

**To study the performance of finger millet varieties in different establishment methods in terms of growth, yield, and quality. (*Eleusine coracana L.*)**

**ABSTRACT**

A field experiment was conducted at the Instructional cum Research (ICR) Farm, AAU, Jorhat during the *Sali* season (2022-23) with a view “To study the performance of finger millets varieties in different establishment methods in terms of growth, yield, and quality. (*Eleusine coracana L.*)” The experiment was laid out in Factorial RBD which was replicated thrice. The treatments consisted of 4 (Four) establishment methods viz., broadcasting (M<sub>1</sub>), line sowing (M<sub>2</sub>), transplanting (M<sub>3</sub>), and SFMI {System of finger millet intensification} (M<sub>4</sub>) and 3 (Three) varieties namely- GPU-67 (V<sub>1</sub>), CFMV-2 (V<sub>2</sub>) and AAU-GSG-Maruvadhan (V<sub>3</sub>). Based on results obtained from the present investigation, it was concluded that finger millet grown in the transplanting method with a combination of CFMV-2 variety must obtain higher growth, yield, and quality parameters of finger millet.

**Keywords:** Establishment methods, variety, yield attributes, yield, growth parameters, quality parameters, SFMI, finger millet.

**INTRODUCTION:**

Global food security today is intricately tied to the performance of a handful of key crops, leaving behind many others like millets and pseudo cereals due to advancements in enhancing the productivity of dominant crops such as rice, wheat, and maize. Millets, a diverse group of small-seeded cereal grains, once the earliest cultivated crops across Asia and Africa, have faded from prominence. This group includes Jowar or sorghum, bajra or pearl millet, and various small millets like mandua/ragi, kangni, kutki, Kodo millet, jhangora, cheena, and korale.

Millets thrive in tropical and subtropical climates with minimal inputs, covering about 12.45 million hectares and contributing 10% to India's food grain supply. These "Nutri-cereals" boast resilience to climate variations, making them vital for food and

nutritional security. Millets' gluten-free nature has sparked public interest, and their richness in polyphenols, antioxidants, and fibers makes them nutritionally valuable.

India stands as the global leader in millet production, contributing around 40% of the world's output, approximately 16 million metric tons annually. The country is also the second-largest millet exporter, with a consistent 12% Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR) in exports over the past three years. The millet market's value is projected to grow from over \$9 billion to \$12 billion by 2025.

Among the minor millets, finger millet stands out for its exceptional nutritional properties, earning it the moniker "wonder grain." Predominant in arid and semi-arid regions of developing countries, finger millet serves as both a staple food and animal feed. India's finger millet cultivation stretches from Tamil Nadu to Uttarakhand, with Karnataka leading in cultivation area followed by Maharashtra and Uttarakhand.

Finger millet's nutritional superiority, rich in fibers, iron, zinc, calcium, vitamins, and essential amino acids, makes it a critical calorie source, especially in resource-poor regions of Asia and Africa. It surpasses rice and wheat in nutritional value and boasts longer seed storage potential, aiding famine-prone areas.

However, in regions like Assam, finger millet cultivation is limited and practiced by economically disadvantaged farmers due to its suitability in less favorable conditions. To improve productivity, adoption of high-yielding varieties and proper management practices are crucial.

In essence, while dominant crops like rice and wheat ensure food security, finger millet steps in to provide much-needed nutritional security, considering its exceptional nutritional content, hardiness, and storability. Efforts to harness its potential through high-yielding varieties and optimized cultivation practices can further elevate its contribution to global food and nutritional stability.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS:**

The research endeavor took place at the Instructional-cum-Research Farm of Assam Agricultural University, Jorhat, in the Kharif season of 2022-2023. The primary focus of this study was, “To study the performance of finger millet varieties in different establishment methods in terms of growth, yield, and quality. (*Eleusine coracana* L).”

The meticulously designed experiment adopted a Factorial Randomized Block Design (F-RBD) to ensure robustness, incorporating three replications for each treatment. Four distinct establishment methods were evaluated: Broadcasting does not maintain spacing, Line Sowing with a spacing of 22.5 × 10 cm, Transplanting with a spacing of 25 × 15 cm, and the innovative System of Finger Millet Intensification (SFMI) with a spacing of 25 × 25 cm. Furthermore, three finger millet varieties were selected for the study: GPU-67 (V 1), CFMV-2 (V 2), and AAU-GSG-Muruadhan 1 (V 3).

