

# EFFECT OF INM ON NUTRIENT CONCENTRATION AND THEIR UPTAKE UNDER MAIZE-BLACKGRAM-GROUNDNUT CROPPING SEQUENCE IN ALFISOLS

**Abstract :** A field experiment was carried out at S.V. Agricultural College Farm, Tirupati during rabi (maize) summer (blackgram) and kharif (groundnut) seasons of 2019-20 with a view to study the direct and residual effects of integrated use of inorganic and organic sources of N and P on performance of maize - blackgram- groundnut cropping sequence in terms of yield. Ten treatments viz. control, fertilizers applied at 50, 75 and 100% of the recommended dose (N240P80K80), N240 only, P80 only, FYM (@ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) applied alone, and in combination with 100%, 75% and 50% recommended NPK were applied to maize. These treatments were compared with no-fertilizer and manure control. Blackgram was grown following maize without any fertilizer or manure application. It was allowed to grow till maturity, and after two pickings, the stover was incorporated into the soil. During succeeding rabi season on the same field black gram was grown for which each main plot treatment of RBD was split into three sub plot treatments with three levels of recommended dose of fertilizers viz., S1 (control), S2 (75% RDF) and S3 (50% RDF) resulting in ninety treatment combinations replicated three times in split plot design. The results revealed that the total N and P uptake in maize varies from 56 - 142 kg/ha and 8.28 - 22.12 kg/ha, in blackgram it varies from 86 - 173 kg/ha and 11.1 - 22.7 kg/ha and in groundnut 75.8 - 126.9 and 9.5 - 20.0 kg/ha respectively. The maximum nutrient concentration and uptakes in case of all treatments was found in INM treatments and lowest in T<sub>1</sub> (Control)

Keywords: INM, maize, blackgram, groundnut sequence, N and P uptake

## Introduction

The excess use of high analysis fertilizers in an unbalanced manner has affected the soil health viz., acidity, alkalinity, the emergence of secondary and micro nutrient deficiencies and deterioration in soil physical environment (SubbaRao and Sammi Reddy, 2005). This was more seen in recent years due to the advent of high yielding varieties (HYVs) which were responsive to chemical fertilizers and increased area under assured irrigation led to a major shift from organic based nutrient application to chemical fertilizers. The rapid spurt in the use of inorganic fertilizers is because of the quick yield responses of crops to their application. In this context, INM holds great promise not only for achieving optimum yields in a cropping system but also protecting soil health against degradation. Therefore, inorganic and organic sources of the nutrient were combined to study the possibility of substitution of N requirement of crops through organic sources and most effective combination of these materials the create impact on soil and plant systems.

## Material and Methods

**Site Description** : Field experiments were carried out during rabi, summer and kharif seasons of 2019-20 at S.V. Agricultural Farm, Tirupati, geographically situated at 13.5o N latitude and 79.5o E longitude at an altitude of 182.9 meters above mean sea level, categorised as the Southern Agroclimatic Zone of Andhra Pradesh. The soil of experimental site was sandy loam in texture with bulk density of 1.49 Mg m<sup>-3</sup> , neutral in reaction (pH 6.8), electrical conductivity 0.35 dSm<sup>-1</sup> , low in organic carbon (0.30 per cent) and low in available nitrogen (95 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> ), medium in available phosphorus (21 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> ) and medium in potassium (162 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> ).

**Experimental design and treatments** : The treatments consisted of integrated nutrient management viz., T1- control, T2- FYM @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> , T3- 100 RDF, T4- 75% RDF, T5- 50% RDF, T6 – 100% RDN, T7 – 100% RDP, T8 – 100% RDF+ FYM @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> , T9- 75% RDF + FYM @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> , T10 – 50% RDF+ FYM @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> to maize in rabi season as main plot treatments replicated three times in randomized block design. Maize hybrid ‘Pioneer 3396’ was sown on 25th November, 2019 and harvested on march,12 2020. Blackgram variety ‘TBG-104’ was grown as residual crop sown after harvest of maize on March 29,2020 and was allowed to grow till maturity. After two pickings, the stover was incorporated into the soil on June 11, 2020. Groundnut variety ‘Dharani’ was sown on July 1, 2020 and harvested on October 23, 2020. FYM was incorporated before sowing of maize. The data recorded were statistically analyzed using OPSTAT Software. The purpose of analysis of variance was to determine the significant effect of treatments on maize- blackgramgroundnut cropping sequence.

**Table 1. Initial properties of the experimental soil**

Particulars	Field Number
	50 B
Particle size distribution	
Sand (%)	82.24
Silt (%)	14.16
Clay (%)	3.60
Texture	Sandy loam
pH (1:2.5)	6.70
EC (dSm <sup>-1</sup> )	0.26
Organic C (%)	0.35
CEC [cmol (p+) kg <sup>-1</sup> soil]	15
Available N ( kg ha <sup>-1</sup> soil)	98

Available P ( kg ha <sup>-1</sup> soil)	25
Available K ( kg ha <sup>-1</sup> soil)	166
Available Fe (ppm)	2.51
Available Mn (ppm)	3.35
Available Cu (ppm)	0.95
Available Zn (ppm)	0.72

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION :

### Maize

Data related to N, P and K concentration in given in table 2. showed that integration of FYM results higher N,P and K concentrations over remaining treatments. N concentration varied from 0.98% (control) to 1.63% in T9 (100% RDF + FYM@ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>). It was also observed that integration of FYM showed higher increase in N, P and K concentration over rest of the treatments.

