

Original Research Article

Effect of foliar application of water-soluble fertilizers on growth and yield of wheat (*Triticumaestivum*L.)

ABSTRACT

Direct ~~fertiliser~~fertilizer application to leaves stimulates leaf activity, which directly affects the plant's water uptake and promotes root growth. Foliar ~~fertiliser~~fertilizers can therefore hasten the uptake of nutrients from the soil, which is advantageous for plants that need urgent nutrient intervention. A field experiment was carried out in medium black clayey soil, slightly alkaline with pH 7.8 and EC 0.33 dS m⁻¹ at the Instructional Farm, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh during rabi season of 2019-20 to evaluate effect of foliar spray of water-soluble fertilizers on wheat (*Triticumaestivum* L.) growth and yield. The experimental trial consists of 12 treatments with 3 replication and randomized block design. The results of the experiment revealed that the growth parameters viz., plant height and number of effective tillers metre⁻¹ row length at harvest increased significantly with the application of T₂ + foliar spray of 19:19:19 @ 0.5% at 60 DAS & 90 DAS whereas plant population were not affect significantly by application of different treatments. There was also significant improvement in grain and straw yields were observed with the application of T₂ + foliar spray of 19:19:19 @ 0.5% at 30 DAS, 60 DAS and 90 DAS over 75% RDF and 100% RDF.

Comment [A1]: All this should go to material and methods section

Comment [A2]: At the first instance please mention the full form and not the acronym

Comment [A3]: Just mention treatment numbers here for clarity

Comment [A4]: RDF????

Keywords: Foliar spray, growth, RDF, water soluble fertilizer, wheat, yield

INTRODUCTION

Foliar feeding is a strategy that is now widely used in modern crop management to ensure optimal crop performance. It does this by enhancing crop growth at specific growth stages, correcting nutrient deficiencies in the crop, and improving crop tolerance to unfavourable/unfavorable conditions for crop growth^{reference?}. Foliar feeding is a method of supplying nutrients to plants by sprinkling liquid fertilizer either in suspension or solution directly over the crop canopy. When used as a supplement to soil fertilization, it can be more

effective, affordable, environmentally friendly, and target-oriented ~~if utilized properly~~. Foliar application gets around some of the drawbacks of soil fertilization, such as leaching, precipitation of insoluble fertilizer's, antagonistic relationships between specific nutrients, heterogeneous soils unsuited to low dosages, and fixation/absorption reactions, such as those involving phosphorus and potassium [1]. Not all fertilizers can be used as foliar sprays, but those with a low salt index, high solubility, and high purity can be used in this way. For foliar application, specialty fertilizers are a preferable source [2]. These

Formatted: Strikethrough

Comment [A7]: only those

Comment [A8]: reference???

Comment [A5]: with

Comment [A6]: and utilized properly

Comment [A9]: What are specialty fertilizers?

fertilizers are extremely water soluble and have various N, P, and K ratios that make them suitable for foliar nutrition [3]. Specialty fertilizers are those fertilizer products that are used under unique soil or plant circumstances or to encourage unique plant behaviourbehavior.