The experiment's groundwork commenced with the careful preparation of finger millet nursery beds. To bolster the nursery area, Farm Yard Manure (FYM) was incorporated into the soil during seedbed preparation, effectively enhancing the soil's nutritional content. Prior to sowing, the seeds underwent a treatment with Bavistin (Carbendazim) to safeguard against potential pathogens.

For the Transplanting method, nursery seedlings aged 25 days were selected for transplantation. In the case of SFMI, seedlings were raised in pro trays filled with a mixture of coco pit, vermicompost, and soil, maintaining a ratio of 1:1:2. These seedlings were then transferred to the experimental field at the age of 12 days.

In the experimental field, the Line Sowing method was executed with precision, maintaining a spacing of 22.5 × 10 cm between seeds. For the Transplanting method, two seedlings were transplanted per hill, with a spacing of 25 × 15 cm. The System of Finger Millet Intensification (SFMI) approach utilized 12-day-old seedlings, with one seedling per hill.

The varietal choices in the study encompassed a diverse range of growth cycles and yields. GPU-67 (V 1) boasted a growth cycle of 114-118 days and a yield potential of 30-35 quintals per hectare, holding a notable position at the national level. CFMV-2 (V 2) exhibited a growth cycle of 115-120 days and a yield of 35.56 quintals per hectare,

also making its mark at the national level. On the other hand, AAU-GSG-Muruadhan 1 (V 3) showcased a slightly longer growth cycle of 125-130 days and represented a local variety specifically adapted to the Assam region. this ambitious study carried out at the Assam Agricultural University aimed to unravel the intricate dynamics of finger millet growth, yield, and quality across different establishment methods and varieties. Through meticulous experimental design, diligent nursery preparation, and precise execution of establishment methods, this research contributes to a deeper understanding of finger millet cultivation practices and their potential implications for agricultural advancement.

### The geographic location of the experimental site

The experiment was conducted at the Instructional-cum-Research Farm, Assam Agricultural University, Jorhat during the kharif season, 2022-2023 which is situated at 26047'N latitude and 94012'E longitude and at an altitude of 86.6 meters above the mean sea level.




Fig 1: Location of the study area





**Fig 2. Study location**

**Missing method of data collection on intended traits. Missing statistical software for analysis.**

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:**

#### **Varietal Impact on Plant Growth Parameters:**

Three finger millet varieties were scrutinized in the study: GPU-67, CFMV-2, and AAU-GSG-Muruadhan 1. Analysis of plant height revealed minimal varietal differences, with CFMV-2 displaying the highest value at 104.53 cm, closely followed by AAU-GSG-Muruadhan 1 (104.07 cm) and GPU-67 (103.95 cm). Similar trends were observed for the number of tillers per square meter, where CFMV-2 exhibited the most vigorous tillering (81.16), followed by GPU-67 (80.16) and AAU-GSG-Muruadhan 1 (79.05). However, in terms of leaf area index (LAI), CFMV-2 again showcased the most robust growth (2.34), surpassing AAU-GSG-Muruadhan 1 (1.43) and GPU-67 (1.63). Additionally, CFMV-2 achieved the highest dry matter production per plant (27.44), outperforming GPU-67 (26.42) and AAU-GSG-Muruadhan 1 (24.33). This superiority in the variety CFMV-2 for exhibiting higher plant height might be due to the inherent capacity of the variety in reference and the result of more no of tillers plant<sup>-1</sup> could be attributed to the method of transplanting of 25 days old seedlings. They had a better chance to get moisture, nutrient supply, and optimum growth conditions at the nursery. A similar result was reported by Krishnamurthy (1971) and Ramamoorthy *et.al.* (2004). (Table No:1)

