

Original Research Article

Agro-climatic indices, plant growth and yield of *Bt* cotton as influenced by planting time and spacing

Abstract

A field experiment was conducted in *kharif* season 2020 to study the effect of sowing time and row spacing on growth, yield and agro-climatic indices of Cotton at Research Farm, Department of Agricultural Meteorology, CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar. The experiment was performed in split-plot design and replicated thrice. The experiment included nine treatment combinations with three sowing dates and row spacings. Among different sowing times, cotton sown on 19th April had significantly higher plant height (176.3 cm), dry matter accumulation (453.39 g plant⁻¹), LAI (1.92), GDD, HTU, PTU and seed cotton yield (3057 kg ha⁻¹) in comparison to sowing in May *i.e.* 8th and 28th. Among various row spacing, cotton planted with a row spacing of 67.5 cm x 60 cm produced significantly higher seed cotton (2657 kg ha⁻¹), although growth was greater with a row spacing of 100 x 45 cm.

Keywords: Sowing time and spacing, Leaf Area Index, Seed cotton yield, Agro-climatic indices

Introduction

Cotton (*Gossypiumhirsutum* L.) is an important cash crop and fibre crop in India. It is also an important part of the country's agricultural economy. Cotton, which is also called "White Gold," is the most important cash crop in India. It gives 65% of the cotton fibre that India's cotton textile companies need as their main raw material. Cotton occupies a preeminent position among cash crops, as it determines the fate of a sizable portion of the agricultural community as well as thriving textile industries, thanks to a favourable climate for cotton cultivation across the nation and improved technologies from the public and private sectors. At the time of a nation's independence, cotton was the primary basic material on which textile mills relied heavily on imports. Cotton is grown in about 60 countries around the world, but about 85% of the world's cotton comes from just 10 countries: Russia, the United States, China, India, Brazil, Pakistan, Turkey, Egypt, Mexico, and Sudan. It is grown on an area of about 32.9 million hectares, and 41.1 million tonnes of seed cotton are made from it. India is

Comment [A1]: Include general objective at the beginning, Experimental design used, treatments (quantity and its repetitions), parameters evaluated, analyzes used and the most important results.

Comment [A2]: Include scientific name

Comment [A3]: Use citations not older than 10 years.

Include results of other previous studies, in addition the general objective is not observed at the end of the introduction

one of the world's biggest cotton producers. It has the most cotton fields and is also the second largest cotton user. Before the Government of India started the "Technology Mission on Cotton" in February 2000, the productivity of cotton was very low. However, significant progress has been made in increasing productivity and yield through the development of high-yielding varieties, better farm management, good weather, and an increase in the area where Bt cotton is grown. Haryana's cotton production might benefit greatly by adopting cutting-edge technology and putting it into timely operation, as it has in neighbouring states Punjab and Gujarat.

The management of planting dates has a significant impact not only on crop growth, development, and yield, but also on insect nuisance control. In recent years, reduced season management, in which early planting plays a key role, has become increasingly significant.

With increased late-season insect pressures, the ability to plant and establish a crop early, carry it through the primary fruiting cycle in a timely and efficient fashion, and then terminate it early has become increasingly important. This approach to earliness management has also been crucial in avoiding the adverse weather conditions typically associated with the summer monsoon season, which creates higher humidity (higher dew point temperatures) and higher night temperatures, resulting in accelerated rates of fruit loss and abortion (Brown and Zeiher, 1997). According to Bozbek *et al.* (2006), the optimal sowing date for a cultivar in a region is the most essential manageable factor in cotton crop. Drought conditions during the flowering and boll development stages (August to September) have a negative impact on the development and subsequent shedding of reproductive organs, resulting in a low crop yield. Early sowing appears to have a greater yield potential, whereas late planting of cotton crop appears to be very vegetative and difficult to manage, resulting in a lower seed cotton yield (Ali *et al.*, 2009). Due to numerous biotic and abiotic stresses, such as weed infestation, insect pests and diseases, sowing too early or too late, nutrient stress, and improper use of genotypes in different agro-ecological zones, it was previously impossible to obtain a high cotton yield (Arshad *et al.*, 2007; Zia-ul-Hassan *et al.*, 2014). The optimal fertilisation date plays a crucial role in yield potential; similarly, the optimal row spacing for a given region is necessary for optimal growth and development.

Dehoet *et al.* (2012) noted that sowing date and row spacing management are significant factors that can have a substantial effect on the yield and qualitative characteristics of a cotton crop.