**Table 2. Effect of fertilizer and manurial treatments on N, P and K content (%) and uptake (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) by maize at silking stage**

Treatments	N		P		K	
	N content	N uptake	P content	P uptake	K content	K uptake
T <sub>1</sub>	0.98 <sup>f</sup>	54.0 <sup>d</sup>	0.10 <sup>b</sup>	5.64 <sup>c</sup>	3.03 <sup>a</sup>	168 <sup>d</sup>
T <sub>2</sub>	1.14 <sup>ef</sup>	68.6 <sup>d</sup>	0.10 <sup>b</sup>	6.01 <sup>c</sup>	3.01 <sup>b</sup>	180 <sup>d</sup>
T <sub>3</sub>	1.58 <sup>ab</sup>	164.4 <sup>a</sup>	0.14 <sup>ab</sup>	14.01 <sup>a</sup>	3.17 <sup>a</sup>	328 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>4</sub>	1.50 <sup>abc</sup>	119.8 <sup>b</sup>	0.11 <sup>b</sup>	8.54 <sup>c</sup>	3.16 <sup>a</sup>	252 <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>5</sub>	1.36 <sup>cd</sup>	102.3 <sup>bc</sup>	0.10 <sup>b</sup>	7.47 <sup>c</sup>	3.06 <sup>a</sup>	229 <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>6</sub>	1.36 <sup>cd</sup>	110.4 <sup>bc</sup>	0.12 <sup>b</sup>	9.34 <sup>bc</sup>	3.17 <sup>a</sup>	258 <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>7</sub>	1.20 <sup>de</sup>	91.2 <sup>cb</sup>	0.11 <sup>b</sup>	8.60 <sup>c</sup>	3.13 <sup>a</sup>	237 <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>8</sub>	1.60 <sup>ab</sup>	170.7 <sup>a</sup>	0.16 <sup>a</sup>	16.93 <sup>a</sup>	3.17 <sup>a</sup>	337 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>9</sub>	1.63 <sup>a</sup>	185.1 <sup>a</sup>	0.15 <sup>a</sup>	17.02 <sup>a</sup>	3.16 <sup>a</sup>	359 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>10</sub>	1.44 <sup>bc</sup>	107.8 <sup>bc</sup>	0.13 <sup>ab</sup>	9.73 <sup>b</sup>	3.16 <sup>a</sup>	237 <sup>b</sup>
Mean	1.38	117.49	0.12	10.33	3.12	259
SEm ±	0.06	7.89	0.01	1.29	0.05	12.08
CD (P=0.05)	0.18	23.65	0.04	3.85	0.16	36.21

**Table 3. Effect of fertilizer and manurial treatments on N and P content (%) and uptake (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) by maize at harvest**

Treatments	Grain		Stover		Total N Uptake	Grain		Stover		Total P Uptake
	N content	N uptake	N content	N uptake		P content	P uptake	P content	P uptake	
T <sub>1</sub> : Control	1.56 <sup>c</sup>	32 <sup>a</sup>	0.37 <sup>c</sup>	24 <sup>f</sup>	56 <sup>c</sup>	0.34 <sup>cde</sup>	7.0 <sup>de</sup>	0.02 <sup>b</sup>	1.36 <sup>c</sup>	8.33 <sup>d</sup>
T <sub>2</sub> : FYM @5 t ha <sup>-1</sup>	1.55 <sup>c</sup>	33 <sup>a</sup>	0.36 <sup>c</sup>	32 <sup>de</sup>	65 <sup>c</sup>	0.32 <sup>ef</sup>	6.8 <sup>e</sup>	0.02 <sup>b</sup>	1.46 <sup>c</sup>	8.28 <sup>d</sup>
T <sub>3</sub> : 100% RDF	1.75 <sup>a</sup>	81 <sup>a</sup>	0.53 <sup>b</sup>	58 <sup>ab</sup>	139 <sup>b</sup>	0.38 <sup>a</sup>	17.1 <sup>a</sup>	0.04 <sup>b</sup>	3.85 <sup>b</sup>	20.99 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>4</sub> : 75% RDF	1.68 <sup>ab</sup>	74 <sup>ab</sup>	0.50 <sup>bc</sup>	54 <sup>b</sup>	128 <sup>b</sup>	0.36 <sup>abc</sup>	9.0 <sup>c</sup>	0.03 <sup>b</sup>	2.16 <sup>c</sup>	11.18 <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>5</sub> : 50% RDF	1.60 <sup>bc</sup>	61 <sup>c</sup>	0.40 <sup>de</sup>	38 <sup>d</sup>	99 <sup>d</sup>	0.35 <sup>bcd</sup>	8.1 <sup>cd</sup>	0.03 <sup>b</sup>	2.06 <sup>c</sup>	10.14 <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>6</sub> : 100% RDN	1.70 <sup>ab</sup>	73 <sup>ab</sup>	0.45 <sup>cd</sup>	38 <sup>d</sup>	111 <sup>c</sup>	0.31 <sup>f</sup>	7.3 <sup>de</sup>	0.03 <sup>b</sup>	2.48 <sup>c</sup>	9.79 <sup>a</sup> <sup>cd</sup>
T <sub>7</sub> : 100 % RDP	1.66 <sup>abc</sup>	64 <sup>c</sup>	0.40 <sup>e</sup>	30 <sup>ef</sup>	94 <sup>d</sup>	0.33 <sup>def</sup>	7.9 <sup>cde</sup>	0.03 <sup>b</sup>	2.40 <sup>c</sup>	10.27 <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>8</sub> : 100 % RDF + FYM @5 t ha <sup>-1</sup>	1.73 <sup>a</sup>	79 <sup>a</sup>	0.52 <sup>b</sup>	60 <sup>ab</sup>	139 <sup>b</sup>	0.37 <sup>ab</sup>	16.7 <sup>a</sup>	0.05 <sup>a</sup>	5.44 <sup>a</sup>	22.12 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>9</sub> : 75% RDF + FYM @5 t ha <sup>-1</sup>	1.75 <sup>a</sup>	78 <sup>a</sup>	0.54 <sup>a</sup>	63 <sup>a</sup>	142 <sup>a</sup>	0.36 <sup>abc</sup>	16.9 <sup>a</sup>	0.04 <sup>b</sup>	4.77 <sup>ab</sup>	21.70 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>10</sub> : 50% RDF + FYM @5 t ha <sup>-1</sup>	1.69 <sup>ab</sup>	69 <sup>bc</sup>	0.48 <sup>bc</sup>	46 <sup>c</sup>	115 <sup>c</sup>	0.34 <sup>cde</sup>	11.7 <sup>b</sup>	0.03 <sup>b</sup>	2.21 <sup>c</sup>	13.93 <sup>b</sup>
Mean	1.67	64	0.46	44	109	0.35	10.9	0.03	2.82	13.67
SEm±	0.04	2.76	0.02	2.11	3.79	0.01	0.37	0.01	0.45	0.52
CD (P=0.05)	0.12	8.26	0.06	6.31	11.36	0.03	1.11	0.03	1.36	1.57

