

Original Research Article

Nutrient uptake and post harvest nutrient status of elephant foot yam influenced by integrated nutrient management under coastal condition

Comment [ERG1]: Please, kindly reevaluate the title of your work.

ABSTRACT

The investigation was carried out to study the intergrated nutrient management practices on nutrient uptake and economics of Elephant foot yam (*Amorphophalluspaeonifolius* (Dennst.) Nicolsan) cv. Gajendra. The field experiment was laid out in randomized block design with thirteen treatments with three replications. Elephant foot yam corms were cut into 800 g for planting, and dipped in cow dung slurry and placed for drying. The treatments comprised of three levels of recommended dose of fertilizers viz., 75%, 100% and 150% along with organic inputs viz., FYM (20 t ha⁻¹), Vermicompost (5 t ha⁻¹), consortium bio fertilizer (5 Kg ha⁻¹) and organic manures of different combinations were applied as basal. The observations were recorded before and after harvesting. From the study it was observed that soil organic content was increased significantly due to the application of organic manures along with biofertilizers, whereas soil physical and chemical properties were unaffected. The economic analysis indicated that the T₅ resulted in the highest net income and B:C ratio..

Comment [ERG2]: What was exactly done during this study?
What is the scope of this study?

Comment [ERG3]: Which nutrient, what type of nutrient?

Comment [ERG4]: ????
When an abbreviation is mentioned for the first time it must be written up and then abbreviated between brackets. Kindly write up the abbreviation.

Keywords: [Elephant foot yam, FYM, Vermicompost, B:C ratio]

Comment [ERG5]: Abbreviations cannot be a part of the Keywords. Kindly look for another Keyword.

Comment [ERG6]: Abbreviations cannot be a part of the Keywords. Kindly look for another Keyword.

1. INTRODUCTION

Elephant foot yam, often known as the "King of Tuber Crops" is a tropical under-ground tuber that is grown in Africa and Southeast Asia. Mostly cultivated commercially in Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Gujarat, Maharashtra, West Bengal, Jharkhand, Kerala, Karnataka, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, and Puducherry [3]. Tuber crops are well adapted to marginal environments, low input management, and drought in general. They bloom well when the annual rainfall is 1000-1500 mm. Tuber crops, particularly elephant foot yam, respond favorably to organic manures in general. Over a decade of research at the Central Tuber Crops Research Institute has shown that organic management improves production, quality, and soil qualities in tuber crops [7]. The Green Revolution in India surely increased agricultural output. However, productivity decreased in many intensively cultivated regions where organic manures were partially or completely prohibited. The expansion of land usage with growing reliance on agrochemicals resulted in crop output stagnation in many cases, necessitating a shift to a alternative farming system approach with built-in aspects of farming-nature harmony [1]. Until 1980, it was widely assumed that inorganic fertilizers were a feasible technique of enhancing agricultural productivity in the humid tropics' low fertility soils. Various reports on the usage of inorganic fertilizers in the tropics had also stagnated, which was explained by low marketing and profitability [4]. As a result, maximizing the use of organic waste by combining it with chemical and bio-fertilizers in an integrated manner was discovered to be the preferable option. As a result, a field experiment was conducted to assess the effects of various organic and inorganic nutrient management strategies along with biofertilizers on nutrient uptake and B:C ratio of elephant foot yam.

Comment [ERG7]: Please cite the references.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study was conducted at farmers field at Thirukkanur village, Villianur, Puducherry during the year 2020-2022. Fifteen plants were tagged randomly in each net plot of each treatment for recording the following observations

Comment [ERG8]: The Materials and Methods are extremely poor. One experiment does not make an article.

2.1 Treatment Details

The treatments comprised of three levels of recommended dose of fertilizers (RDF - 80:40:100 Kg NPK ha⁻¹) viz., 75%, 100% and 150% along with organic inputs viz., FYM (20 t ha⁻¹), Vermicompost (5 t ha⁻¹) and (Consortium bio fertilizer 5 Kg ha⁻¹) (Table 1). Organic manures of different combinations were applied as basal. Observations were recorded before and after harvest of the crop. Fifteen plants were tagged randomly in each plot of each treatment for recording the following observations.