Material and Methods

Comment [A4]: More procedurally describe the experiment setup process so that readers can replicate the experiment

parameters evaluated?
used statistical analysis and software?

list the formulas used

During the *kharif* season of 2020, the experiment was conducted at Research Farm, Department of Agricultural Meteorology, CCS HAU, Hisar, located in the subtropics at 75°46' E, 29°10' N, and 215.2 metres above mean sea level. The experiment was designed with a split-plot layout and replicated thrice. The experiment comprised nine treatment combinations consisting of three sowing dates under three different row spacing. Three replications of the nine treatment combinations were arranged in a split plot design. The cotton crop was planted on the 2nd fortnight of April, 1st fortnight of May and 2nd fortnight of May under 67.5 X 60 cm, 100 X 45 cm and 100 X 67.5 cm row spacings.

The agro-meteorological observatory that is located close to the research area at the Department of Agricultural Meteorology provided the source for the collection of the mean weekly meteorological data from the 17th to the 40th (standard meteorological weeks) during the *kharif* season of 2020 (April to October) (**Fig. 1.**) The minimum weekly temperature ranged from 9.8 °C to 28.3 °C, and the maximum weekly temperature range was from 29.7 °C to 43.2 °C. The weekly morning and evening relative humidity ranges varied from 46.8% to 93.5% and 15.7% to 77.1%, respectively. The total amount of rainfall that was received was 363.4 mm.

After seed treatment with imidachloprid, clean cotton seed of the hybrid variety RCH 773 was utilised for manual dibbling at a depth of 4-5 cm as per the treatments. The crop was raised according to the standard package and practices of CCS HAU, Hisar.

To calculate plant height (cm) three plants were selected randomly from each plot and average was taken as plant height at different intervals. Three plants selected randomly from each plot were cut at soil surface and dried in shade for 2-3 days. After sun drying these were transferred to oven and dried at 65 °C until a constant weight was achieved. Average was presented as dry matter accumulation per plant. Leaves were separated from plants collected for dry matter accumulation and leaf area was measured using a leaf area metre (LI-3000C Area metre, LI-COR Biosciences, Nebraska, USA). Three plants were selected randomly from each plot and tagged for yield attributes and average was taken. The seed cotton was picked from net plot area of 1 X 1 m² and presented as kg ha⁻¹.

The cumulative growing degree days were computed by adding the daily mean temperature above the basal temperature and are denoted in °C day. This was computed using the formula shown below:

$$\text{GDD } (^{\circ}\text{C day}) = \sum \frac{T_{\text{max}} - T_{\text{min}}}{2} - T_b$$

Where,

T_{max} = Daily maximum temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$)

T_{min} = Daily minimum temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$)

T_b = Base temperature (10°C , WMO, 1996)

Photothermal units were computed by multiplying the cumulative value of GDD by the almost possible sunshine hours and are expressed in $^{\circ}\text{C}$ day hours:

$$\text{PTU } (^{\circ}\text{C day hours}) = \sum (\text{GDD} \times N)$$

Where,

N = Maximum possible sunshine hours or day length

Heliothermal units for a day are the product of GDD and actual bright sunshine hours and are expressed in $^{\circ}\text{C}$ day hours:

$$\text{HTU } (^{\circ}\text{C day hours}) = \sum (\text{GDD} \times \text{BSS})$$

Where,

BSS = Bright sunshine hours

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) for the split plot design was calculated using OPSTAT software. At a significance level of 5%, the F-test was used to ascertain the significance of the treatment effects.

Results And discussion

Agroclimatic indices

During the *kharif* season 2020, agrometeorological indices such as GDD, HTU, and PTU were measured in *Bt* cotton grown in various environments. Early sown *i.e.* 19th April, cotton had the maximum number of growing degree days, heliothermal units and photothermal units at maturity followed by crop sown on 8th May and 28th May. (Fig. 2). Among different row spacing, GDD, HTU and PTU were highest under row spacing of 100×60 cm followed by 100×45 cm and 67.5×60 cm (**Figure 2, 3 and 4**). The reason may be that the previous date of sowing and spacing required a greater number of days to

Comment [A5]: Update references used. Improve reference format

Improve considering material and methods

achieve distinct phenophases. Kular and Hundal (2006) also discovered that the heat units accumulated by various cotton cultivars were greater in early sown crops than in medium and late sown crops.