Its scope includes all water-soluble fertilizers (WSF), slow-release fertilizers, micronutrients, and bespoke fertilizers. Water soluble fertilizers come in a variety of formulas with varying amounts of nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium (NPK), but they may also include other nutrients including micronutrients. To increase yield and enhance quality of a variety of crops, such as fruits, vegetables, oil seeds, pulses, cereals, cotton, coriander, tobacco, sugarcane, and tea, water soluble fertilizers are used as chemical fertilizers in sprinkler and drip irrigation systems as well as foliar sprays. Water soluble fertilizers applied topically to crops had positive effects on their growth, production, and quality [4]. Foliar nutrition is thus acknowledged as a significant fertilization technique in contemporary agriculture. Foliar fertilization can be an excellent method for addressing nutrient deficits and supplying vital nutrients when a crop is in need of a lot of nutrients. Crop foliage gains more nutrients as a result, and crop leftovers also gain more nutrients. In the late growing season, when plants are less able physiologically to absorb nutrients from the soil, it can feed nutrients effectively. Foliar fertilization has a significant potential to produce higher yield when utilized as a supplement to soil fertilization in intensive cropping systems.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Field experiment was conducted at Instructional Farm, Junagadh Agricultural University, Gujarat, (21°51' N latitude and 70°55' E longitude), during *rabi* 2019-20 season. Soil was medium black clayey in texture (pH 7.8, EC 0.33 d S m⁻¹). The experimental field was laid out in randomized block design comprising of 8 treatments and 3 replications i.e., T₁-100 % RDF, T₂- 75 % RDF (control), T₃ - T₂ + foliar spray (FS) of Urea @ 2 % at 30 DAS, T₄ - T₂ + FS of Urea @ 2 % at 30 DAS & 60 DAS, T₅ - T₂ + FS of Urea @ 2 % at 30 DAS, 60 DAS & 90 DAS, T₆ - T₂ + FS of 19:19:19 @ 0.5 % at 30 DAS, T₇ - T₂ + FS of 19:19:19 @ 0.5 % at 30 DAS & 60 DAS, T₈ - T₂ + FS of 19:19:19 @ 0.5 % at 30 DAS, 60 DAS & 90 DAS, T₉- T₂ + FS of Urea @ 2 % at 30 DAS + FS of 19:19:19 @ 0.5 % at 60 DAS, T₁₀- T₂ + FS of Urea @ 2 % at 30 DAS + FS of 13:00:45 @ 0.5 % at 60 DAS, T₁₁- T₂ + FS of Urea @ 2 % at 30 DAS + FS of 19:19:19 @ 0.5 % at 60 DAS + FS of 13:00:45 @ 0.5 % at 90 DAS and T₁₂- T₂ + FS of 19:19:19 @ 0.5 % at 30 DAS + FS of 13:00:45 @ 0.5 % at 60 DAS. Wheat was grown under GW 463 variety. The initial plant population was noted at harvest and 60 days following seeding. This was accomplished by calculating the number of plants per hectare based on the no. of plants per 1 meter row length from three different spots within each net plot area. The original plant population was noted at harvest and 60 days after sowing. This was done by counting number of plants in each net plot area from various three spots along a 1 m row length and converting that number into hectares. Each net plot's output was threshed and cleaned separately, and the grain yield was calculated in kilograms per net plot. On a hectare basis, the grain yield per net plot was

Comment [A12]: This section should also clearly mention when and how the fertilizer application was carried out

Comment [A13]: RDF???

Comment [A14]: DAS?

Comment [A10]: Is reported to show

Comment [A15]: Under GW 463 variety? Meaning?

Comment [A16]: 60 days following seedling and harvest

Comment [A11]: The sentence needs to be rephrased

Formatted: Strikethrough

Comment [A17]: It is a repeated information

changed to kilograms. ~~Each net plot's output was threshed and cleaned separately, and the grain yield was calculated in kilograms per net plot. On a hectare basis, the grain yield per net plot was changed to kilograms.~~ Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed on the experiment's data in accordance with Gomez and Gomez's [5] experimental design.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Plant population

Table 1 provides information on the plant population per hectare at 60 days after sowing and at harvest as affected by various treatments. A review of the

Table 1: Plant population of wheat as influenced by different treatments

Treatment No.	Plant Population (ha ⁻¹)	
	At 60 DAS	at harvest
T ₁	1481481	1475474
T ₂	1452564	1446241
T ₃	1358876	1356875
T ₄	1457749	1455394
T ₅	1561574	1557458
T ₆	1560856	1558564
T ₇	1563231	1560233
T ₈	1661736	1659769
T ₉	1665405	1661452
T10	1564536	1560261
T11	1560845	1558107
T12	1559956	1558214
S.Em.±	11760	12570
C.D. at 5%	NS	NS
C.V.%	6.14	6.67

data revealed that the number of plants per hectare at 60 DAS and at harvest were not significantly impacted by the various treatments. The results clearly indicated that plant population per hectare were uniform. Hence, various growth, yield attributes and yield of wheat crop was not influenced due to variation in the plant population.