**Nitrogen:** The treatments T<sub>9</sub> (1.75%), T<sub>3</sub> (1.75%), T<sub>8</sub> (1.73%), T<sub>6</sub> (1.70%), T<sub>10</sub> (1.69%), T<sub>4</sub> (1.68%) and T<sub>7</sub> (1.66%) were found to be at par in terms of high nitrogen (N) content of maize grain. The lowest value was recorded under the treatment T<sub>2</sub> (1.63%), which was statistically similar to T<sub>1</sub> (1.56%) and T<sub>5</sub> (1.60%). The nitrogen content of maize stover lower than that in grain, indicating thereby translocation of nitrogen from the vegetative to the reproductive parts.

Treatment T<sub>3</sub> recorded the highest N uptake (81 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), followed by T<sub>8</sub> (79 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), T<sub>9</sub> (78 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and T<sub>4</sub> (74 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), all of which were at par. The treatments T<sub>5</sub> (61 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) T<sub>7</sub> (64 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and T<sub>10</sub> (69 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) were superior to the treatments T<sub>2</sub>(33 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and T<sub>1</sub> (32 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). Application of nitrogen at lower level or through only FYM could not match with the other treatments in terms of N uptake by grain as these were unable to supply sufficient nitrogen to the crop in a soil which was low in available N status.

Higher uptake of N by maize stover obtained under the treatments T<sub>9</sub> (63 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), T<sub>8</sub> (60 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and T<sub>3</sub> (58 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) which were not significantly different among themselves. Lowest value of 24 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> recorded under control (T<sub>1</sub>).

The results suggest that the treatment T<sub>9</sub>, which involved applying 75% of the recommended dose of fertilizer (RDF) along with farmyard manure (FYM), resulted in the highest total nitrogen uptake by the maize crops (142 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). The second-highest nitrogen uptake was observed in treatment T<sub>3</sub> (139 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). The nitrogen uptake values were lower under treatments T<sub>2</sub> (65 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and T<sub>1</sub> (56 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), and these values were statistically similar. The study indicates that applying nitrogen at the recommended rate led to higher nitrogen content and uptake by the maize crops. This outcome can be attributed to the ability of these treatments to provide a substantial amount of readily available nitrogen to fulfill the crop's demand for this essential nutrient. Additionally, the application of phosphorus alongside nitrogen appeared to enhance nitrogen uptake by the maize crops through a synergistic effect. This suggests that the combination of phosphorus and nitrogen contributed to better nutrient uptake by the plants. Interestingly, substituting 25% of the inorganic nitrogen with farmyard manure seemed to be as effective as using 100% NPK (nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium) fertilizer. This could be attributed to the rapid mineralization of farmyard manure in an environment rich in readily available nutrients. The study suggests that the organic matter in the farmyard manure contributed to a continuous release of nutrients, supporting the growth and nutrient uptake of the maize crops (Rahale *et al.*, 2018)

**Phosphorus:** The treatments T<sub>3</sub> (0.38%), T<sub>8</sub> (0.37%), T<sub>4</sub> = T<sub>9</sub> (0.36%), were found to be at par in terms of high nitrogen (P) content of maize grain. The lowest value was recorded under the treatment T<sub>6</sub> (0.31%), which was statistically similar to T<sub>7</sub> (0.33%) and T<sub>2</sub> (0.32%).

The P uptake by grain was highest under T<sub>3</sub> followed by T<sub>9</sub> and T<sub>8</sub>, all of which were at par. These were followed by statistically similar treatments T<sub>4</sub>, T<sub>5</sub> and T<sub>7</sub>. The lowest value of 6.8 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> was recorded under T<sub>2</sub> followed by statistically similar treatments, T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>6</sub> and T<sub>7</sub>.

Among all, significantly higher total P uptake by maize recorded by 100% RDF+FYM @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (22.12 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) which was closely followed with 75% RDF+ FYM @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (21.7 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) 100% RDF (20.99 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and was found to be superior to T<sub>7</sub> (10.27 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). The lowest P uptake was recorded under T<sub>2</sub> (8.28 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). Compared to inorganic treatments, INM treatments recorded high total P uptake may be due to solubilization of fixed phosphorus by P-solubilizer due to secretion of organic acids. Similar findings corroborate with the studies of Venkata Lakshmi *et al.* (2020).

