments comprised of T1-Farmer's practices, T2- 7.5 t FYM +PSB+ PSM+ Bio-Pesticides, T3- T2 + Seed treatment with PSB+ PSM+ Bio-pesticides, T4 – T3 + Foliar spray of pseudo-monas, T5 – T3 + Foliar spray of NSKE @ 5 %, T6 - T3 + Foliar spray of Panchagavya and T7-Absolute control, T8-100% RDF (15kg N+ 60 kg $_2O_5$ /ha). The results revealed that in treatment T5, application of farmyard manure (FYM) (7.5 t/ha) inoculated with microbes (bio fertilizers+bio-pesticides) 15 days before sowing (heapit) and seed treatment with bio fertilizers+bio-pesticides at the time of sowing gave significantly higher pod yield (2750 kg/ha) over absolute control (2151 kg/ha) and FYM without inoculated with microbes but at par with other treatments. The same trend was also observed in B:C Ratio (3.66) with treatment T5 (T3 + Foliar spray of NSKE @ 5 %). The study indicated that the groundnut showed greater response to the application of organic practices (i.e., organic farming) under semi arid region.

Highlights

Farmyard manure (7.5 t/ha) inoculated with microbes (bio fertilizers+bio-pesticides) + seed treatment with bio fertilizers+bio-pesticides gave highest pod yield (2750 kg/ha).

Keywords: Groundnut, organic packages, bio-pesticides, yield, yield attributes

Groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) is the major oilseed crop and also known as poor men's cashew nut and wonder nut. India produced 8.26 mt from 5.86 mh area, with an average yield of 1411 kg/ha of Groundnut, while the contribution of Rajasthan in production was 0.68 mt from 0.35 mh area, with an average yield of 1943 kg/ha during 2010-11 (Agricultural statistics at a glance, 2012). Okello *et al.*, 2010 reported that groundnut seeds contain 40-50% oil, 20-50% protein, and 10-20% carbohydrate depending on the variety and some essential minerals and vitamins. In conventional agriculture, chemical fertilizers and pesticides are used to increase crop yield as well as to control pests, which not only affects soil environment but also threat to human health. Contrary to this, organic practices minimize the environmental pollution and the use of non-renewable natural resources. It protects long term fertility of soil by maintaining organic matter and providing crop nutrients indirectly by using relatively insoluble nutrient



resources, which are made available to plants by the action of soil micro-organisms. Since the organically grown food are much in demand world wide and also fetch premium prices in export market, therefore, the organic farming is becoming popular and their products have higher demand round the world. Organic manures contribute to plant growth through their favorable effects on the physical, chemical and biological properties of soil. Organic manures also have a pronounced residual effect on the nutrient availability and enhancing productivity of field crops(Rakshit et al., 2008, Rakshit, 2013). Olowoake and Adeoye, 2013 and Sisodia and Kewat, 2012 reported higher yield in maize and rice with organic manures respectively. High yields of groundnut and sustainability in its production can be obtained with better fertility management practices especially with organic farming practices (Nagaraj et al., 2001). The production and productivity of groundnut fluctuates seasonally depending upon rainfall, pest and disease outbreak. The present study aims to access the performance of organic practices on sustainable yield and yield attributes of groundnut especially in semi arid regions.

Materials and Methods

The present experiments were carried out at research farm of Rajasthan Agricultural Research Institute, Durgapura, Jaipur (Rajasthan) during three consecutive kharif seasons of 2008-09 and 2010. Durgapura is situated in the eastern part of Rajasthan and lies between 26° 51' North latitude and 75°47' east longitude and at an elevation of 390 m. It falls under semi arid climatic conditions, which is characterized by the features of hot dry summers and cool dry winters. The annual rainfall ranges from 500-600 mm. The rainfall of the locality is often erratic and ill-distributed along with an occasional long dry spells or frequent heavy rainy days during rainy season. The mean daily maximum temperature ranges from 22.0 to 40.6 °C and daily minimum temperature ranges from 8.3 °C to 27.3 °C. In some of the years, maximum temperature reaches as high as 48 °C in the month of May or June, while minimum temperature falls down to a limit of 1 °C during end of December or January months. The relative humidity varies from season to season. It ranges between 80 to 95% during rainy season, which goes upto 100% and 20 to 30% during winter and summer seasons, respectively. The soil of the experimental field had a uniform topography. The soil type of the experimental field was loamy sand with sand (87.7%), silt (5.6%), clay (7.7%), 8.3 pH, 0.24% organic carbon and 143.3, 33.0, and 223.6 kg/ha available N, P_2O_5 and K_2O_5 respectively.

