

Original Research Article

Effect of organic sources of nutrients on yield, quality, soil fertility status and economics of onion (*Allium cepa* L.)

ABSTRACT

An experiment was carried out to study the effect of organic sources of nutrients on yield, quality, soil fertility status and economics of onion (*Allium cepa* L.) at Horticulture Research Farm, College of Horticulture, AAU, Anand during the three consecutive years 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19. The experiment was laid out in Randomized Block Design with three replications and ten treatments viz., T₁: RDF 100:75:75 NPK kg ha⁻¹ (control), T₂: 100 % N from FYM, T₃: 100 % N from Vermicompost, T₄: 100 % N from Castor cake, T₅: 75 % N from FYM + NPK consortium 1 L ha⁻¹, T₆: 75% N from VC + NPK consortium 1 L ha⁻¹, T₇: 75% N from CC + NPK consortium 1 L ha⁻¹, T₈: 50% N from FYM + NPK consortium 1 L ha⁻¹, T₉: 50% N from VC + NPK consortium 1 L ha⁻¹, T₁₀: 50% N from CC + NPK consortium 1 L ha⁻¹. Soil application of 75% N from VC + NPK consortium 1 L ha⁻¹ (T₆) and 75 % N from FYM + NPK consortium 1 L ha⁻¹ (T₅) recorded significantly, higher bulb yield (467 and 417 q/ha) and also increase organic carbon as well as soil microbial population. Higher net return (₹445672) was observed in T₆ whereas maximum BCR (5.96) recorded in T₅.

Key words: Organic manure; TSS; Microbial count; BCR.

1. INTRODUCTION

Onion (*Allium cepa* L.) is one of the most important commercial vegetable crops grown extensively throughout the country. It is the only vegetable in which India figures prominently in the world for its production and export. In India, total area under onion cultivation is 1.639 million hectares with total production of about 26.830 MT. (Anon., 2021)^[1]. In Gujarat, total area under onion cultivation is 0.082 million ha with total production of 2.109 MT with productivity of 25.71 metric tonnes (Anon., 2021)^[2].

The continuous chemical fertilizer use deteriorated crop while organic manures improved these properties (Mamatha, 2006).^[6] The farmers can in turn obtained good remuneration from the organically produced vegetables due to their heavy demands in national and international markets. Adoption of organic vegetable production would largely depend upon supplies of organic inputs, thoroughly backed up by well-proven production technologies. Judicious use of organic manures can maintain long term soil fertility and sustain higher productivity of crops. Therefore, keeping in view the production of onion with judicious application of organic substances along with bio fertilizers is an integrated way to reduce health hazards, to protect environment as well as enhancing production of onion.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The field experiment entitled "Effect of organic sources of nutrients on yield, quality, soil fertility status and economics of onion (*Allium cepa* L.)" was laid out during the three consecutive years 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19 at Horticultural Research Farm, College of Horticulture, Anand Agricultural University, Anand, Gujarat, India, during the *Rabi* season. The experiment was laid out with ten treatments *i.e.*, T₁: RDF 100:75:75 NPK kg ha⁻¹ (control), T₂: 100 % N from FYM, T₃: 100 % N from Vermicompost, T₄: 100 % N from Castor cake, T₅: 75 % N from FYM + NPK consortium 1 L ha⁻¹, T₆: 75% N from VC + NPK consortium 1 L ha⁻¹, T₇: 75% N from CC + NPK consortium 1 L ha⁻¹, T₈: 50% N from FYM + NPK consortium 1 L ha⁻¹, T₉: 50% N from VC + NPK consortium 1 L ha⁻¹, T₁₀: 50% N from CC + NPK consortium 1 L ha⁻¹ in a Randomized Block Design with three replications and plot size of 3.0 × 2.0 m. The experiment was conducted in organic plot and the soil was light alluvial having sandy loam texture with 7.11 pH, 0.65% organic carbon, 240.00 kg/ha available N, 87.10 kg/ha available P₂O₅, 241.00 kg/ha available K. About six week old seedlings of white onion cv. GAWO 3 was transplanted at 15 × 10 cm spacing. The organic manures (FYM and Vermicompost) and bio-fertilizer (NPK Consortium @ 1 L ha⁻¹) were applied at the time of field preparation. Observations were recorded for different traits.