TABLE 1 :Treatment Details

Treatment	Treatment Details
T ₁	FYM 20 t ha ⁻¹ + 75% RDF (60:30:75 Kg NPK ha ⁻¹)
T ₂	FYM 20 t ha ⁻¹ + 100% RDF (80:40:100 Kg NPK ha ⁻¹)
T ₃	FYM 20 t ha ⁻¹ + 125% RDF (100:50:125 Kg NPK ha ⁻¹)
T ₄	FYM 20 t ha ⁻¹ + 75% RDF (60:30:75 Kg NPK ha ⁻¹) + CBF 5 Kg ha ⁻¹
T ₅	FYM 20 t ha ⁻¹ + 100% RDF (80:40:100 Kg NPK ha ⁻¹) + CBF 5 Kg ha ⁻¹
T ₆	FYM 20 t ha ⁻¹ + 125% RDF (100:50:125 Kg NPK ha ⁻¹) + CBF 5 Kg ha ⁻¹
T ₇	Vermicompost 5 t ha ⁻¹ + 75 % RDF (60:30:75 Kg NPK ha ⁻¹)
T ₈	Vermicompost 5 t ha ⁻¹ + 100 % RDF (80:40:100 Kg NPK ha ⁻¹)
T ₉	Vermicompost 5 t ha ⁻¹ + 125 % RDF (100:50:125 Kg NPK ha ⁻¹)
T ₁₀	Vermicompost 5 t ha ⁻¹ + 75 % RDF (60:30:75 Kg NPK ha ⁻¹) + CBF 5 Kg ha ⁻¹
T ₁₁	Vermicompost 5 t ha ⁻¹ + 100 % RDF (80:40:100 Kg NPK ha ⁻¹) + CBF 5 Kg ha ⁻¹
T ₁₂	Vermicompost 5 t ha ⁻¹ + 125 % RDF (100:50:125 Kg NPK ha ⁻¹) + CBF 5 Kg ha ⁻¹
T ₁₃	Control

Comment [ERG9]: What type of manures? Cow, pig,..... manres?

Comment [ERG10]: What kind of combinations? Please, describe the combination for future repetition for better guidance for the readers.

Comment [ERG11]: What are the plots' measurements?

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The experiment was laid out during *kharif*, 2020 at the farmer field at Thirukkanur village, Villianur, Puducherry to assess the effect of integrated nutrient management on soil parameters of Elephant foot yam (*Amorphophalus paeonifolius* (Dennst.) Nicolsan) cv. Gajendra.

The data result of the field experimental has been presented in (Table 2&3).

3.1 SOIL PARAMETERS AND ECONOMICS AFFECTED BY INTEGRATED NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

Table 2 shows the soil physical parameters, bulk density (BD) as well as the chemical properties, soil organic carbon, accessible N, P, and K levels available and after crop harvest as modified by different treatments. The soil organic carbon concentration was highest when 50% of the N was replaced with vermicompost, which recorded 0.64% organic carbon content and was comparable to T₁₂. Replacing 50% N with diverse organic nutrient sources increased the amount of organic carbon in the soil, resulting in a considerable increase in soil organic carbon content. The effect of bio-fertilizer application was found to be significant, with the highest organic carbon content of 0.64% found in the treatment with bio-fertilizer application, which may be due to well decomposition of organic manures by applied microbes, which may ultimately increase soil organic carbon content [7]. Similar results have been also reported in other crops under Indian conditions [2], [6],[3] discovered that manure treatment increased soil microbial bio-mass and carbon content. The enzymes found in organic manures may also directly boost soil enzymatic activity.

Comment [ERG12]: How it is possible to present some results of an experiment that was not carried out. This experiment title is not declared in the Materials and Methods section. Please, kindly declare it in the Materials and Methods section.

Better N, P, and K consumption was reported in treatments with integrated nutrition management or a higher level of vermicompost application. Control had the lowest nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium intake. After two years of experiments, available P in the chemical plot was noticeably increased. This could be owing to the inclusion of synthetic fertilizers as well as FYM, which could limit P fixation. Bulk density was non-significant, but accessible N, P, and K were slightly higher in the treatments where 100% of the nitrogen was replaced with organic manures. [8] obtained similar results in elephant foot yam. When compared to the initial soil status, the amount of accessible N, P, and K contents is about equal to or slightly higher.

