Standardising The Different Levels of NPK on Yield and Yield Attributes of Potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.) for North Zone of Bihar

Abstract

This field research was carried out on a potato crop of the cultivar *Kufri Lalit* in the Rabi season of 2021–2022.at research farm of TCA, Dholi (Muzaffarpur), Bihar13 treatments and 3 replications were used in this experiment's randomised block design. The experimental location had a sandy loam texture, a reaction pH of 8.47 that is alkaline a low organic carbon content of 0.43%, and accessible N (223 kg ha^{-1}). However, P (16.95 kg ha^{-1}) and K (131.46 kg ha^{-1}) availability is moderate.The varying levels of key nutrients had a substantial impact on all growth and yield parameters, including percent emergence, plant height, shoot and leaf number $plant^{-1}$, dry matter accumulation, tuber bulking rateand yield. Among all treatments, treatment T_{10} (240N, $120P_2O_5$ and $150K_2O$ kg ha^{-1}) recorded highest per cent emergence (94.00 %), plant's height (44.27), shoot's number $plant^{-1}$ (5.60), leave's number $plant^{-1}$ (56.30),tuber yield (26.53 t ha^{-1}) and treatment T_{10} also recorded statistically at par with treatment T_6.

(Key words: Potato, treatments, varying levels and alkaline)

Introduction

Potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.) is classified under family Solanaceae and in terms of human consumption world's III[rd] most significant food crop after wheat and rice. Potato appears to have developed via isolation in both geography and ecology.In general, potatoes needed an acidic soil with a pH of 5.5 for optimum growth and development. A number of many types of soils Mollisols, Inceptisols, Alfisols, Entisols, and Vertisols, are also used to grow potatoes. In terms of texture, sandy loam soils with a pH 5.50 to 8.0 are said to be the best for growing potatoes. Because of its sensitivity to alkalinity, potato cultivation should be avoided on soils with a pH of more than 8.2. **(Pandey, 2007)**.The most significant dietary component of the potato, which has excellent nutritional value and contains crucial essential dietary elements, is carbohydrates, Proteins, minerals including calcium (Ca), phosphorus (P), and iron (Fe), as well as vitamins B_1, B_2, B_6, and C are other essential components. It is made up of 70-82 percent water, 11-23 percent carbs, 0.8-3% protein, 0.1-% fat, 1.1-% mineral, and 17-29 percent dry matter. Ash content is 0.90 percent**(Pandey, 2007).**

.Nitrogen is mostly contained in plants in the form of the plant cell wall, chlorophyll, protein content, DNA, and RNA. In general, a plant employs nutrients to carry out tissue growth, cell expansion, and the development of organs and systems. Nitrogen makes up between 2 and 7 percent of the Plant. The amount of nitrogen that plants need varies depending on the species. Plants that need a lot of water have large vegetative development, food reserves, or reproductive structures. Nitrate and ammonium in soils are the two main nitrogen sources for plants. **(Owen and Jones, 2001)**.A lack of nutrients can cause stunted growth, tissue death, or yellowing of the leaves because less chlorophyll, a pigment vital to photosynthesis, is produced.

After nitrogen, phosphorus (P) is the mineral nutrient that has the greatest impact on crop output in the potato plant. P is the most significant primary nutrient limiting factor for potato development after nitrogen and potassium, according to **Jasim *et al.* (2020).** Reduced carbon absorption results from a lack of a deficiency in P that directly impacts photosynthesis by lowering the quantity of inorganic P available in the chloroplast. a deficiency in P in leaf mesophyll cells.According to enhanced photoassimilation to the roots is promoted by phosphorus deficit.At a yield of 29 t ha^{-1},

potatoes lose around 91K_2O kg ha^{-1}, with potassium enhancing both marketable and total tuber weight by increasing average tuber diameters. (**Moinuddin *et al.*, 2004).**More so than on yield, potassium fertilisation has a beneficial impact on the quality of the tubers. The most popular techniques for recommending potassium for crops are based on soil testing., and while they occasionally work well for directing fertiliser applications, it is important to establish the crucial level of soil test potassium.The alternative strategy is to base fertiliser recommendations on agronomic effectiveness and yield response. Similar to how nitrogen absorption by potato crops is influenced by meteorological conditions, soil type, fertility, farmed variety, and crop management techniques.According to **Bhattarai and Swarnima (2016)**Maintaining osmotic potential enhances root permeability and water absorption, regulates ionic equilibrium controls stomata in plants and stimulates enzymatic reactions. Potassium aids in all of these processes.