#### **Establishment Method Influence on Plant Growth Parameters:**

Four establishment methods were explored: Broadcasting, Line Sowing, Transplanting, and SFMI (System of Finger Millet Intensification). Among these, Transplanting exhibited the most favorable results across various growth parameters. Plants subjected to the Transplanting method displayed the tallest plant height (112.29 cm), the highest number of tillers per square meter (102.11), the largest leaf area index (2.82), and the greatest dry matter production per plant (32.45). The SFMI method followed closely, demonstrating promising growth attributes, albeit slightly lower than the Transplanting approach. Line Sowing produced intermediate results while Broadcasting yielded the least desirable outcomes across all growth parameters. In comparison to the method of transplanting, the SFMI method showed a reduced number of tillers which may have resulted because of transplanting 12 days old seedlings with poor root growth and less tolerance to transplanting shock. The taller plants and the higher number of tillers/m<sup>2</sup> in the transplanting method might be due to the availability of optimum crop geometry for the vegetative growth with the availability of moisture as well as microenvironment which may result in more nutrient absorption by the roots for the synthesis of protoplasm responsible for rapid cell division; thereby it may result in an increase in the plant shape and size and ultimately the production of tillers may be more. Similar findings were reported by Negi (2015) (Table No:1)

#### **Varietal Influence on Yield Parameters:**

Three finger millet varieties - GPU-67, CFMV-2, and AAU-GSG-Muruadhan 1 - were meticulously evaluated across various significant parameters. The number of ear heads per square meter displayed slight variability, with CFMV-2 having the highest count (58.68), followed by AAU-GSG-Muruadhan 1 (56.99) and GPU-67 (57.39). Similarly, the number of fingers per ear head demonstrated minor differences, with CFMV-2 leading (6.78), followed by GPU-67 (6.40) and AAU-GSG-Muruadhan 1 (6.20).

Notably, the length per finger exhibited variations, with CFMV-2 showcasing the longest fingers (7.64 cm), followed by GPU-67 (5.92 cm) and AAU-GSG-Muruadhan 1 (5.83 cm). The weight of ear heads mirrored these trends, with CFMV-2 yielding the heaviest ear heads (12.01 g), followed by GPU-67 (10.74 g) and AAU-GSG-Muruadhan 1 (10.61 g).

The quality assessment also extended to test weight, where CFMV-2 displayed a higher value (2.84 g), followed by AAU-GSG-Muruadhan 1 (2.63 g) and GPU-67 (2.77 g). This consistency signifies uniform grain density across the evaluated varieties.

Three finger millet varieties - GPU-67, CFMV-2, and AAU-GSG-Muruadhan 1 - were meticulously examined across key yield parameters. In terms of grain yield, CFMV-2 emerged as the highest performer (21.42 q/ha), closely followed by GPU-67 (20.55 q/ha) and AAU-GSG-Muruadhan 1 (19.88 q/ha).

The evaluation extended to fresh stover yield, where CFMV-2 led (52.54 q/ha), trailed by AAU-GSG-Muruadhan 1 (51.70 q/ha) and GPU-67 (52.00 q/ha). Similarly, in dry stover yield, CFMV-2 continued to showcase its superior performance (30.16 q/ha), followed by AAU-GSG-Muruadhan 1 (28.33 q/ha) and GPU-67 (28.18 q/ha).

The harvest index, a crucial parameter reflecting yield efficiency, displayed marginal differences, with CFMV-2 leading (41.40%), trailed by AAU-GSG-Muruadhan 1 (41.18%), and GPU-67 (41.90%). (Table No:2)

#### **Establishment Method Influence on Yield Parameters:**

The study evaluated four establishment methods: Broadcasting, Line Sowing, Transplanting, and SFMI. The number of ear heads per square meter was highest under Transplanting (76.93), followed by SFMI (62.67) and Line Sowing (50.82). Broadcasting yielded the lowest number of ear heads (40.32).

A similar trend emerged in the number of fingers per ear head, with Transplanting displaying the highest count (7.82), followed by SFMI (7.07) and Line Sowing (6.29). Length per finger indicated Transplanting (7.18 cm) as the most favorable method, closely trailed by SFMI (6.73 cm) and Line Sowing (6.41 cm).