According to the findings, elephant foot yam efficiently utilized the extra nitrogen for vegetative growth while phosphorus and potassium for improved quality and corn production. The post-harvest soil nutrient status revealed that maximum soil N, P₂O₅ and K₂O₅ was available in T₁₁. Elephant foot yam response to P₂O₅ was observed up to 60 kg ha⁻¹ [5]. This might be due to un-utilization of applied N and K in this treatment. Whereas in case of P₂O₅ was as result of excess application of P and lesser utilization of P by the crop.

The data presented in Table 3 revealed that the highest B:C ratio (4.46) was obtained in the treatment T₅ which was closely followed by the B:C ratio of 4.27, obtained in the treatment combination of T₁₁. The key explanation for this finding is the price differential between vermicompost and farm yard manure. The B: C ratio in all organic treatments can be increased if organic manures are created on the farm. One of the most significant aspects of organic farming is the natural fertility of each field/farm or region. As a result, effort should be taken to ensure that only a limited amount of nutrients exit the system, hence limiting "import" of nutrients. This can only be accomplished by recycling on-farm waste, which lowers input costs [10].

Comment [ERG13]: The stipulated value does not coincide with the one represented in the table 3. Can you please explain better?

Table. 2. Effect of organic sources, recommended dose of fertilizers and biofertilizers on soil status of elephant foot yam.

Comment [ERG14]: What type of analyses were done to produce this table? In what experiment can it be attributed? And from where comes the data?

Treatments	Bulk density (gcm ⁻³)	Soil O.C. (%)	Nutrient uptake (Kg ha ⁻¹)			Post harvest soil nutrient status (Kg ha ⁻¹)		
			N	P	K	N	P ₂ O ₅	K ₂ O
T ₁	1.40	0.60	118.73	106.51	87.64	88.59	52.09	82.69
T ₂	1.34	0.62	148.06	149.83	113.69	101.45	61.17	91.46
T ₃	1.40	0.58	129.81	128.72	100.51	95.06	56.34	87.05
T ₄	1.42	0.59	116.22	112.83	90.88	90.23	53.26	83.80
T ₅	1.41	0.61	152.51	155.13	116.85	103.12	62.21	92.54

T ₆	1.36	0.49	134.27	134.00	104.11	96.66	57.48	88.16
T ₇	1.31	0.55	120.83	118.14	94.03	91.89	54.30	84.91
T ₈	1.47	0.57	157.00	160.42	120.06	104.69	63.27	93.65
T ₉	1.45	0.60	13.11	44.00	1670.40	98.31	59.02	89.02
T ₁₀	1.60	0.54	12.00	41.89	1440.32	93.45	55.31	86.00
T ₁₁	1.23	0.64	14.60	46.86	2009.17	106.31	64.29	94.83
T ₁₂	1.11	0.63	13.46	44.68	1743.72	99.87	60.11	90.38
T ₁₃	1.63	0.61	9.47	37.52	1068.26	85.28	50.17	79.51
CD (p=0.05)	NS	NS	0.34	0.68	2.35	1.53	0.98	1.03

Table. 3. Effect of integrated nutrient management on cost economics analysis in elephant foot yam

S.No		Cost of cultivation (Rs ha ⁻¹)	Total yield (t ha ⁻¹)	Gross income (Rs ha ⁻¹)	Net income (Rs ha ⁻¹)	B:C ratio
1	T ₁	136257	24.21	484200	347943	1:2.55
2	T ₂	138787	36.51	730200	591413	1:4.26
3	T ₃	141781	30.20	604000	462219	1:3.26
4	T ₄	137257	25.58	511600	374343	1:2.72
5	T ₅	139787	38.18	763600	623813	1:4.46
6	T ₆	142781	31.98	639600	496819	1:3.48
7	T ₇	148757	27.37	547400	398643	1:2.68
8	T ₈	151287	39.75	795000	643713	1:4.25
9	T ₉	154281	33.38	667600	513319	1:3.33
10	T ₁₀	149757	28.78	575600	425843	1:2.84
11	T ₁₁	152287	40.15	803000	650713	1:4.27
12	T ₁₂	155281	34.84	696800	541519	1:3.49

Comment [ERG15]: What type of analyses were done to produce this table? In what experiment can it be attributed? And from where comes the data?