### **Blackgram**

The content and uptake of N and P by blackgram grain were not found to be significantly affected by any of the treatments applied to maize. Compared to the plots T<sub>1</sub> and where only phosphorus was applied to maize T<sub>7</sub> and all the other treatments were found to yield statistically similar and superior N uptake by blackgram. The higher N,P,K uptake of blackgram at flowering stage was registered by T<sub>9</sub> (212, 71.3 and 214 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) respectively. However the highest P uptake was registered under T<sub>3</sub>. The treatments combining FYM with fertilizer, *viz.*, T<sub>8</sub> and T<sub>9</sub> compared favourably with T<sub>4</sub> with respect to P uptake by blackgram haulms. The lower values of P uptake was observed under the treatments where no P was applied to maize, *viz.*, T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>6</sub> and FYM treatment T<sub>2</sub>. The rest of the treatments, *viz.*, T<sub>5</sub> and

T<sub>10</sub>, were statistically at par and significantly superior to T<sub>7</sub>. The total P uptake by blackgram almost followed a similar trend as that by haulms. As in the case of yield, high uptake of N and P in case of blackgram was resulted where INM treatment and 100% RDF applied to maize.

Statistically similar treatments, namely T<sub>2</sub> (10.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and T<sub>1</sub> (10.3 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), were found to be inferior to the rest of the treatments, all of which were found to be at par when the K uptake by blackgram grain was compared. The K content, uptake by blackgram haulms and total K uptake were found low under control (T<sub>1</sub>).

The integrated application seems to result in higher nutrient uptake by plants due to the balanced and combined use of various nutrient sources. This leads to improved absorption, translocation, and assimilation of nutrients, ultimately resulting in increased dry matter accumulation and nutrient content in plants, particularly nitrogen (N), phosphorus (P), and potassium (K) nutrients.

Tyagi *et al.* (2014) and Kalaiyarasi *et al.* (2019) likely support the idea that combining different nutrient sources leads to enhanced plant growth and nutrient uptake. This concept aligns with the principles of nutrient management and sustainable agriculture, where optimizing nutrient availability for plants is essential for higher yields and efficient resource utilization.

Higher N content was noticed under T<sub>8</sub> (3.14 %), followed by T<sub>9</sub> (3.13 %), T<sub>10</sub> (3.11 %), T<sub>4</sub> (3.01 %), T<sub>6</sub> (2.95 %) and T<sub>3</sub> (2.92 %) lowest was under T<sub>7</sub> (2.40 %) which received only 100% P. T<sub>9</sub> (212 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) recorded higher N content and low N uptake by T<sub>1</sub> (60 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>).

Both P content (1.05 %) and uptake (71.3 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) was higher under T<sub>9</sub>, while T<sub>1</sub> recorded lower P content (0.85%) and uptake (19.8 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). Almost similar trend by K content and uptake, high values were observed by T<sub>9</sub> (3.17 %) and (214 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>).

In later stages i.e., at harvest stage, content and uptakes gradually decrease, which might be due to translocation of nutrients from vegetative part of crop plant to grain at the time of maturity. INM treatments showed more content and uptakes of N, P and K when compared to sole application of inorganics, due to favourable effect of incorporation of organic sources together with inorganic nutrients.

**Table 4. Effect of fertilizer and manurial treatments on N,P and K content (%) and uptake (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) by blackgram at flowering stage**

Treatments	N		P		K	
	N content	N uptake	P content	P uptake	K content	K uptake
T <sub>1</sub>	2.60 <sup>bc</sup>	60 <sup>f</sup>	0.85 <sup>e</sup>	19.8 <sup>e</sup>	2.71 <sup>c</sup>	62 <sup>e</sup>
T <sub>2</sub>	2.56 <sup>c</sup>	108 <sup>e</sup>	0.85 <sup>e</sup>	35.7 <sup>d</sup>	2.97 <sup>b</sup>	125 <sup>d</sup>
T <sub>3</sub>	2.92 <sup>a</sup>	149 <sup>cd</sup>	1.04 <sup>ab</sup>	52.7 <sup>c</sup>	3.17 <sup>a</sup>	161 <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>4</sub>	3.01 <sup>a</sup>	190 <sup>ab</sup>	0.97 <sup>abc</sup>	60.9 <sup>bc</sup>	3.01 <sup>b</sup>	190 <sup>ab</sup>
T <sub>5</sub>	2.87 <sup>ab</sup>	206 <sup>a</sup>	0.89 <sup>cde</sup>	63.5 <sup>ab</sup>	2.95 <sup>bc</sup>	211 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>6</sub>	2.95 <sup>a</sup>	122 <sup>de</sup>	0.70 <sup>f</sup>	29.2 <sup>d</sup>	2.80 <sup>de</sup>	116 <sup>d</sup>
T <sub>7</sub>	2.40 <sup>c</sup>	174 <sup>bc</sup>	0.87 <sup>de</sup>	62.9 <sup>ab</sup>	2.82 <sup>cde</sup>	204 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>8</sub>	3.14 <sup>a</sup>	186 <sup>ab</sup>	1.00 <sup>ab</sup>	59.0 <sup>bc</sup>	2.96 <sup>b</sup>	175 <sup>bc</sup>
T <sub>9</sub>	3.13 <sup>a</sup>	212 <sup>a</sup>	1.05 <sup>a</sup>	71.3 <sup>a</sup>	3.17 <sup>a</sup>	214 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>10</sub>	3.11 <sup>a</sup>	199 <sup>ab</sup>	0.94 <sup>bcd</sup>	59.8 <sup>bc</sup>	2.92 <sup>bcd</sup>	187 <sup>abc</sup>
Mean	2.87	160	0.91	51.5	2.95	165
SEm ±	0.10	10.03	0.03	3.12	0.04	9.12
CD (P=0.05)	0.29	30.06	0.08	9.35	0.13	27.36