From the data presented in Table1 revealed that 60 days after sowing and at

Plant height

Formatted: Strikethrough

Comment [A18]: Again repetition

Comment [A19]: Instead of giving reference it is advised to write the program on which the analysis were to be conducted

Comment [A20]: The page format needs correction from below this paragraph.

harvest plant population were not significantly affected due to application of foliar spray of WSF. This indicated that foliar spray application of water soluble fertilizers had no influence on germination and emergence which tended to indicate that plant population was uniform in all the treatments and there was no any adverse effect on wheat crop.

Comment [A22]: How WSF can have any impact on germination and emergence as they are applied after the plant has already germinated? Please comment

Formatted: Strikethrough

Comment [A21]: The

Formatted: Strikethrough

The data recorded (presented in Table 2) on plant height at 30, and 60 days after sowing and at harvest as affected by various treatments along with statistical inference. The data on plant height at 30

Formatted: Strikethrough

Formatted: Strikethrough

Table 2: Plant height of wheat as influenced by different treatments

Tr. No.	Plant height (cm) at		
	30 DAS	60 DAS	Harvest
T ₁	29.62	50.73	76.26
T ₂	29.03	49.59	70.44
T ₃	32.92	65.35	78.67
T ₄	29.09	65.06	74.89
T ₅	31.92	73.60	81.44
T ₆	32.83	73.55	83.88
T ₇	32.05	66.23	76.73
T ₈	33.31	75.80	85.46
T ₉	34.69	75.43	81.61
T10	31.68	52.95	73.26
T11	32.00	64.16	74.26
T12	31.29	65.38	80.17
S.Em.±	1.26	2.95	3.32
C.D. at 5%	NS	8.66	9.75
C.V.%	6.93	7.83	7.37

DAS as influenced by various treatments are presented in Table 2. A perusal of data indicated that height of plant at 30 DAS did not affected significantly due to different treatments.

Formatted: Strikethrough

According to the data in Table 2, increasing the foliar application of water-soluble nutrients resulted in a significant rise in plant height. Application of T₂ + FS of 19:19:19 @ 0.5% at 30 DAS, 60 DAS & 90 DAS (T₈) recorded significantly higher plant height (75.80cm), but it was

statistically at par with T₂ + FS of Urea @ 2% at 30 DAS + FS of 19:19:19 @ 0.5% at 60 DAS (T₉), T₂ + FS of 19:19:19 @ 0.5% at 30 DAS (T₆), and T₂ + FS of Urea @ 2% at 30 DAS, 60 DAS & 90 DAS (T₅). While treatment 75% RDF (T₂) recorded significantly lower plant height (49.59 cm), which was at par with T₂ (100% RDF).

Comment [A23]: differ

Data givens in Table 2 and indicated that increasing foliar spray of WSF significantly increased plant height. Application of T₂ + FS of 19:19:19 @ 0.5%

Comment [A24]: presented

Formatted: Strikethrough

at 30 DAS, 60 DAS & 90 DAS (T_8) recorded significantly higher plant height (85.46cm) at harvest, but it was statistically at par with T_2 + FS of 19:19:19 @ 0.5% at 30 DAS (T_6), T_2 + FS of Urea @ 2% at 30 DAS + FS of 19:19:19 @ 0.5% at 60 DAS (T_9), T_2 + FS of 19:19:19 @ 0.5% at 30 DAS + FS of 13:00:45 @ 0.5% at 60 DAS (T_{12}), T_2 + FS of Urea @ 2% at 30, 60 & 90 DAS (T_5) and 100% RDF (T_1). While treatment 75% RDF (T_2) recorded significantly the lower plant height (70.44 cm).