For yield observation five bulbs from randomly tagged plants were weighed by weighing balance and after that the average value was calculated. The quality parameters *i.e.*, TSS and Total sugar were estimated from bulbs. Soil fertility status and microbial count of soil measured at initial and after harvest of the crop. The pooled analysis was conducted in accordance with Panse and Sukhatme (1967)^[9] to examine the average effect of various treatments over time.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 YIELD PARAMETERS OF ONION

3.1.1 Bulb yield (q/ha):

The data on bulb yield as influenced by different treatments is presented in Table 1. The results indicated that significantly, higher bulb yield was noted with treatment T₆ during 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19 and in pooled analysis. In pooled analysis treatment T₆ (75% N from VC + NPK consortium 1 L ha⁻¹) recorded significantly, higher bulb yield (467 q/ha) which was at par with treatment T₁ [RDF (100:75:75) NPK kg ha⁻¹] and T₅ (75 % N from FYM + NPK consortium 1 L ha⁻¹). It might be due to application of vermicompost and bio fertilizer (NPK consortium) there is increase in the vegetative growth of the plant. Hence, the leaf surface area increase resulting in high photosynthetic activity and **chlorophyll** synthesis which in **turn** increase the bulb size and weight as the carbohydrate are **transported** to the underground bulb ultimately increased yield. Similar result were also reported by Singh *et al.* (2015), Rabarriet *al.* (2016) and Vaghela *et al.* (2019)^[15,11,17] in onion.

3.2 QUALITY PARAMETERS OF ONION

3.2.1 Total soluble solids (^oBrix):

The data on Total soluble solids (^oBrix) influenced by different treatments is presented in Table 1 and results revealed that effect of different treatments on Total soluble solids (^oBrix) was found non-significant during the 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19 and in pooled analysis.

3.2.2 Total sugar (%):

The data on Total sugar (%) influenced by different treatments is presented in Table 1 and results revealed that effect of different treatments on Total sugar (%) was found non-significant during the 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19 and in pooled analysis.

3.3 SOIL PARAMETERS AFTER HARVEST OF ONION

Data on soil chemical parameters as influenced by different treatments are presented in Table 2. Difference between treatments was found significant for soil EC, organic carbon, available P₂O₅ and K₂O. Whereas, soil organic carbon was found significantly higher with treatment T₃ (0.72) statistically followed by treatment T₂, T₅, T₉ and T₁₀. The increase in organic carbon content in vermicompost applied plots may be attributed to the higher direct incorporation of organic materials subsequently decomposition of these materials might have resulted in enhanced organic carbon content of soil. These results also collaborate with the findings of Sharma *et al.*^[14], Sharma *et al.*^[13], Baskaret *al.*^[3] and Tolanur and Badanur^[16]. Soil EC (0.40) was recorded statistically the highest with treatment T₈, while available P₂O₅ and K₂O were found statistically superior with treatment T₁ (90.50 kg/ha and 260.07 kg/ha, respectively) over rest of the treatments.

The increase in available phosphorus content of soil due to the incorporation of organic manures may be attributed to the direct addition of phosphorus as well as solubilization of native phosphorus through release of various organic acids during the decomposition of organic matter, similar results were obtained by Kumar *et al.* (2003)^[7] and Jamir *et al.* (2013)^[6] and Desai *et al.* (2009)^[4] also reported that the application of PSB was effective when applied with inorganic P. While Increase in available K due to organic manures application may be attributed to the direct addition of potassium to the available pool of soil. The beneficial effect of vermicompost and farmyard manure on available K might also be attributed to the reduction in fixation and release of K due to interaction of organic matter with clay besides the direct K addition to the available K pool of soil sharma *et al.* (2003)^[12].

3.4 MICROBIAL COUNT AFTER HARVEST OF ONION

The data pertaining to average microbial count after harvest influenced by different treatments is presented in Table 3 and results revealed that the treatments T₅ to T₁₀ receiving inoculation of Bio NPK consortium showed higher microbial population as compared to T₁ to T₄. Specifically, T₅ to T₁₀ showed 2 fold increase in *Azospirillum* and *Azotobacter* population as well as 3 fold increase in PSB and KMB population as compared to their respective controls *i.e.* T₂ to T₄. It might be due to slow releasing of nutrients from vermicompost and farm yard manure is a carrier of organic carbon and organic dry matter ultimately microbial

count improved in soil with the application of vermicompost and farm yard manure alone or in combination with biofertilizers. Similar trends of results were reported Dilpreet *et al.* (2017)^[5].