The present investigation was comprised of 8 treatment combinations consisting with different organic practices viz. T1-Farmer's practices, T2- 7.5 t FYM +PSB+ PSM+ Bio-Pesticides, T3 - T2 + Seed treatment with PSB+ PSM+ Bio-pesticides, T4 – T3 + Foliar spray of pseudo-monas, T5 - T3 + Foliar spray of NSKE @ 5 %, T6 - T3 + Foliar spray of Panchagavya, T7-Absolute control and T8-100% RDF (15kg N+ 60 kg $_{2}O_{s}/ha$) were tested in a randomized block design with three replications and the net plot size was 18.0 sq m with 35cm row to row and 15 cm plant to plant spacing. The varieties Girnar-2 was sown in the month of June of 2007, 2008 and 2009 respectively. Four irrigations were given. Phorate 10 G at the time of sowing @ 25 kg/ha and Chloropyriphos 4 lit/ha with irrigation was used to control white grub. Seeds (kernels) were treated with Dithan M-45 at the rate of 3 g/kg to avoid the possible occurrence of the seed and soil borne diseases.

All the physiological parameters were recorded at 30 days after sowing (DAS) and at maturity every year and means were calculated and used for the interpretation of the results. The data were statistically analyzed for the test of significance at 0.05% probability level. The Benefit-cost ratio which gives an indicative of the true monetary gain over every rupee of investment under a particular treatment was worked out by using the following formula:

Benefit-cost ratio = $\frac{\text{Gross monetary return (Rs/ha)}}{\text{Cost of cultivation (Rs/ha)}}$

Results and Discussion

Table 1 revealed that management of groundnut through organic practices significantly influenced pod weight, plant population, kernel yield, pod yield and haulm yield over farmers practices and control during each year of study. Highest plant population (183.69 th/ha) and 100 kernel weight (66.56 g) were observed in treatment T5 (T3 + Foliar spray of Panchagavya). Highest oil content (51.16 %) was observed in treatment T3 (T2 + Seed treatment with PSB+ PSM+ Bio-pesticides) followed by treatment T4 (T3 + Foliar spray of pseudo-monas) (51.14 %). But the number of pods/plant (23.55) were highest in treatment T4 (T3 + Foliar spray of pseudo-monas). The lowest pod yield and haulm yield were obtained in absolute control. Treatment T5 (T3 + Foliar spray of NSKE @ 5 %) showed significantly the highest pod yield (2768 kg/ha) but kernel yield (2067 kg/ha) and haulm yield (3002 kg/ha) was observed in treatment T3 (T2 + Seed treatment with PSB+ PSM+ Bio-pesticides) over rest of the treatments under study.

PRINT ISSN.: 0974-1712 ONLINE ISSN.: 2230-732X

The lowest haulm yield (2359 kg/ha) and pod yield (2151 kg/ha) and kernel yield (1418 kg/ha) was recorded in absolute control during all the years which revealed the inefficiency of fertilization as reported by Deshmukh et al., 2005 that the beneficial effect of FYM in conjunction with recommended dose of fertilizers may be due to the effect of organic matter in improving physical, chemical and biological environment of soil conducive to better plant growth. This was in agreement with the findings of Sisodia and Kewat, (2012), Malligawad and Parameshwarappa, (2006), Malligawad et al., (2007) who have reported that organic farming maintains dynamic soil nutrient status and safe environment. Dharma, 1996 observed that FYM might have stimulated the activities of microorganisms that made the plant nutrients readily available to the crops which augmented pod yield of groundnut. Olowoake and Adeoye, 2013 reported that application of FYM increased the availability of nutrients to crop, increasing moisture content of soils and enhanced the availability of potassium to plant which resulted in higher maize yield. FYM application had increased the dry matter production, which might be due to increased release of macro as well as micronutrients in better extraction by the groundnut. In general, crop growth was found better in the plots having organic package treatments than in absolute control treatment (Table 1).