**Table 5. Effect of fertilizer and manurial treatments on N and P uptake (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) by blackgram at harvest**

Treatments	Grain		Haulm		Root		Total N uptake	Grain		Haulm		Root		Total P uptake
	N content	N uptake	N content	N uptake	N content	N uptake		P content	P uptake	P content	P uptake	P content	P uptake	
T <sub>1</sub>	3.62	27.0	1.7 <sup>c</sup>	56 <sup>d</sup>	0.77 <sup>c</sup>	3.74	86 <sup>c</sup>	0.45	3.32	0.22 <sup>a</sup>	7.14 <sup>f</sup>	0.15	0.731	11.1 <sup>f</sup>
T <sub>2</sub>	3.66	27.4	1.7 <sup>c</sup>	84 <sup>c</sup>	0.82 <sup>bc</sup>	5.51	117 <sup>b</sup>	0.45	3.40	0.23 <sup>c</sup>	11.24 <sup>e</sup>	0.12	0.828	15.4 <sup>e</sup>
T <sub>3</sub>	3.56	30.8	2.0 <sup>ab</sup>	126 <sup>ab</sup>	1.07 <sup>a</sup>	6.56	164 <sup>a</sup>	0.45	3.93	0.28 <sup>a</sup>	17.90 <sup>a</sup>	0.15	0.902	22.7 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>4</sub>	3.66	31.4	2.0 <sup>ab</sup>	127 <sup>ab</sup>	0.88 <sup>abc</sup>	5.41	164 <sup>a</sup>	0.46	3.97	0.26 <sup>ab</sup>	16.23 <sup>b</sup>	0.13	0.817	21.0 <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>5</sub>	3.59	30.8	1.9 <sup>b</sup>	119 <sup>b</sup>	0.79 <sup>c</sup>	4.90	155 <sup>a</sup>	0.44	3.81	0.24 <sup>bc</sup>	14.74 <sup>bc</sup>	0.12	0.752	19.3 <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>6</sub>	3.69	30.6	2.0 <sup>ab</sup>	123 <sup>ab</sup>	0.84 <sup>bc</sup>	5.23	159 <sup>a</sup>	0.44	3.69	0.19 <sup>d</sup>	11.77 <sup>de</sup>	0.13	0.791	16.2 <sup>de</sup>
T <sub>7</sub>	3.59	29.0	1.5 <sup>d</sup>	82 <sup>c</sup>	0.89 <sup>abc</sup>	5.72	116 <sup>b</sup>	0.45	3.66	0.23 <sup>c</sup>	12.65 <sup>d</sup>	0.12	0.786	17.0 <sup>d</sup>
T <sub>8</sub>	3.70	32.3	2.1 <sup>a</sup>	132 <sup>ab</sup>	1.03 <sup>ab</sup>	6.61	171 <sup>a</sup>	0.47	4.13	0.26 <sup>ab</sup>	16.6 <sup>ab</sup>	0.15	0.926	21.6 <sup>ab</sup>
T <sub>9</sub>	3.63	31.4	2.0 <sup>ab</sup>	126 <sup>ab</sup>	0.89 <sup>abc</sup>	5.82	163 <sup>a</sup>	0.48	4.14	0.27 <sup>a</sup>	16.55 <sup>ab</sup>	0.14	0.895	21.5 <sup>ab</sup>
T <sub>10</sub>	3.67	31.3	2.1 <sup>a</sup>	136 <sup>a</sup>	0.87 <sup>abc</sup>	5.94	173 <sup>a</sup>	0.46	3.92	0.24 <sup>bc</sup>	15.63 <sup>bc</sup>	0.13	0.933	20.4 <sup>bc</sup>
Mean	3.64	30.2	1.90	111	0.83	5.54	147	0.46	3.80	0.24	14.04	0.13	0.836	18.674
SEm ±	0.05	1.93	0.06	5.63	0.07	1.04	6.44	0.01	0.21	0.01	0.46	0.01	0.09	0.52
CD (P=0.05)	NS	NS	0.19	16.88	0.21	NS	19.31	NS	NS	0.02	1.39	NS	NS	1.55

## Groundnut :

Higher N uptake (Table 6) was noticed under T<sub>8</sub> (52.77 %), followed by T<sub>3</sub> (52.09 %) and T<sub>9</sub> (51.11 %), lowest was under T<sub>2</sub> (42.28 %).

Both P content (0.38 %) and uptake (8.26 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) was higher under T<sub>7</sub>, while T<sub>1</sub> recorded lower P content and uptake.

Data on potassium uptake also manifested the similar trend as was noticed with N and P uptake. Among the doses of phosphorus to *khariif* groundnut, 100 % RDF + FYM recorded significantly higher potassium uptake (43.21 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) in haulm which was closely followed with 75 % RDF + FYM (41.80 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), and lowest was under control (32.75 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>).