Growth parameters

Among different date of sowing, the crop planted on 19th April had significantly higher plant height, dry matter accumulation and leaf area index as compared to sowing on 8th and 28th May. Among different row spacing, cotton grown under 100 cm x 60 cm spacing had maximum dry matter accumulation and leaf area index while plant height was maximum under 67.5 x 60 cm. It was significantly superior over rest of the row spacing at different intervals (**Table 1, Table 2 and Table 3.**). Early sown cotton had better growth as compared to sowing in May. With delay in sowing significant effect on growth was observed. In early sown cotton, maximum number of days are available for proper growth and development. Wider spacing resulted in maximal plant height, dry matter accumulation per plant and leaf area index as a result of efficient growth, ground area available to each plant and increased light interception by leaves which led to increased photosynthetic activity and better growth of cotton. The highest level of photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) intercepted by the early-sown crop may have contributed to its maximum growth. These findings are in line with Bhalerao *et al.*, (2010), Singh *et al.*, (2012), Tripathi (2005), Khamparia and Sisodia (2007) and Poursia and Nabipour (2007).

Yield and its attributes

Early planting of cotton in 2nd fortnight of April *i.e.* 19th April resulted in significantly greater number of sympodial per plant, number of bolls per plant, boll weight (g) per plant and seed cotton yield in comparison to sowing in May. Row spacing had significantly affected the yield and yield attributes of cotton. Significantly higher yield attributes of cotton were reported under 100 cm x 60 cm row spacing when compared to 100x45cm and 67.5 x 60 cm. However, number of monopodia per plant and seed cotton was higher under 67.5 x 60 cm spacing (**Table 4**). In comparison to other sowing dates, crops planted on April 19 absorb more radiation and are more energy efficient. Similarly, Swami *et al.* (2016) found that late-planted crops have very weak growth. In comparison to wider spacing, 67.5 cm x 60 cm spacing resulted in a greater crop yield than wider spacing. It may be a result of greater LAI and PAR absorption per unit area. While yield attributes values per

plant, number of bolls per plant and number of sympodial branches per plant) were found to be greater in wider spacing (100 X 60 cm) as a result of greater energy efficiency by each plant. These results are in line with Kaur *et al.*, (2009), Bhalerao *et al.*, (2010) and Singh *et al.*, (2012).

Conclusion

Based on the experiment, it can be concluded that early planting of cotton on 19th April resulted in better growth and yield of cotton in comparison to late planting in May. Cotton grown under row spacing of 67.5 cm x 60 cm had higher seed cotton yield however growth was better under 100x45cm.

References

- Ali, H., Naved Afzal, M. and Muhammad, D. (2009). Effect of sowing dates and plant spacing on growth and dry matter partitioning in cotton *Gossypiumhirsutum* L. *Pakistan Journal of Botany*,41(5): 2145-2155.
- Arshad, M., Aftab, W., Maqsood, M., Hussain, K., Aslam, M. and Ibrahim, M. (2007). Response of growth, yield and quality of different cotton cultivars to sowing dates *Pakistan Journal of Agricultural Science*, Vol. 44(2).
- Bhalerao, P.D. and Gaikwad, G.S. (2010). Productivity and profitability of *Bt* cotton (*Gossypiumhirsutum*) under various plant geometry and fertilizer levels. *Indian J. Agron.* 55(1): 60-63.
- Bozbek, T., A. Sezener and A. Unay (2006). The effect of sowing date and plant density on cotton yield. *Journal of Agronomy* 5: 122-125.
- Brown P. W. and Zeiher, C. A. (1997). Cotton heat stress. Pp. 91-104. Cotton, Univ. of Arizona Rep. P-108.
- Deho, Z. A., S. Laghari., Abro, S., Khanzada, S. D. and Fakhuruddin (2012). Effect of sowing dates and picking intervals at boll opening percent, yield and fiber quality of cotton cultivars. *Science Technology and Development*, 31(3): 288-293.
- Kaur, P., Gill, M.S., Buttar, G.S. and Kaur, M. 2009. Response of *Bt* cotton hybrid RCH-134 to varied nutrient and spacing levels. National symposium on "*Bt* cotton: Opportunities and prospects". Crop Production: 17-19 November, 2009. CICR: Nagpur. pp 60.
- Khamparia, S.K. and Sisodia, R.I. (2007). American cotton varieties as influenced by plant densities and fertility levels under rainfed conditions. *J. Cott. Res. Dev.* 21(1): 35-40.