The importance of organic to inorganic manuring in groundnut plants was emphasized by Okello, 2010 and Ahmed et al., 1997 who stated that the highest dry matter accumulation, kernel yield and oil content were achieved by fertilization with farmyard manure as there was significant increase in organic C, available N and P content of the soil with application of FYM possibly due to the increase in decomposition product of organic matter which resulted in better performance. All the organic practices significantly influenced the shelling % and SMK % (sound mature kernels) over absolute control treatment (Table 2). The lowest shelling % and SMK % were obtained in absolute control. Treatment T5 (T3 + Foliar spray of NSKE @ 5 %) showed highest shelling percent (75.42 %) and SMK (86.77 %) followed by treatment T3 (T2 + Seed treatment with PSB+PSM+Bio-pesticides) over rest of the treatments under study.

The economic analysis of the treatments was made with different sub-heads as cost of cultivation and gross as well as net returns as per hectare basis and finally as profitability (benefit: cost ratio). The data on these parameters are presented in Table 3. The monetary value of the marketable produce is termed as Gross return. The gross return values varied due to effect of different organic package treatments (Table 3). Gross return is directly related to the value of the marketable produce, which could be realized from the existing market price of the produce. The Gross return value was maximum (Rs 88564 Rs/ha) with treatment T5 (T3 + Foliar spray of NSKE @ 5 %). The higher gross returns of these treatments were due to higher pod yield. Treatment, T7 (absolute Control) led to record significantly minimum gross return of Rs 68993/ha in totality as it recorded less pod and haulm yields. The cost of cultivation was maximum (Rs 25476/ha) under treatment T6 (T3 + Foliar spray of Panchagavya) followed by treatment T4 (T3 + Foliar spray of pseudo-monas) (Rs 25375/ha). The lowest cost of cultivation was observed in treatment T5 (T3 + Foliar spray of NSKE @ 5 %).

The maximum net returns (Rs 64371/ha) was obtained under treatment T5 (T3 + Foliar spray of NSKE @ 5 %) over all the organic package treatments including absolute control treatment, followed by treatment T3 (T2 + Seed treatment with PSB+ PSM+ Bio-pesticides) (Table 3). The B: C ratio was maximum (3.66:1) under treatment T5 (T3 + Foliar spray of NSKE @ 5 %) (Table 3), due to the maximum gross return value with the lowest cost of cultivation associated with it, followed by treatment T3 (T2 + Seed treatment with PSB+ PSM+ Bio-pesticides). Thus it could be concluded that investment on the use of every unit of organic package was more remunerative. The treatment T6 (T3 + Foliar spray of Panchagavya) had the minimum B:C ratio (3.32:1) among all treatments as it recorded less pod and haulm yields. Similar results were observed by Chandrasekaran et al., 2007.

Conclusion

The study was undertaken at research farm of Rajasthan Agricultural Research Institute, Durgapura, Jaipur (Rajasthan) during three consecutive kharif seasons of 2008, 2009 and 2010 to study the effect of organic practices on the yield and yield attributes of groundnut in semi arid region. The results indicated that the groundnut showed greater response to different organic practices under semi arid region. The study also revealed that under semi arid conditions with moderately less rainfall, sustainable yields of groundnut can be obtained with organic practices involving application of farmyard manure with microbes (bio fertilizers+bio-pesticides) and seed treatment with bio fertilizers+bio-pesticides.