At 30 DAS, the increasing application of foliar sprays of water-soluble ~~fertiliser~~fertilizers had non-significant impact on plant height. Nevertheless, foliar sprays of 19:19:19 @ 0.5% at 30, 60 and 90 DAS resulted in significantly greater plant heights of 75.80 cm and 85.46 cm at 60 days after sowing and harvest, respectively.

The significantly higher increase in plant height that was observed may be because the crop's responses to using nutrients throughout several growth phases have been stimulated by the foliar application of nutrients at different times of the crop's growth stages. The spraying of Nitrogen, Phosphorus, and Potassium in combination increased the ~~mobilisation~~mobilization of macronutrients as reported by Hatwaret *al.* [6].

Grains yield (kg ha⁻¹)

Table 3 presents data on grain yield as effected by different treatments together with statistical inference. A critical examination of data (Table 3) indicated that grain yield was significantly affected by increasing foliar spray of water-soluble fertilizer's. Significantly higher yield (4688 kg ha⁻¹) was obtained with the application of T_2 + FS of 19:19:19 @ 0.5% at 30 DAS, 60 DAS & 90 DAS (T_8), but it remained statistically at par with T_2 + FS of Urea @ 2% at 30 DAS + FS of 19:19:19 @ 0.5% at 60 DAS (T_9), T_2 + FS of Urea @ 2% at 30 DAS + FS of 19:19:19 @ 0.5% at 60 DAS + FS of 13:00:45 @ 0.5% at 90 DAS (T_{11}), T_2 + FS of 19:19:19 @ 0.5% at 30 DAS + FS of 13:00:45 @ 0.5% at 60 DAS (T_{12}), T_2 + FS of Urea @ 2% at 30 DAS + FS of 13:00:45 @ 0.5% at 60 DAS (T_{10}), and T_2 + FS of 19:19:19 @ 0.5% at 30 DAS & 60 DAS (T_7). While, treatment 75% RDF (T_2) recorded significantly lower grain yield (2868 kg ha⁻¹).

Straw yield (kg ha⁻¹)

The data (Table 3) regarding straw yield as influenced by various treatments that with increasing foliar spray of water-soluble fertilizers significantly increasing straw yield. Higher straw yield (5690 kg ha⁻¹) were recorded with the application of T_2 + FS of 19:19:19 @ 0.5% at 30 DAS, 60 DAS & 90 DAS (T_8), which was significantly higher but remained at par with T_2 + FS of Urea @ 2% at 30 DAS + FS of 19:19:19 @ 0.5% at 60 DAS (T_9), T_2

Comment [A25]: Instead of writing the whole formulation just the treatment would be more clear and concise, it is hard to catch with all this confusing inter-linked statements. Only use the Treatment numbers as used in the given Tables.

Comment [A26]: Is this a statistical inference? As, from the data of Harvest the difference does not seem statistically significant. If there is no significant difference between control and treatments how would authors argue about whether the difference is due to WSF or other environmental factors? Please comment

Comment [A27]: Only use treatment numbers as used in the table.

+ FS of Urea @ 2% at 30 DAS + FS of 19:19:19 @ 0.5% at 60 DAS + FS of 13:00:45 @ 0.5% at 90 DAS (T₁₁), T₂ + FS of Urea @ 2% at 30 DAS + FS of 13:00:45 @ 0.5% at 60 DAS (T₁₀), T₂ + FS of 19:19:19 @ 0.5% at 30 DAS + FS of 13:00:45 @ 0.5% at 60 DAS (T₁₂) and T₂

+ FS of 19:19:19 @ 0.5% at 30 DAS & 60 DAS (T₇). While, treatment 75% RDF (T₂) recorded significantly lower straw yield (4507 kg ha⁻¹). Banerjee *et al.* [7] also find similar results with the foliar application of fertilizers grass pea.