3.5 ECONOMICS OF ONION

Data on economics given in Table 4 revealed that higher bulb yield (467 q/ha) and net return (₹ 542661/____) was observed with application of 75% N from VC + NPK consortium 1 L ha⁻¹ but higher BCR 5.96 was observed with application of 75 % N from FYM + NPK consortium 1 L ha⁻¹. These results are in line with findings of Dilpreet *et al.* (2017)^[5] in onion.

4. CONCLUSION

From the pooled results of three years, it can be concluded that application of 75% N from VC + NPK consortium 1 L ha⁻¹ or 75 % N from FYM + NPK consortium 1 L ha⁻¹ gave higher bulb yield and also increase organic carbon as well as soil microbial population. Higher net return (₹445672) was observed in 75% N from VC + NPK consortium 1 L ha⁻¹ whereas maximum BCR (5.96) recorded in 75 % N from FYM + NPK consortium 1 L ha⁻¹.

Comment [L1]: Write full unit Rs per _____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Authors are highly thankful to the Anand Agricultural University, Gujarat for firm support, funds and facilities provided.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Treatments	Bulb yield (q/ha)				Total soluble solids (°Brix)				Total sugar (%)			
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	Pooled	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	Pooled	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	Pooled
T ₁	401 ^{ab}	381 ^{abc}	510 ^a	431 ^{bc}	13.8	13.7	13.3	13.6	5.40	5.48	5.34	5.41
T ₂	373 ^{bc}	352 ^{abcd}	497 ^a	408 ^{bcd}	13.2	13.2	13.6	13.3	5.35	5.30	5.34	5.33

Table 1: Effect of organic sources of nutrients on yield and quality parameter of onion

T ₃	390 ^{abc}	371 ^{abc}	468 ^{ab}	410 ^{bcd}	13.2	13.2	13.5	13.3	5.36	5.32	5.30	5.33
T ₄	314 ^c	290 ^d	439 ^{ab}	348 ^f	12.5	12.6	13.8	12.9	5.34	5.25	5.36	5.32
T ₅	417 ^{ab}	415 ^{ab}	513 ^a	448 ^{ab}	12.6	12.7	13.7	13.0	5.36	5.34	5.42	5.37
T ₆	459 ^a	429 ^a	511 ^a	467 ^a	13.5	13.5	13.5	13.5	5.36	5.35	5.29	5.33
T ₇	362 ^{bc}	341 ^{bcd}	427 ^{ab}	377 ^{def}	13.4	13.3	13.5	13.4	5.37	5.39	5.45	5.40
T ₈	370 ^{bc}	350 ^{bcd}	430 ^{ab}	383 ^{def}	13.7	13.7	13.3	13.6	5.36	5.33	5.44	5.37
T ₉	387 ^{abc}	366 ^{abc}	427 ^{ab}	393 ^{cde}	13.6	13.5	13.4	13.5	5.38	5.43	5.43	5.42
T ₁₀	355 ^{bc}	333 ^{cd}	399 ^b	362 ^{ef}	13.6	13.5	13.4	13.5	5.39	5.44	5.43	5.42
SEm (T)	23.43	22.47	25.25	13.27	NS	NS	NS	0.28	NS	NS	NS	0.02
SEm (Y X T)	-	-	-	35.20	-	-	-	0.27	-	-	-	0.05
F Test (T)	Sig.	Sig.	Sig.	Sig.	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
F (Y X T)	-	-	-	NS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	NS

Note: Treatment means with the letter/letters in common are not significant by Duncan's New Multiple Rang Test at 5% level of Significance

Table 2: Effect of organic sources of nutrients on soil parameters after harvest of crop