	Plant Po	Plant Population (000/ha)	(000/ha)		No of Pods/P	Pods/Pla	lant	2	Pod Wt/Plant (gm)	tht (gm)		100K	100KernelWt (gm)	t (gm)	_	Kernel Yield (Kg/ha)	ield (Kg	(eu/	g	Pod yield kg/ha	g/ha		Hai	Haulm yield kg/ha	kg/ha	
	2008	2009	2010	Mean	2008	2009	2010 Mean		2008 2009)9 201C	IC Mean	2008	2005	§ 2010 Mean	Mean	2008 20	2009 2	201C Me	Mean 2008	08 2009	09 2010		Mean 2008	38 2009	9 2010	0 Mear
T1-Farmer's practices	191.85	191.85 174.44	179.62	179.62 181.97	22.13	18.07	20.33 19.84		26.46 25.13	13 30.9	9: 27.50	40.89	9 67.9	76.5	61.79 9	922 1(1692 1	1990 1536	36 1388	88 2750	50 2978	78 2372	72 957	7 3203	3 3629	9 2596
T2-7.51FYM+PSB+PSM 186.85 169.25 172.03 176.04	186.85	169.25	172.03	176.04	24.20	24.20 19.60	22.00 21.93		27.86 31.13	13 38.2	2 32.42	42.07		68.1 73.7 6	61.31 1103		2218 2	2615 1979	79 1638	38 3099	3357	57 2698	98 1129	29 3611	1 4079	9 2939
Bio-Pesticides																										
T3-T2 + Seed treatment v 192.59 175.92 178.33 182.28	192.59	175.92	178.33	182.28	23.73	19.93	22.48 20.04		27.32 30.20	20 37.1	1: 31.66	41.44	4 68.4	74.1	61.35	1101 2	2358 2	2742 2067	57 1638	38 3174	74 3438	38 2750	50 1101	11 3722	2 4185	5 3002
PSB+ PSM+ Bio-pesticide																										
T4-T3+Foliar spray of 185.37 171.11 179.44 178.64	185.37	171.11	179.44	178.64	24.20	21.47	25.00 23.55		28.72 30.20	20 37.1	1: 32.02	41.71	1 71.1	1 77.0 63.28		1057 2	2199 2	2604 1953	53 1574	74 3116	16 3390	90 2693	93 1074	14 3629	9 4129	9 2944
pseudo-monas																										
T5–T3+Foliar spray of	196.66	17.77	176.66	196.66 177.77 176.66 183.69	26.33	20.73	22.46 22.84		28.80 30.26	26 37.3	3 32.12	43.10	0 71.2	77.1	63.82	1226 22	2269 2	2682 2059	59 1685	85 3084	84 3535	35 2768	68 1138	3444	4 4081	1 2887
NSKE @ 5 %																										
T6 - T3 + Foliar spray of	190.74	174.49	179.62	190.74 174.49 179.62 181.61	24.80	20.86	23.93 23.10		28.66 29.80	80 36.7.	7. 31.73	53.04	4 70.4	76.2	66.56	1058 27	2185 2	2706 1983	83 1546	46 2972	72 3385	85 2634	34 1055	55 3481	1 4124	4 2886
Panchagavya																										
T7-Absolute control	188.18	176.85	175.92	188.18 176.85 175.92 180.31	21.20	18.20	20.78 20.06		24.06 24.40	40 29.9	9 26.14	37.97	7 71.7	74.9	61.54 7	780 1	1596 1	1875 1418	18 1250	50 2500	00 2705	05 2151	51 851	2926	9300	0 2359
SEM1	10.7	4.71	4.50		0.89	1.10	1.20	0.96	96 1.17	7 1.04	4	3.62	2.37	2.68		52 1(0 <u>1</u>	114	11	128	8 118	8 48	29	126	159	
CD at 5%	SN	SN	SN		NS	NS	SN	2.97	37 3.63	3 4.24	4	NS	NS	NS	-	163 3(309	348	239	9 397	7 359	9 148	8 176	389	484	
CV%	6.61	4.68	4.48		6.58	9.61	9.29	60.9	90 7.10	0 6.77	7	11.17	7 10.5	6.16	~~	8.86 8.	8.37 7	7.98	8.80	0 7.42	2 6.21	57	9.48	8 6.37	7 6.91	_