## Nitrogen:

Consequent to the high yield, the nitrogen uptake by both pod and haulm was highest under the treatment T<sub>8</sub>, the values were 83.8 and 43.1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> for pod and haulm, respectively (Table 7). In case of pod, T<sub>8</sub> was followed by T<sub>3</sub> (81.8 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) T<sub>9</sub>, T<sub>4</sub>, T<sub>6</sub>, T<sub>5</sub>, T<sub>7</sub> and T<sub>10</sub> were at par except T<sub>1</sub> (54.4 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and T<sub>2</sub> (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). It was noticeable that none of the treatments applied to maize had any significant effect on N content of haulm. This indicates that there was a residual effect of FYM in terms of N release to groundnut. Incorporation of blackgram before sowing of groundnut could enhance the N recovery from FYM applied to maize due to increase in microbial population. The order followed by the treatments applied to maize in terms of total N uptake was: T<sub>8</sub> (127 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) > T<sub>3</sub> (124 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) > T<sub>9</sub> (122 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) > T<sub>4</sub> (120 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) > T<sub>6</sub> (120 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) > T<sub>5</sub>, T<sub>7</sub>, T<sub>10</sub> (117 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) > T<sub>2</sub> (90 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) > T<sub>1</sub> (75 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>).

Significantly higher N uptake of pod (79.66 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and haulm (45.7 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) was observed under S<sub>2</sub> compared to the S<sub>3</sub> and S<sub>1</sub>. The nutrient availability, slow nutrient release and reduction of nutrient fixation in soil enhances the nutrient uptake by groundnut. The total N uptake followed the order : S<sub>2</sub> (125.3 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) > S<sub>3</sub> (116.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) > S<sub>1</sub> (97.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>).

**Table 6. Effect of fertilizer and manurial treatments on N,P and K content(%) and uptake (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) by groundnut at flowering stage**

Treatments	N		P		K	
	content	uptake	content	uptake	content	uptake
<b>Main plots</b>						
T <sub>1</sub> : Control	2.19	42.28 <sup>c</sup>	0.27 <sup>c</sup>	5.32 <sup>b</sup>	1.64 <sup>b</sup>	32.75 <sup>j</sup>
T <sub>2</sub> : FYM @5 t ha <sup>-1</sup>	2.21	43.62 <sup>bc</sup>	0.29 <sup>bc</sup>	5.59 <sup>b</sup>	1.77 <sup>ab</sup>	33.89 <sup>i</sup>
T <sub>3</sub> : 100% RDF	2.36	52.09 <sup>a</sup>	0.33 <sup>abc</sup>	7.41 <sup>a</sup>	1.80 <sup>ab</sup>	39.87 <sup>e</sup>
T <sub>4</sub> : 75% RDF	2.31	49.51 <sup>ab</sup>	0.34 <sup>ab</sup>	7.41 <sup>a</sup>	1.79 <sup>ab</sup>	38.60 <sup>f</sup>
T <sub>5</sub> : 50% RDF	2.25	47.79 <sup>abc</sup>	0.33 <sup>abc</sup>	7.10 <sup>a</sup>	1.79 <sup>ab</sup>	38.25 <sup>h</sup>
T <sub>6</sub> : 100% RDN	2.34	49.98 <sup>ab</sup>	0.33 <sup>abc</sup>	7.08 <sup>a</sup>	1.80 <sup>ab</sup>	38.52 <sup>g</sup>
T <sub>7</sub> : 100 % RDP	2.30	48.95 <sup>abc</sup>	0.38 <sup>a</sup>	8.26 <sup>a</sup>	1.91 <sup>a</sup>	41.09 <sup>c</sup>

<b>T<sub>8</sub></b> : 100 % RDF + FYM @5 t ha <sup>-1</sup>	2.36	52.77 <sup>a</sup>	0.36 <sup>a</sup>	8.04 <sup>a</sup>	1.93 <sup>a</sup>	43.21 <sup>a</sup>
<b>T<sub>9</sub></b> : 75% RDF + FYM @5 t ha <sup>-1</sup>	2.36	51.11 <sup>a</sup>	0.36 <sup>a</sup>	7.81 <sup>a</sup>	1.93 <sup>a</sup>	41.80 <sup>b</sup>
<b>T<sub>10</sub></b> : 50% RDF + FYM @5 t ha <sup>-1</sup>	2.34	49.47 <sup>ab</sup>	0.34 <sup>ab</sup>	7.24	1.88 <sup>ab</sup>	40.00 <sup>d</sup>
SEm <sub>±</sub>	0.066	2.301	0.020	0.481	0.082	0.023
CD (P=0.05)	NS	6.84	0.06	1.43	0.24	0.07
<b>Sub plots</b>						
<b>S<sub>1</sub></b> : Control	2.16 <sup>c</sup>	39.55 <sup>c</sup>	0.30 <sup>c</sup>	5.41 <sup>c</sup>	1.62	29.72 <sup>c</sup>
<b>S<sub>2</sub></b> : 75% RDF	2.44 <sup>a</sup>	56.34 <sup>a</sup>	0.37 <sup>a</sup>	8.49 <sup>a</sup>	1.97	45.59 <sup>a</sup>
<b>S<sub>3</sub></b> : 50% RDF	2.31 <sup>b</sup>	50.37 <sup>b</sup>	0.34 <sup>b</sup>	7.46 <sup>b</sup>	1.88	41.08 <sup>b</sup>
SEm <sub>±</sub>	0.014	0.693	0.004	0.130	2.408	0.725
CD (P=0.05)	0.04	1.98	0.01	0.37	NS	2.07
<b>Interaction</b>						
<b>S at T</b>						
SEm <sub>±</sub>	0.004	2.192	0.014	0.412	0.074	2.292
CD (P=0.05)	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
<b>T at S</b>						
SEm <sub>±</sub>	0.097	3.491	0.030	0.720	0.123	3.732
CD (P=0.05)	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