Treatments	EC (dS/m)	pH	OC %	Available N (kg/ha)	Available P ₂ O ₅ (kg/ha)	Available K ₂ O (kg/ha)
Initial	0.34	7.11	0.65	240.0	87.10	241.90
T ₁	0.33 ^{bcd}	7.11	0.63 ^e	261.0	90.50 ^a	260.07 ^a
T ₂	0.31 ^{de}	7.11	0.70 ^{abc}	251.2	80.70 ^{bc}	240.30 ^b
T ₃	0.30 ^e	7.15	0.72 ^a	255.9	82.30 ^b	242.47 ^b
T ₄	0.32 ^{cde}	7.11	0.66 ^{cd}	252.9	80.10 ^{bc}	238.97 ^b
T ₅	0.35 ^{bc}	7.15	0.70 ^{ab}	258.8	78.60 ^{cd}	243.07 ^b
T ₆	0.34 ^{bcd}	7.20	0.68 ^{bcd}	255.7	80.30 ^{bc}	240.77 ^b
T ₇	0.36 ^b	7.30	0.65 ^{de}	258.8	82.70 ^b	245.63 ^b
T ₈	0.40 ^a	7.25	0.67 ^{bcd}	257.4	75.30 ^e	243.43 ^b
T ₉	0.33 ^{bcd}	7.28	0.70 ^{abc}	250.5	78.90 ^{cd}	242.27 ^b
T ₁₀	0.35 ^{bc}	7.18	0.69 ^{abc}	246.0	76.10 ^{de}	239.93 ^b
SEm	0.01	0.13	0.01	8.15	0.91	3.74
F Test	Sig.	NS	Sig.	NS	Sig.	Sig.

Note: Treatment means with the letter/letters in common are not significant by Duncan's New Multiple Rang Test at 5% level of Significance

Table 3: Effect of organic sources of nutrients on soil microbial population (cfu/g of soil)after completion of experiment

Treatments	Soil microbial population (cfu/g of soil)				
	PSB	Azotobacter	Azospirillum	KMB	Total
Initial	2.4 x 10³	1.2 x 10²	1.1 x 10²	1.1 x 10²	1.9 x 10³
T ₁ :RDF (100:75:75) NPK kg/ha	6.6 x 10 ³	2.4 x 10 ²	4.9 x 10 ²	6.0 x 10 ²	2.9 x 10 ⁴
T ₂ : 100 % N from FYM	9.6 x 10 ⁴	1.7 x 10 ³	2.5 x 10 ³	2.8 x 10 ³	6.3 x 10 ⁵
T ₃ : 100 % N from Vermicompost	5.0 x 10 ⁴	3.6 x 10 ³	3.9 x 10 ³	3.6 x 10 ³	4.7 x 10 ⁵
T ₄ :100 % N from Castor cake	2.1 x 10 ⁴	1.6 x 10 ³	1.5 x 10 ³	1.2 x 10 ³	1.9 x 10 ⁵
T ₅ :75 % N from FYM + NPK consortium 1L/ha	5.2 x 10 ⁷	5.3 x 10 ⁵	4.2 x 10 ⁵	5.9 x 10 ⁶	6.4 x 10 ⁹
T ₆ : 75 % N from VC + NPK consortium 1 L/ha	4.5 x 10 ⁷	5.4 x 10 ⁵	4.9 x 10 ⁵	5.3 x 10 ⁶	4.3 x 10 ⁹
T ₇ : 75 % N from CC + NPK consortium 1 L/ha	3.3 x 10 ⁷	4.1 x 10 ⁴	2.9 x 10 ⁴	1.8 x 10 ⁶	1.9 x 10 ⁹
T ₈ : 50 % N from FYM + NPK consortium 1L/ha	4.7 x 10 ⁷	5.2 x 10 ⁵	3.6 x 10 ⁵	5.7 x 10 ⁶	6.0 x 10 ⁹
T ₉ : 50 % N from VC + NPK consortium 1 L/ha	3.5 x 10 ⁷	5.2 x 10 ⁵	4.7 x 10 ⁵	5.2 x 10 ⁶	4.1 x 10 ⁹
T ₁₀ : 50 % N from CC + NPK consortium 1L/ha	2.8 x 10 ⁷	2.5 x 10 ⁴	2.7 x 10 ⁴	1.4 x 10 ⁶	1.6 x 10 ⁹

Table 4: Effect of organic sources of nutrients on economics of onion

Treatments	A grade (q/ha)	B grade (q/ha)	C grade (q/ha)	Total onion bulb yield (q/ha)	Gross income (₹/ha)	Common cost (₹/ha)	Treatment cost (₹/ha)	Total cost (₹/ha)	Net return (₹/ha)	BCR
T ₁	282	117	32	431	413037	70165	7911	78076	334962	5.29
T ₂	265	113	30	408	472279	70165	21780	91945	380334	5.14
T ₃	262	115	34	410	473791	70165	34754	104919	368872	4.52
T ₄	212	103	33	348	400924	70165	27732	97897	303027	4.10
T ₅	299	116	34	449	520391	70165	17180	87345	433046	5.96
T ₆	326	110	31	467	542661	70165	26824	96989	445672	5.60
T ₇	237	106	35	377	435211	70165	21460	91625	343586	4.75
T ₈	236	113	36	384	442184	70165	12002	82167	360017	5.38
T ₉	245	117	32	394	454621	70165	18311	88476	366145	5.14
T ₁₀	201	122	40	363	415302	70165	14622	84787	330515	4.90