608



	T1-Farmer's practices T2-7.5 t FYM +PSB+ PSM+ Bio-Pesticides T3- T2 + Seed treatment with PSB+ PSM+ Bio-pe T4 - T3 + Foliar spray of pseudo-monas T5 - T3 + Foliar spray of NSKE @ 5 %				0/ 91111010			SN	SMK%			•	Oil%	
	T1-Farmer's practices T2-7.5 t FYM +PSB+ PSM+ Bio-Pesticides T3- T2 + Seed treatment with PSB+ PSM+ Bio-pe T4 - T3 + Foliar spray of pseudo-monas T5 - T3 + Foliar spray of NSKE @ 5 %		2008	2009	2010	Mean	2008	2009	2010	Mean	2008	2009	2010	Mean
les 67.36 71.46 77.85 72.22 82.70 84.63 83.34 50.90 50.83 50.24 $+$ Bio-pesticides 67.20 74.28 80.85 74.11 86.33 86.03 87.66 86.67 51.66 51.20 50.64 67.20 70.54 76.78 71.50 86.23 85.00 85.94 51.33 51.16 50.70 72.66 73.57 80.05 75.42 86.23 85.03 87.83 86.77 51.36 51.16 72.66 73.36 79.81 73.91 91.40 86.73 88.83 51.36 51.76 68.56 63.48 69.48 65.17 77.13 76.30 77.70 77.20 47.20 47.26 62.56 63.48 69.48 65.17 77.13 76.30 77.70 77.26 47.20 47.20 1.08 1.56 1.59 3.27 32.22 2.24 2.33 51.16 50.60 52.56 63.48 69.48 65.17 77.13 76.30 77.70 77.20 47.20 47.20 1.08 1.56 1.59 3.27 2.24 2.33 0.24 0.78 0.27 3.34 4.81 4.85 NS 6.92 NS 0.20 0.25 0.27 2.78 3.87 3.61 6.64 4.60 4.60 4.60 0.78 0.24 2.78 3.87 3.61 6.64 $4.$	T2-7.5 t FYM +PSB+ PSM+ Bio-Pesticides T3- T2 + Seed treatment with PSB+ PSM+ Bio-pe T4 - T3 + Foliar spray of pseudo-monas T5 - T3 + Foliar spray of NSKE @ 5 %		66.56	61.56	66.95	65.02	87.36	88.36	90.02	88.58	50.80	50.76	50.21	50.59
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	T3- T2 + Seed treatment with PSB+ PSM+ Bio-pe T4 – T3 + Foliar spray of pseudo-monas T5 – T3 + Foliar spray of NSKE @ 5 %		67.36	71.46	77.85	72.22	82.70	82.70	84.63	83.34	50.90	50.83	50.24	50.65
67.20 70.54 76.78 71.50 86.23 85.00 86.60 85.94 51.33 51.40 50.70 72.66 73.57 80.05 75.42 86.26 86.23 87.83 86.77 51.36 51.16 50.56 68.56 73.36 79.81 73.91 91.40 86.73 88.83 51.33 51.10 50.60 68.56 73.36 79.81 73.91 91.40 86.73 88.33 51.33 51.10 50.60 62.56 63.48 65.17 77.13 76.30 77.70 77.04 47.20 47.26 46.76 1.08 1.56 1.59 3.27 2.24 2.33 0.20 0.25 0.27 3.34 4.81 4.85 NS 6.92 Ns 0.64 4.60 4.68 0.78 0.28 0.27 2.778 3.87 3.61 6.64 4.60 4.68 1.71 1.87 0.95 2.78 3.87 3.61 6.64 4.60 4.68 1.71 1.87 0.95	T4 – T3 + Foliar spray of pseudo-monas T5 – T3 + Foliar spray of NSKE @ 5 % T6 – T3 + Eoliar spray of Dancharouve		67.20	74.28	80.85	74.11	86.33	86.03	87.66	86.67	51.66	51.20	50.64	51.16