13	T ₁₃	111475	21.34	426800	315325	1:2.83
----	-----------------	--------	-------	--------	--------	--------

List 1 :Cost of Experimental sources

Urea – 298/50 kg	FYM – 500/t	Labour cost – 200/day
SSP - 356/50 kg	Vermicompost – 5100/t	Seed cost – 20/kg
MOP – 565/50 kg	Irrigation charges – 50/hr	Bio fertilizers – 120/litre

4. CONCLUSION

The results of the study inferred that individual effect of integrated nutrient sources and bio-fertilizers had been effective in improving the soil fertility status. From the above enumeration, inference can be drawn that integrated nutrient management with vermicompost along with bio-fertilizers largely improves soil status in cultivation of elephant foot yam. T₅ recorded highest B:C ratio followed by T₁₁.

ABBREVIATIONS

%	:	per cent
()	:	Bracket parenthesis
@	:	At the rate of
=	:	is equal to
CBF	:	Consortium Biofertilizers
C.D.	:	Critical difference
cm	:	Centimeter
cv.	:	Cultivar
FYM	:	Farmyard manure
g	:	gram
ha ⁻¹	:	per hectare
NPK	:	Nitrogen, Phosphorus and Potassium
Kg	:	Kilogram
No.	:	Number
RDF	:	Recommended dose of fertilizers
ha ⁻¹	:	per hectare
t	:	tonne
VIZ	:	NAMELY

Comment [ERG16]: Irrelevant. This is not applied to a scientific article.

REFERENCES

- Alexander D. The Adhoc Package of Practices Recommendations for Organic Farming, Kerala Agricultural University, Thrissur, 2002; pp-209.
- Mahapatra BS, Singh SP, Rajesh A, Vishwakarma VK, Bhushan C, Anil Kumar et al. Performance of lentil, chick pea and wheat under organic mode during initial years of conversion in relation to nutrient management practices. *Journal of Ecofriendly Agric.* 2006;1: 105-116.

3. Nedunchezhiyan M, Byju G, Dash SN. Effects of organic production of orange fleshed sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas* L.) on root yield, quality and soil biological health. *International Research Journal of Plant Science*. 2010; 1(6):136-143.
4. Patel NB, Saravaiya SN, Patel BN and Desai KD. Studies in integrated nutrient management (INM) in elephant foot yam. *The Asian Journal of Horticulture*. 2010; 5(1): 32-33.
5. Sethi K, Mohanty A, Naskar SK, Byju G and Mukherjee A. Effect of set size, spacing and NPK fertilizer on yield of *Amorphophallus* in hilly areas of Orissa. *Orissa Journal of Horticulture*. 2002;30: 72-75.
6. Srivastava AK, Singh S, Shivankar VJ, Das AK and Rao CN. *Organic Citrus Status*. National Research Centre for Citrus, Nagpur, Maharashtra, 2006; pp.175.
7. Suja G, Sreekumar J, Susan John K and Sundaresan S. Organic production of tuberous vegetables: Agronomic, nutritional and economic benefits. *J. Root Crops*. 2012 a; 38: 135-141.
8. Suja G, Sundaresan S, Susan John K, Sreekumar J and Misra RS. Higher yield, profit and soil quality from organic farming of elephant foot yam. *Agron. Sustain. Dev*. 2012 b; 32: 755-764.
9. Suja G, Susan John K, Ravindran CS, Prathapan K and Sundaresan S. On farm validation of organic farming technology in elephant foot yam [*Amorphophalluspaeoniifolius* (Dennst.) Nicolson]. *J. Root Crops*. 2010; 36: 59-64.
10. Yadav AK. *Organic Agriculture-Concept, Scenario, Principles and Practices*. National Centre for Organic Farming, Department of Agriculture and Co-operation, Ministry of Agriculture, GOI, Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh, 2011; 60 p.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