Table 3: Grain yield, straw yield and harvest index of wheat as influenced by different treatments

Treatment No.	Grain Yield (kg ha ⁻¹)	Straw Yield (kg ha ⁻¹)	Harvest index (%)
T ₁	3426	4759	41.85
T ₂	2868	4507	38.53
T ₃	3126	4912	38.20
T ₄	3246	4907	39.32
T ₅	3241	4958	39.52
T ₆	3918	5079	43.53
T ₇	4069	5159	44.08
T ₈	4688	5690	45.17
T ₉	4369	5683	43.46
T ₁₀	4092	5399	43.11
T ₁₁	4228	5402	43.90
T ₁₂	4102	5277	43.73
S.Em.±	232	238	1.60
C.D. at 5%	680	699	NS
C.V.%	10.67	8.02	6.64

Harvest index (%)

Table 3 presents data on harvest index as affected by various treatments along with statistical interpretation. The study of data concluded that the harvest index HI (HI harvest index) was significantly not impacted by the foliar application of water-soluble fertiliser/fertilizers.

The evaluation of yields is the practical method for determining if a technology is superior. Because of foliar feeding of major nutrients, significant variations in wheat grain and straw production were seen in the current study.

Among different treatments, application of T₂ + FS of 19:19:19 @ 0.5% at 30 DAS, 60 DAS & 90 DAS (T₈) significantly influenced grain yield and straw yield (Table 3). Yield of wheat is the cumulative effect of growth and yield attributing characteristic's. Also, foliar fertilisation/fertilization has the capacity to increase the effectiveness and speed with which a nutrient is utilised/utilized by a plant that desperately needs it for maximum growth and yield [8].

The improvement in yield characteristics can be attributed to the production of dry matter and its

Formatted: Strikethrough

Comment [A28]: Not significantly

accumulation in reproductive organs. This can be determined by analysing/analyzing the accumulation of dry matter in the leaves and leaf area, which affects the plant's ability to photosynthesize, yield and performance of any crop. Additionally, foliar application of WSF, which contains all three key nutrients, increases photosynthetic activity, increasing/increases the synthesis and storage of carbohydrates and auxins, which favour/favors flower retention and increase the number of reproductive parts per plant. Additionally, an increase in nutrient absorption and enhanced growth factors may be the cause of a considerable rise in yield metrics. Foliar application of nutrients enhanced the availability of nutrients for absorption and use by the crops, which in turn produced more photosynthates and improved dry matter partitioning from source to sink. Foliar feeding primarily boosted photosynthesis, carbohydrates, soluble protein levels, and nucleic acid levels, which led to higher dry matter output and sink size. The improved grain development are associated with higher WSF concentrations may be attributable to enhanced photosynthetic activity, higher chlorophyll content and higher nutrient uptake, which together increase plant dry matter production and, ultimately, productivity. The management of soil Nitrogen, Phosphorus, Potassium, and other nutrients should be improved to increase crop yield and improve crop

quality. For vegetative growth, a balanced fertiliser/fertilizer application is required [9]. Higher yield under more frequent application of water-soluble fertiliser/fertilizer (Polyfeed - 19:19:19) may be caused by sufficient availability of easily soluble nutrients. A favourable/favorable sink that might have provided more nutrients throughout critical development phases would have been generated if cytokinins could be synthesised at their highest levels at higher levels of nitrogen and phosphorous. Nitrogen availability is boosted by the foliar spray, which increases photosynthetic activity. The increased growth was attributed to better photosynthate utilisation/utilization and better photosynthate distribution to the economically valuable regions. Spraying water-soluble nutrients may have raised yields because it increased nutrient and water intake, which in turn promoted photosynthesis and increased food buildup in edible sections. It is more reliable because of its quick plant responses, convenience, high efficacy, and reduction of toxic symptoms brought on by higher soil accumulation of specific nutrients as a result of foliar nutrition [10]. All these factors discussed above collectively boosting the yields under the influence of WSF (Polyfeed - 19:19:19) in wheat. These finding are corroborating with the results of [11-14].