72.66 73.57 80.05 75.42 86.26 86.23 87.83 86.77 51.36 51.16 50.56 68.56 73.36 79.81 73.91 91.40 86.73 88.33 51.33 51.10 50.60 68.56 63.48 65.17 77.13 76.30 77.70 77.04 47.20 47.26 46.76 1.08 1.56 1.59 3.27 2.24 2.33 0.20 0.25 0.27 3.34 4.81 4.85 NS 6.92 Ns 0.64 4.60 4.68 0.71 1.17 1.87 0.95 2.778 3.87 3.61 6.64 4.60 4.68 1.71 1.87 0.95	T5 – T3 + Foliar spray of NSKE @ 5% T6 – T3 + Foliar entry of Danchamina		67.20	70.54	76.78	71.50	86.23	85.00	86.60	85.94	51.33	51.40	50.70	51.14
68.56 73.36 79.81 73.91 91.40 86.73 88.35 81.33 51.10 50.60 62.56 63.48 69.48 65.17 77.13 76.30 77.70 77.04 47.20 47.26 46.76 1.08 1.56 1.59 3.27 2.24 2.33 0.20 0.25 0.27 3.34 4.81 4.85 NS 6.92 Ns 0.64 0.78 0.84 2.78 3.87 3.61 6.64 4.60 4.68 1.71 1.87 0.95 2.78 3.87 3.61 6.64 4.60 4.68 1.71 1.87 0.95	TE T2 \pm Eoliar enroy of Danchagamia		72.66	73.57	80.05	75.42	86.26	86.23	87.83	86.77	51.36	51.16	50.56	51.02
62.56 63.48 69.48 65.17 77.13 76.30 77.70 77.04 47.20 47.26 46.76 1.08 1.56 1.59 3.27 2.24 2.33 0.20 0.25 0.27 3.34 4.81 4.85 NS 6.92 Ns 0.64 0.78 0.84 2.78 3.87 3.61 6.64 4.60 4.68 1.71 1.87 0.95 2.78 3.87 3.61 6.64 4.60 4.68 1.71 1.87 0.95	10 - 10 + 10 mar spray of 1 anomagavy a		68.56	73.36	79.81	73.91	91.40	86.73	88.36	88.83	51.33	51.10	50.60	51.01
1.08 1.56 1.59 3.27 2.24 2.33 0.20 0.25 3.34 4.81 4.85 NS 6.92 Ns 0.64 0.78 2.78 3.87 3.61 6.64 4.60 4.68 1.71 1.87	T7-Absolute control		62.56	63.48	69.48	65.17	77.13	76.30	77.70	77.04	47.20	47.26	46.76	47.07
.5% 3.34 4.81 4.85 NS 6.92 Ns 0.64 0.78 2.78 3.87 3.61 6.64 4.60 4.68 1.71 1.87	$SEm \pm$		1.08	1.56	1.59		3.27	2.24	2.33		0.20	0.25	0.27	
2.78 3.87 3.61 6.64 4.60 4.68 1.71 1.87	CD at 5%		3.34	4.81	4.85		NS	6.92	$N_{\rm S}$		0.64	0.78	0.84	
	CV%		2.78	3.87	3.61		6.64	4.60	4.68		1.71	1.87	0.95	
	Treatments	Gro	ss returi	ns (Rs/ha		Cost	of cultiva	ation (Rs,	/ha)	Ne	t returns	(Rs/ha)	B	:C ratio
Treatments Gross returns (Rs/ha) Cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) Net returns (Rs/ha) B:C ratio		2008	2009	2010	Mean	2008	2009	2010	Mean	2008	2009	2010	Mean	
Gross returns (Rs/ha) Cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) Net returns (Rs/ha) 2008 2009 2010 Mean 2009 2010 Mean	T1-Farmer's practices		83319	96598	75878	20000	23000	24840	22613	27718	60319	71758	53265	3.36
Gross returns (Rs/ha) Cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) Net returns (Rs/ha) 2008 2009 2010 Mean 2008 2010 Mean 2009 2010 Mean s practices 47718 83319 96598 75878 20000 23000 24840 22613 27718 60319 71758 53265	T2-7.5 t FYM +PSB+ PSM+ BIO-Pesticides T2-T7 + Seed treatment with DSB+ DSM+	56356	94506 96864	111510	86262 88210	21900	24900	26890	24563	34412 34356	69606 71874	81978	61998 63616	3.52