The weight of the ear head showcased a substantial disparity, with Transplanting yielding the heaviest ear heads (15.75 g), followed by SFMI (14.31 g) and Line Sowing (9.14 g). In terms of test weight, Transplanting exhibited the highest value (2.84 g).

Four establishment methods underwent meticulous scrutiny: Broadcasting, Line Sowing, Transplanting, and SFMI. Grain yield exhibited substantial variation across these methods, with Transplanting yielding the highest (23.46 q/ha), followed by SFMI (22.44 q/ha), Line Sowing (18.75 q/ha), and Broadcasting (17.81 q/ha).

Fresh stover yield followed a similar pattern, with Transplanting leading (59.32 q/ha), trailed by SFMI (54.27 q/ha), Line Sowing (48.59 q/ha), and Broadcasting (46.14 q/ha). Dry stover yield mirrored the trend, with Transplanting outperforming (32.95 q/ha), followed by SFMI (30.05 q/ha), Line Sowing (26.81 q/ha), and Broadcasting (25.75 q/ha).

Harvest index exhibited minor variations across establishment methods, with Transplanting leading (42.12%), followed by SFMI (41.83%), Line Sowing (41.17%), and Broadcasting (40.84%).

Transplanting shows better results this might be due to the optimum crop geometry, availability of proper moisture and nutrients during the critical growth stages like ear head emergence, flowering, and grain filling periods, and due to higher tillers/m<sup>2</sup>. The number of fingers per ear head is a principal yield contributing parameter in finger millet, similar results were reported by R. Veeraputhiran *et al.* (2009) and Revathi (2016). The transplanting method recorded the highest grain yield, fresh stover yield, dry stover yield, and harvesting index. Similar results were reported by Suryanarayana *et al.* (2014), Bisht *et al.* (2015), and Negi, S. (2015) while working on finger millet.

The higher grain yield is the result of enhanced yield attributes, forming a larger sink size in addition to efficient translocation of photosynthates to the sink was reported in the transplanting method. Similar results were reported by R. Veeraputhiran *et al.* (2009), Tejeswararao *et al.* (2015), Sarawale *et al.* (2016), and Sarawale *et al.* (2017). Among the establishment methods, the broadcasting method performed poorly which might be due to a greater number of plant populations which led to more competition between the plants. Similar results were recorded by Vikaset *et al.*, (2023). (Table:No:2)

### **Varietal Influence on Quality Parameters:**

The results indicated that the crude protein content in the grain of finger millet varied among the different varieties. Among the varieties tested, CFMV-2 (V2) exhibited the highest crude protein content in the grain (6.30%), followed closely by AAU-GSG-Muruadhan 1 (V3) with 6.12%, and GPU-67 (V1) with 5.93%. This demonstrates the variability in protein content among different finger millet varieties, with CFMV-2 showing the most favorable protein content.

In terms of crude protein content in stover, the highest value was observed in the transplanting method (M3) with a content of 4.18%, followed by SFMI (M4) with 3.43%, line sowing (M2) with 3.25%, and broadcasting (M1) with the lowest content of 2.05%. This suggests that transplanting the finger millet plants led to higher protein accumulation in the stover compared to other establishment methods. (Table :3)

#### **Establishment Method Influence on Quality Parameters:**

The establishment methods also had a significant impact on the quality parameters of finger millet. The highest crude protein content in the grain was observed in the transplanting method (M3) with a value of 7.68%, followed by SFMI (M4) with 6.37%, and line sowing (M2) with 6.00%. Broadcasting (M1) resulted in the lowest crude protein content in the grain at 4.42%. This indicates that the transplanting method led to a significant increase in the protein content of the grain.