**Table 7. Effect of fertilizer and manurial treatments on N and P content (%) and uptake (kg P ha<sup>-1</sup>) by groundnut at harvest**

Treatments	N				Total N uptake	P				
	Pod		Haulm			Pod		Haulm		Total P uptake
	content	uptake	content	uptake		content	uptake	content	uptake	
<b>Main plots</b>										
T <sub>1</sub>	3.29 <sup>b</sup>	40.6 <sup>c</sup>	1.68	35.2 <sup>b</sup>	75.8 <sup>c</sup>	0.51 <sup>d</sup>	6.2 <sup>b</sup>	0.16 <sup>c</sup>	3.31 <sup>c</sup>	9.5 <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>2</sub>	3.37 <sup>ab</sup>	55.5 <sup>b</sup>	1.69	34.8 <sup>b</sup>	90.3 <sup>d</sup>	0.52 <sup>cd</sup>	8.6 <sup>b</sup>	0.17 <sup>c</sup>	3.54 <sup>bc</sup>	12.1 <sup>b</sup>
T <sub>3</sub>	3.40 <sup>a</sup>	81.8 <sup>a</sup>	1.79	42.0 <sup>a</sup>	123.9 <sup>ab</sup>	0.56 <sup>bcd</sup>	13.6 <sup>a</sup>	0.20 <sup>b</sup>	4.62 <sup>a</sup>	18.2 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>4</sub>	3.42 <sup>a</sup>	80.0 <sup>a</sup>	1.77	40.2 <sup>ab</sup>	120.2 <sup>ab</sup>	0.57 <sup>bcd</sup>	13.5 <sup>a</sup>	0.20 <sup>b</sup>	4.64 <sup>a</sup>	18.1 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>5</sub>	3.41 <sup>a</sup>	78.8 <sup>a</sup>	1.71	38.4 <sup>ab</sup>	117.2 <sup>b</sup>	0.56 <sup>bcd</sup>	13.0 <sup>a</sup>	0.20 <sup>b</sup>	4.52 <sup>a</sup>	17.5 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>6</sub>	3.42 <sup>a</sup>	79.4 <sup>a</sup>	1.79	40.4 <sup>ab</sup>	119.8 <sup>ab</sup>	0.56 <sup>bcd</sup>	13.1 <sup>a</sup>	0.20 <sup>b</sup>	4.46 <sup>ab</sup>	17.5 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>7</sub>	3.41 <sup>a</sup>	77.1 <sup>a</sup>	1.77	39.6 <sup>ab</sup>	116.8 <sup>b</sup>	0.65 <sup>a</sup>	14.8 <sup>a</sup>	0.23 <sup>a</sup>	5.18 <sup>a</sup>	20.0 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>8</sub>	3.45 <sup>a</sup>	83.8 <sup>a</sup>	1.81	43.1 <sup>a</sup>	126.9 <sup>a</sup>	0.61 <sup>ab</sup>	14.7 <sup>a</sup>	0.21 <sup>ab</sup>	5.06 <sup>a</sup>	19.8 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>9</sub>	3.44 <sup>a</sup>	80.0 <sup>a</sup>	1.82	41.6 <sup>a</sup>	121.6 <sup>ab</sup>	0.60 <sup>ab</sup>	14.0 <sup>a</sup>	0.21 <sup>ab</sup>	4.88 <sup>a</sup>	18.9 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>10</sub>	3.39 <sup>a</sup>	76.8 <sup>a</sup>	1.79	39.9 <sup>ab</sup>	116.7 <sup>b</sup>	0.58 <sup>bc</sup>	13.2 <sup>a</sup>	0.20 <sup>b</sup>	4.56 <sup>a</sup>	17.8 <sup>a</sup>
SEm <sub>±</sub>	0.034	2.638	0.052	1.939	2.847	0.025	0.780	0.012	0.320	0.922
CD (P=0.05)	0.10	7.84	NS	5.76	8.46	0.07	2.32	0.03	0.95	2.74
<b>Sub plots</b>										
S <sub>1</sub> : Control	3.29 <sup>c</sup>	65.44 <sup>c</sup>	1.65 <sup>c</sup>	32.08 <sup>c</sup>	97.52 <sup>c</sup>	0.52 <sup>c</sup>	10.40 <sup>c</sup>	0.17 <sup>c</sup>	3.41 <sup>c</sup>	13.81 <sup>c</sup>
S <sub>2</sub> : 75% RDF	3.52 <sup>a</sup>	79.66 <sup>a</sup>	1.87 <sup>a</sup>	45.70 <sup>a</sup>	125.36 <sup>a</sup>	0.62 <sup>a</sup>	14.06 <sup>a</sup>	0.22 <sup>a</sup>	5.36 <sup>a</sup>	19.42 <sup>a</sup>
S <sub>3</sub> : 50% RDF	3.39 <sup>b</sup>	75.21 <sup>b</sup>	1.77 <sup>b</sup>	40.85 <sup>b</sup>	116.06 <sup>b</sup>	0.58 <sup>b</sup>	12.97 <sup>b</sup>	0.20 <sup>b</sup>	4.66 <sup>b</sup>	17.63 <sup>b</sup>
SEm <sub>±</sub>	0.011	0.747	0.011	0.580	1.076	0.006	0.201	0.003	0.089	0.248
CD (P=0.05)	0.03	2.14	0.03	1.66	3.08	0.02	0.58	0.01	0.25	0.71
<b>Interaction</b>										
<b>S at T</b>										
SEm <sub>±</sub>	0.034	2.364	0.034	1.833	3.403	0.020	0.637	0.009	0.281	0.785
CD (P=0.05)	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
<b>T at S</b>										
SEm <sub>±</sub>	0.052	3.972	0.076	2.939	4.481	0.037	1.163	0.017	0.481	1.380
CD (P=0.05)	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

**Phosphorus:** It was evident from the (Table 7), the phosphorus content and uptake of pod, haulm and total P uptake was maximal under treatment (T<sub>7</sub>) supplied only with 100% P, followed by (T<sub>8</sub>) in all cases. Total P uptake was found low under T<sub>1</sub> (9.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) which was found to be at par with T<sub>2</sub> (12.1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>).