Selling price of onion:

Chemical: A grade- ₹ 1000/q, B grade- ₹ 900/q, C grade- ₹ 800/q
Organic: A grade- ₹ 1200/q, B grade- ₹ 1100/q, C grade- ₹ 1000/q

REFERENCES

1. Anonymous. Directorate of Horticulture, Gujarat State, Gandhinagar, 2021.
2. Anonymous. Horticultural Statistics at a Glance. Horticulture Statistics Division, Department of Agriculture, Co-operation & Farmers Welfare, Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, Government of India, 2021.
3. Baskar K. Effect of integrated use of inorganic fertilizer and FYM or green leaf manure on uptake and nutrient use efficiency of rice-rice system on an Inceptisol. *J Ind. Soc. Soil Sci.* 2003; 51: 47-51.
4. Desai RM, Patel GG, Patel TD, Das A. Effect of integrated nutrient supply on yield, nutrient uptake and soil properties in rice-rice crop sequence on a VerticHaplustepts of south Gujarat. *J. Ind. Soc. Soil Sci.* 2009; 57: 172-177.
5. Dilpreet T, Singh K and Singh J. Effect of biofertilizers on soil microbial count, nutrient availability and uptake under November sown onion. *Journal of Applied and natural Science.* 2017; 9(1):55-59.
6. Jamir S, Singh VB, Kanaujia SP and Singh AK. Effect of integrated nutrient management on growth, yield and quality of onion (*Allium cepa* L.). *Prog Hort.* 2013; 45: 373—380.
7. Kumar M, Singh RP and Rana NS. Effect of organic source of nutrition on productivity of rice. *Ind. J. Agron.* 2013; 48: 175-177.
8. Mamatha HN. Effect of organic and inorganic sources of nitrogen on yield and quality of onion (*Allium cepa* L.) and soil properties in Alfisol. 2006; M. Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, Univ. Agric. Sci., Dharwad, India.
9. Panse, VG and Sukhatme, PV. Statistical methods for agricultural workers. Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi. 1967.
10. Premsekhar, M and V. Rajashree. Influence organic manures on growth, yield and quality of okra. *J. Sustain. Agric.* 2009; 3(1): 6-8.
11. Rabari KV, Patel MV and Umale AA. Effect of nutrient management on growth, TSS content, bulb yield and net realization from onion bulb. *Biosciences Biotechnology Research Asia.* 2016; 13(1): 557-559.
12. Sharma RP, Datt N and Sharma PK. Combined of nitrogen, phosphorus potassium and FYM in onion (*Allium cepa*) under high hills, dry temperate conditions of north western Himalayas. *Ind. J. of Agric Sci.* 2003; 73: 225-227.
13. Sharma RP, Sharma A and Sharma JK. Productivity, nutrient uptake, soil fertility and economics as affected by chemical fertilizers and FYM in broccoli (*Brassica oleraceavaritalica*) in an Entisol. *Ind. J. Agric. Sci.* 2005; 75: 576-579.

Comment [L2]: Not cited in text

14. Sharma S, Dubey YP, Kristha BP and Verma TS. Effect of Rhizobium inoculation and phosphorus level on symbiotic parameters, growth and yield of French bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) in north-western acid Alfisol. *Leg. Res.* 2005; 28:103-106.
15. Singh A, Ram RB and Meena ML. Efficacy of different sources of nutrient and biofertilizer on growth, yield, quality of onion. *International Research Journal of Natural and Applied Sciences.* 2015; 2(10):64-70.
16. Tolanur, Badanur VP. Changes in organic carbon, available N, P and K under integrated use of organic manure, green manure and fertilizer on sustaining productivity of pearl millet-pigeon pea system and fertility of an Inceptisol. *J. the Indian Soc. Soil Science.* 2003; 51: 37-41.
17. Vaghela KS, Patel KM and NadodaSR. Effect of organic, inorganic and biofertilizer on growth and yield of onion cv. GJRO-11. *Int. J. Chem. Studies.* 2019; 7(4): 2358-2361

UNDER PEER REVIEW

UNDER PEER REVIEW