Similarly, calcium, zinc, and iron content were also influenced by the establishment methods. Transplanting (M3) showed the highest calcium content (339.11 mg/100g), while broadcasting (M1) had the lowest (319.56 mg/100g). For zinc content, transplanting (M3) again showed the highest value (2.00 mg/100g), followed by SFMI (M4) with 1.83 mg/100g, and line sowing (M2) with 1.82 mg/100g. In terms of iron content, SFMI (M4) demonstrated the highest value of 4.23 mg/100g, while broadcasting (M1) had the lowest content of 3.28 mg/100g. similar results recorded by Prashanet al., (2013)(Table :3)

**Table No: 1Effect of varieties and establishment methods on Plant growth parameters offFinger Millet**

Treatments	Plant height	Number of tillers/m <sup>2</sup>	LAI	Dry matter production/plant
<b>Varieties</b>				
V <sub>1</sub> - GPU-67	103.95	80.16	1.63	26.42
V <sub>2</sub> - CFMV-2	104.53	81.16	2.34	27.44
V <sub>3</sub> - AAU-GSG-Muruadhan 1	104.07	79.05	1.43	24.33
SEm (±)	0.26	2.93	0.04	1.92
CD (P=0.05)	NS	NS	0.12	NS
<b>Establishment methods</b>				
M <sub>1</sub> – Broadcasting	95.18	54.34	1.41	19.82
M <sub>2</sub> - Line sowing	99.74	70.83	1.59	25.44
M <sub>3</sub> – Transplanting	112.29	102.11	2.82	32.45
M <sub>4</sub> - SFMI	109.52	93.22	2.24	26.54
SEm (±)	0.30	3.38	0.05	2.21
CD (p=0.05)	0.87	9.92	0.14	6.50
Interaction	NS	NS	S	NS

\*\*= Significant NS= Non-significant

What does S mean in the Table 1 above?



**Fig No:3. Effect of varieties and establishment methods on Plant growth parameters of Finger Millet**


UNDER PEER REVIEW

**Table No: 2 Effect of varieties and establishment methods on yield parameters of finger millet**

Treatments	Number of ear heads per m <sup>2</sup>	Number of fingers per ear head	Length per finger (cm)	Weight of ear head (g)	Test weight (g)	Grain yield (q/ha)	Fresh stover yield (q/ha)	Dry stover yield (q/ha)	Harvest index (%)
<b>Varieties</b>									
V <sub>1</sub> - GPU-67	57.39	6.40	5.92	10.74	2.77	20.55	52.00	28.18	41.90
V <sub>2</sub> - CFMV-2	58.68	6.78	7.64	12.01	2.84	21.42	52.54	30.16	41.40
V <sub>3</sub> - AAU-GSG Murudhan 1	56.99	6.20	5.83	10.61	2.63	19.88	51.70	28.33	41.18
SEm (±)	0.68	0.23	0.16	0.18	0.05	0.10	0.17	0.23	0.36
CD(p=0.05)	NS	NS	0.46	0.52	0.14	0.30	0.49	0.68	NS
<b>Establishment methods</b>									
M <sub>1</sub> - Broadcasting	40.32	4.67	5.53	5.28	2.63	17.81	46.14	25.75	40.84
M <sub>2</sub> - Line sowing	50.82	6.29	6.41	9.14	2.71	18.75	48.59	26.81	41.17
M <sub>3</sub> - Transplanting	76.93	7.82	7.18	15.75	2.84	23.46	59.32	32.95	42.12
M <sub>4</sub> - SFMI	62.67	7.07	6.73	14.31	2.82	22.44	54.27	30.05	41.83
SEm (±)	0.79	0.26	0.18	0.20	0.05	0.12	0.19	0.27	0.42
CD(p=0.05)	2.31	0.76	0.54	0.60	0.16	0.35	0.57	0.78	NS
Interaction	NS	NS	S	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

\*\*= Significant NS= Non-significant

What does S mean in the Table 2 above?