As regards, subplot treatment, S<sub>2</sub> (75% RDF) was superior to S<sub>3</sub> and S<sub>1</sub> in case of P content and uptake of pod, haulm and total P uptake. Total P uptake is in the order : S<sub>2</sub> (19.42 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) > S<sub>3</sub> (17.63 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) > S<sub>1</sub> (13.81 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). Phosphorus recovery and uptake has been observed to improve either by the application of P to maize crop (Sarkadi, 1995) or by application of FYM along with chemical fertilizers to the preceding wheat crop (Negi *et al.*, 1992).

### Conclusion :

The application of integrated nutrient management (INM) substantially increased the content of nitrogen (N), phosphorus (P), and potassium (K) in both grain and stover compared to the control. This indicates that the utilization of INM practices positively influenced nutrient uptake by the crops. The incorporation of Farm Yard Manure (FYM) in combination with recommended fertilizer doses (100% RDF and 75% RDF) notably affected nutrient content in grain and stover. This underscores the contribution of organic matter (FYM) along with conventional fertilizers to elevated nutrient concentrations. Furthermore, integrating FYM led to a more pronounced increase in nutrient concentration, not only for nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium, but also for other essential nutrients. This suggests that the integration of organic matter positively impacted overall nutrient availability and uptake. The observed heightened concentrations of N, P, and K were attributed to their synergistic effects during various crop growth stages. This highlights the interplay between these nutrients, enhancing their uptake and utilization by the plants. The discrepancy in potassium (K) concentration between grain and stover was attributed to nutrient translocation, with nitrogen and phosphorus moving from vegetative parts to grain during maturity. Conversely, the higher K concentration in stover was attributed to the response of fibrous cells, particularly sclerenchyma cells, to potassium supply, leading to increased turgidity, cellulose, and hemicellulose content. Similar results are also reported by other workers Karki *et al.* (2005), Shashidhar *et al.* (2009), Mann *et al.* (2006), Mahala *et al.* (2006) and Vikas *et al.* (2007).

### References

1. Karki TB, Ashok Kumar, Gautam RC. Influence of integrated nutrient management on growth, yield, content and uptake of nutrients and soil fertility status in maize (*Zea mays* L.). *Indian J Agric. Sci.* 2005; 75(10):682-685.
2. Mahala HL, Shaktawat MS, Shivran RK. Direct and residual effect of sources and levels of phosphorus and farmyard manure in maize (*Zea mays* L.) -mustard (*Brassica juncea*) cropping sequence. *Indian Journal of Agronomy.* 2006; 51:10-13
3. Mann KK, Brar BS, Dhillon NS. Influence of long-term use of farmyard manure and inorganic fertilizers on nutrient availability in a Typic Ustochrept. *Indian J Agric. Sci.* 2006; 76(8):477-480
4. Negi, S.C., Singh, KK. and Thakur, RC. 1992. Effect of phosphours with and without FYM on yield and uptake of N, P and protein content in wheat-maize sequence. *Himachal Journal of Agricultural Research* 18(1): 5-8.

5. Rahale, C.S., Balasubramanian, P and Bharani, A. 2018. Effect of long term fertilization on soil fertility and yield of rice in cauvery delta zone. *Oryza*. 55(1): 141-151.
6. Sarkadi, J.1995. Utilization of the nutrient contents of organic manure and mineral phosphorus transformation vis-a-vis rice yield in a rice-wheat cropping system. *Archives of Agronomy and Soil Science*. 62:1,1-18.
7. Shashidhar CU, Veeranna HK, Ramesh YM, Somashekarappa PR, Vijay Mahantesh. Effect of different nutrient management practices on yield, economics and nutrient uptake in maize (*Zea mays* L.). *Res. on crops*. 2009; 10(2):27-230
8. SubbaRao A and Sammi Reddy K (2005) Emerging strategies for sustaining higher productivity and ensuring soil quality under intensive agriculture. *Indian Journal of Fertilizers* 1(4) : 61-76.
9. Tyagi, P.K., Upadhyay, A.K and Raikwar, R.S. 2014. Integrated approach in nutrient management of summer green gram. *The Bioscan International Journal of Life Sciences*. 9(4): 1529-1533.
10. Venkata Lakshmi M, Pulla Rao Ch, Prasad PVN, Prasuna Rani P, and Ashoka Rani Y. 2020. Studies on yield, nutrient content and nutrient uptake of groundnut as influenced by phosphorus management practices in rice-groundnut sequence. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*. 9(2): 257-263.
11. Vikas Abrol, Sharma V, Sharma P, Khar D, Vittal KPR. Direct and residual effect of organic and inorganic sources of nutrients on maize (*Zea mays*)-mustard (*Brassica napus*) cropping sequence under rainfed conditions. *Indian Journal of Dryland Agriculture Research and Development*. 2007; 22(1):82-89.