PRINT ISSN.: 0974-1712 ONLINE ISSN.: 2230-732X

©2013 New Delhi Publishers. All rights reserved

A

3.40 3.66

T4 – T3 + Foliar spray of pseudo-monas T5 – T3 + Foliar spray of NSKE @5 % T6 - T3 + Foliar spray of Panchagavya T7-Absolute control

Bio-pesticides

3.32 3.44



Kumar, et al.,

References

- Agricultural Statistics at a glance. 2012. Directorate of Economics and Statistics. Department of Agricultural and Co-operation. Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India.
- Ahmed, M. K., A. A. O. M. Saad, A. T. Thalooth, and M. O. Kabesh. 1997. Utilization of biofertilizers in yield crops production. 10- Yield response of groundnut to inorganic, organic and biofertilizers. Annals of Agriculture Sciences 42: 365-375.
- Chandrasekaran, R., E. Somasundaram, M. Amanullah, K. Nalini, K. Thirukkumaran, and K. Sathyamoorthi. 2007. Response of confectionery groundnut (Arachis hypogaea L.) varieties to farm yard manure. Journal of Applied Science Research 3: 1097-1099.
- Dharma, A. K. 1996. Organic farming for sustainable agriculture. 115-130 p. 1st ed. Agro Botanical Publishers, India.
- Malligawad, L., H. Mamle, N. R. Desai, M. G. Bentur, and K. G. Parameshwarappa. 2007. Effect of organics on the productivity of large seeded (Confectionery) groundnut under rainfed farming situations. In Proceedings of ISOR National Seminar 29-31st January 2007. Directorate of Oilseeds Research, Hyderabad, India.
- Malligawad, L., H. Mamle, and K. G. Parameshwarappa. 2006. Effect of organics on the productivity of Spanish bunch groundnut under rainfed farming situations. In Proceedings of 18th World

Congress of Soil Science 9-15th July 2006. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA.

- Nagaraj, M. V., L. Malligawad, H. Mamle, and D. P. Biradar. 2001. Productivity and economics of confectionery groundnut as influenced by plant density and fertilizer management. Karnataka Journal of Agriculture Science 14: 932-937.
- Okello, D. K., M. Biruma, and C. M. Deom. 2010. Overview of groundnuts research in Uganda: Past, present and future. African Journal of Biotechnology 9: 6448-6459.
- Olowoake, A. A., and G. O. Adeoye. 2013. Influence of differently composted organic residues on yield of maize and its residual effects on the fertility of an alfisol in Ibadan, Nigeria. International Journal of Agriculture Environment and Biotechnology 6: 79-84.
- Rakshit A2013.Pest and Disease Tolerance in Rice cv Pusa Basmati as Related to Different Locally Available Organic Manures Grown in New Alluvail Region of West Bengal, India .Pakistan Journal of Biological Sciences16(12): 593-597
- Rakshit, A, NC Sarkar and Debashish Sen 2008. Influence of organic manures on productivity of two varieties of rice. Journal of Central European Agriculture 9(4):629-634.
- Sisodia, V., and M. L. Kewat. 2012. Influence of decomposed organic manures on yield attributing traits, yield potential and economics of hybrid rice 'Proagro-6201'. International Journal of Agriculture Environment and Biotechnology 5: 267-270.