**Fig No:4. Effect of varieties and establishment methods on yield parameters of finger millet**

UNDER REVIEW


**Table No: 3 Effect of varieties and establishment methods on quality parameters of finger millet**

Treatments	Crude protein content in grain (%)	Crude protein content in stover (%)	Calcium content (mg/100g)	Zinc content (mg/100g)	Iron content (mg/100g)
<b>Varieties</b>					
V <sub>1</sub> - GPU-67	5.93	3.19	331.08	1.74	4.39
V <sub>2</sub> - CFMV-2	6.30	3.36	332.75	1.80	4.63
V <sub>3</sub> - AAU-GSG-Muruadhan 1	6.12	3.14	304.67	1.75	3.93
SEm (±)	0.12	0.09	14.70	0.02	0.18
CD @ 5%	NS	NS	NS	NS	0.54
<b>Establishment methods</b>					
M <sub>1</sub> - Broadcasting	4.42	2.05	319.56	1.39	3.28
M <sub>2</sub> - Line sowing	6.00	3.25	328.22	1.82	4.70
M <sub>3</sub> - Transplanting	7.68	4.18	339.11	2.00	5.06
M <sub>4</sub> - SFMI	6.37	3.43	304.44	1.83	4.23
SEm (±)	0.13	0.10	16.97	0.03	0.21
CD (p=0.05)	0.39	0.29	NS	0.08	0.62
Interaction	S	NS	NS	NS	NS

\*\*= Significant NS= Non-significant

What does S mean in the Table 3 above?

Should add one more table of significant combinations between varieties and establishment methods (significant interactions)



**Fig No: 5. Effect of varieties and establishment methods on quality parameters of finger millet**

## CONCLUSION

Based on the forgone results, among the establishment methods, transplanting shows better results compared to others. Similarly, among the varieties, CFMV-2 yields favorable outcomes in comparison to the rest. Interestingly, when combining V2 (CFMV-2) with the transplanting method, shows good results. These findings are from only one year of investigation, further experimentation may be required to derive a valid conclusion.

**In the**

## REFERENCES

- Bisht, A., Jeena, A. S., Singh, N. K. and Singh, S. P. 2015. Morphological characterization and Genetic analysis of finger millet (*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn). *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences* 3(1): 9-14.

- Krishnamurthy, K. 1971. Response of finger millet varieties, under various levels of nitrogen. *Annals of Arid Zone*. 10:261-265.
- Negi, S. 2015. Studies on Morphological Characterization, Seed Quality Parameters and Genetic Divergence in Finger Millet (*Eleusine Coracana* (L.) Gaertn.) Germplasm M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, V. C. S. G. Uttarakhand University of Horticulture & Forestry, Bharsar-246 123, Uttarakhand, India
- prashant, ahiwale & Chavan, LS & Jagtap, Dnyaneshwar & Mahadkar, Uttam & Gawade, MB. (2013). Effect of establishment methods and nutrient management on yield attributes and yield of finger millet (*Eleusine coracana* G.). 45. 141-145.
- Ramamoorthy, K., Christoper, Louduraj, A., Alagudurai, S. and Kandaswamy, O. S. 2004. Effect of crop residue management of early season legumes on the succeeding rainfed finger millet. *Madras Agricultural Journal* 91(4-6): 180-183.
- Revathi, T. 2016. Agro-climatic indices for prediction of growth and yield of finger millet (*Eleusine Coracana* L.) M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University Guntur, Andhra Pradesh.
- Sarawale, P. P., Rajemahadik, V. A., Shendage, G. B., & Mane, S. V. (2017). Effect of Different Establishment Methods and Varieties on Yield, Quality and Nutrient Uptake of Kharif Finger Millet (*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn.). *International journal of current microbiology and applied sciences*, 6 (4), 1285-1289
- Sarawale, P. P., Rajemandlik, V. A., Shendge, G. B. and Mane, S. V. 2016. Effect of different varieties and establishment methods on growth and yield of finger millet [*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn.] under Kokan condition. *Indian Society of Coastal Agricultural Research*. 34 (2): 22-26
- Suryanarayana, L., Sekhar, D. and Rao, N. V. 2014. Interrelationship and cause-effect analysis in finger millet (*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn) genotypes. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences* 3: 937-941

Tejeswararao, K., Upendrarao, A., Sekhar, D. and Venugopalarao, N. 2015. Performance of finger millet (*Eleusine coracana*. L) varieties under different crop establishment methods for North coastal Andhra Pradesh. *The Andhra Agricultural Journal*. 62(2): 255-258

Veeraputhiran, R., Chellamuthu, V. and Pandian, B. J. 2009. Performance of finger millet varieties in the coastal region of Karaikal. *International Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 5(1): 190- 192

Veeraputhiran, R., Chellamuthu, V. and Pandian, B. J. 2009. Performance of finger millet varieties in coastal region of Karaikal. *International Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 5(1): 190- 192

UNDER PEER REVIEW