CONCLUSION

Comment [A29]: Accumulated

Formatted: Strikethrough

Comment [A30]: The whole discussion part is very mixed and confused without single reference to most of the scientific inferences. It needs to be re-written with clarity and references.

On the basis of this experimental, it may be concluded that soil application of 75% RDF N-P₂O₅-K₂O ha⁻¹ along with foliar spray of WSF (19:19:19) @ 0.5 per cent at 30, 60 and 90 DAS or foliar spray of urea @2% at 30 DAS + foliar spray of (19:19:19) @ 0.5 per cent at 60 DAS were for obtaining higher the yield and profitability of wheat under irrigated conditions.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Kaushal, S.; Rana, R.; Kumar, S. and Kumar, R. 2014. *Popular Kheti*, **2**(2): 76-81.
- [2]. Vibhute, C. P. 1998. A process for manufacturing complex solid and liquid completely water soluble fertilizers. *Fertilizer News*, **43**(8): 63.
- [3]. Jayabal, A.; Revathy, M. and Saxena, M. G. 1999. Effect of foliar nutrition on nutrient uptake pattern in soybean. *Andhra Agricultural Journal*, **46**: 243-244.
- [4]. Patel, G. M. 2011. Water soluble fertilizers-for efficient and balanced fertigation. *Indian Journal of Fertilizer*, **7**(12): 56-63.
- [5]. Gomez, K. A. and Gomez, A. A. 1984. Statistical procedures for agricultural research, IARI: A Wiley Pub., New York, pp: 199-201.
- [6]. Hatwar, G. P.; Gondane, S. U.; Urkude, S. M. and Gahakar, O. V. 2003. Effect of micronutrients on growth and yield of chilli. *Journal of Soils and Crops*, **13**: 123-125.
- [7]. Banerjee, P., VishaKumari, V., Nath, R., and Bandyopadhyay, P. (2019). Seed priming and foliar nutrition studies on relay grass pea after winter rice in lower Gangetic plain. *J. Crop. Weed*, **15**, 72-78.
- [8]. Oosterhuis, D. 1999. Foliar fertilization. p. 26-29. In: P. Dugger and D. Richter (eds.) In: Proc. Beltwide Cotton Production Research Conf., National Cotton Council of America, Memphis, TN.
- [9]. Nai-hua, Y.; Dingguo, Z. and Wang, J. 1998. Phosphorus and potassium nutrient management for vegetable soils in Shanghai and Guangdong. In: *Donald L. Armstrong (Ed.), Better Crops International*, **12**(1):1.
- [10]. Jules, J. (1984). Foliar nutrition in tree plants. *Horti. Review*, **6**, 287-355.
- [11]. Bhowmick, M. K., Dhara, M. C., Duary, B., Biswas, P. K. and Bhattacharyya, P. (2014). Improvement of lathyrus productivity through seed priming and foliar nutrition under rice-utera system. *Journal of Crop and Weed*, **10**(2), 277-280.
- [12]. Das, S. K. and Jana, K. 2015. Effect of foliar spray of water soluble fertilizer at pre flowering stage on yield of pulses. *Agricultural Science Digest*, **35**(4): 275-279.
- [13]. Mudalagiriappa, Sameer Ali, M.; Ramachandrappa B. K., Nagaraju and

Shankaralingappa, B. C. 2016. Effect of foliar application of water soluble fertilizers on growth, yield and economics of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *Legume Research*, **39**(4): 610-613.

[14]. Vivek, K. S.; Patel, G. G.; Suresh, B. and Dipak, H. 2016. Effect of foliar application of water soluble fertilizers in okra. *Research Environment of Life Science*, **9**(3): 297-299.

UNDER PEER REVIEW