- Kular, J. S., Hundal, S.S and Dhaliwal, L.K. (2006). Use of agrometeorological indices for forecasting of mustard aphid. *J. of Agrom.* 7(2):304-306.
- Pouresia, M. and Nabipour, M. (2007). Effect of planting date on canola phenology, yield and yield components. In: *Proc. of 12 Intern. rap. cong.* Wuhan, China. March 26-30 III: 97-101.
- Singh, K., Singh, H., Rathore, P. and Gumber, R.K. (2012). Response of desi cotton (*Gossypium arboretum* L.) genotypes to plant geometries and nutrient levels under irrigated conditions. *J. Cott. Res. Dev.* 26(1): 58-61.
- Tripathi, M. K. 2005. Quantification of micrometeorological variations in Indian mustard under different growing environments. Ph.D. Thesis. CCS HAU, Hisar.
- Zia-ul-Hassan, Kubar, K. A., Rajpar, I., Shah, A. N., Tunio, S. D., Shah, J. A. and Maitlo, A. A. (2014). Evaluating potassium use-efficiency of five cotton genotypes of Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Botany*, 46(4): 1237- 1242.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Fig. 1: Mean weekly meteorological data during crop season (2020)




Fig. 2: Effect of treatments on GDD (Growing Degree Days) in *Bt* cotton at various phenophases under different growing environments.




Fig. 3: Effect of treatments on HTU (Heliothermal Units) in *Bt* cotton at various phenophases under different growing environments




Fig. 4: Effect of treatments on PTU (Photothermal Units) in *Bt* cotton at various phenophases under different growing environments

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| SEm± | 0.24 | 0.70 | 4.05 | 8.33 | 2.48 |
| CD (P=0.05) | 0.97 | 2.83 | 16.35 | 33.60 | 10.00 |
| Spacing | | | | | |
| S ₁ - 67.5cm x 60cm | 12.91 | 63.94 | 234.88 | 293.43 | 305.09 |
| S ₂ - 100cm x 45cm | 13.75 | 67.55 | 252.66 | 316.20 | 328.20 |
| S ₃ - 100cm x 60cm | 14.75 | 79.15 | 297.26 | 383.03 | 397.92 |
| SEm± | 0.35 | 0.50 | 3.62 | 6.01 | 5.61 |
| CD (P=0.05) | 1.09 | 1.55 | 11.27 | 18.74 | 17.50 |

Table. 3: Effect of treatments on Leaf area index of *Bt* cotton at various growth intervals under different growing environments

| Leaf area index | | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Treatments | 45 DAS | 75 DAS | 105 DAS | 135 DAS | Harvest |
| Dates of sowing | | | | | |
| D ₁ - 19 th April | 0.42 | 1.77 | 3.52 | 4.68 | 1.92 |
| D ₂ - 8 th May | 0.38 | 1.66 | 3.31 | 4.21 | 1.75 |
| D ₃ - 28 nd May | 0.31 | 1.28 | 2.77 | 3.84 | 1.51 |
| SEm± | 0.017 | 0.03 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.06 |
| CD (P=0.05) | 0.06 | 0.12 | 0.30 | 0.20 | 0.24 |
| Spacing | | | | | |
| S ₁ - 67.5cm x 60cm | 0.41 | 1.85 | 3.82 | 5.00 | 2.26 |
| S ₂ - 100cm x 45cm | 0.38 | 1.66 | 3.54 | 4.57 | 1.90 |
| S ₃ - 100cm x 60cm | 0.30 | 1.20 | 2.25 | 3.17 | 1.01 |
| SEm± | 0.009 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.04 |
| CD (P=0.05) | 0.02 | 0.12 | 0.18 | 0.21 | 0.13 |

Table. 4: Effect of treatments on Yield attributes and yield of *Bt* cotton under different growing environments

| Yield attributes and yield | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Treatments | Number of sympodia per plant | Number of monopodia per plant | Number of bolls per plant | Boll weight (g) | Seed cotton yield (kg/ha) |
| Dates of sowing | | | | | |
| D ₁ - 19 th April | 31.28 | 2.72 | 52.78 | 4.83 | 3057 |
| D ₂ - 8 th May | 29.90 | 1.76 | 50.31 | 4.61 | 2268 |
| D ₃ - 28 nd May | 27.14 | 1.58 | 46.39 | 4.33 | 1853 |
| SEm± | 0.55 | 0.05 | 0.74 | 0.15 | 39.53 |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
| CD (P=0.05) | 2.24 | 0.20 | 3.01 | NS | 159.37 |
| Spacing | | | | | |
| S ₁ - 67.5cm x 60cm | 27.37 | 2.47 | 47.26 | 4.22 | 2657 |
| S ₂ - 100cm x 45cm | 29.73 | 2.14 | 49.52 | 4.70 | 2432 |
| S ₃ - 100cm x 60cm | 31.21 | 1.45 | 52.63 | 4.84 | 2089 |
| SEm± | 0.17 | 0.10 | 0.64 | 0.11 | 15.95 |
| CD (P=0.05) | 0.55 | 0.32 | 2.01 | 0.35 | 49.71 |

UNDER PEER REVIEW