Materials and Methods

The current research trial investigated in plot number 11 at TCA Farm, DhOli, Muzaffarpur, Dr. RPCAU, Pusa (Samastipur), Bihar, during the RabìseasOn of 2021-2022.

The experimental site situated at $25^{0}98'$ North (N) latitude and $85^{0}60'$ East I longitude on the Burhi Gandak river's southern bank, which is 52.2 metres above mean sea level. Experimental soil wascalcareous-alluvium and somewhat alkaline innature heaving pH 8.47 and soil was moderately fertile-being low organic carbon (0.43%), nitrogen (223 kg ha^{-1}), potassium (131.46 kg ha^{-1}) and medium phosphorus content (16.95%). The crop was sown in November eighteen at 60x20 row to row and plant to plant spacing. Experiment was laid out in RCBD statistical design with 3 replications involving following treatmentsT_1-(Control), T_2 (150N, $90P_2O_5$ and $100K_2O$ kg ha^{-1}), T_3 (0N, $80P_2O_5$ and $150K_2O$ kg ha^{-1}), T_4 (120N, $8OP_2O_5$ and $150K_2O$ kg ha^{-1}), T_5 (180N, $80P_2O_5$ and $150K_2O$ kg ha^{-1}), T_6 (240N, $80P_2O_5$ and $150K_2O$ kg ha^{-1}), T_7 (300N, $80P_2O_5$ and $150K_2O$ kg ha^{-1}), T_8 (240N, $0P_2O_5$ and $150K_2O$ kg ha^{-1}), T_9 (240N, $40P_2O_5$, and $150K_2O$ kg ha^{-1}), T_{10} (240N, $120P_2O_5$ and $150K_2O$ kg ha^{-1}), T_{11} (240N, $80P_2O_5$ and $0K_2O$ kg ha^{-1}), T_{12} (240N, $80P_2O_5$ and $50K_2O$ kg ha^{-1}), T_{13} (240N, $80P_2O_5$ and $100K_2O$ kg ha^{-1}).

Thevariety***KufriLalit***wasdevelopedby clonalselectionfromthehybrid 85-P-670 x CP-3192 with selection number 2001-P-55 at CPRI, Shimla (HP.) in 2014. It is released for cultivation mainly in North-eastern plains of India.

% Plantemergence = total number emerged plants/ total planted tubers x 100

Plant's height

Randomly chosen 5 plants from every plot were measured in height extending from the soil to the plant neck. The height was averaged using centimeter measurements.

Total shoot's numberplant^{-1}

The potato's shoots numberplant^{-1} counted at an interval of two weeks in each plot from randomly selected plant.

Total leave's number plant^{-1}

The number of plant's leavesplant^{-1} was counted from randomly selected five plant of net plot area of each plot at 45DAP, 60DAP, 75DAP, and at harvest.

Accumulation of dry matter (gplant^{-1})

Measurements of dry matter accumulated (gplant^{-1}) wheretwo plants plucked from every plot of each treatment's gross plot area. The weight of the entire plant (tuber and shoots) was measured and averaged. The plants were then cut into bits, and 100g of the total ‘homogenous samples’ were stored in paper bags, dried by oven, and then baked at 70^0degrees Celsius in hot air oven till a consistent mass was achieved. As a result, the dry weightplant^{-1} treatment^{-1} ratio was calculated.

Tuber's bulking rate(gday^{-1}plant^{-1})

Tuber's bulking rateobservation was taken at 45DAP, 60DAP, 75DAP and at harvest. On fresh weight basis of tubers, an increase tuber weight at 15-day intervals was calculated splitting the weightof tubers between 15 days intervals in gday^{-1}plant^{-1}.

Tuber's yield (tha^{-1})

All the collectedtubers from the net plot area of each where shadow dried tuber weights was calculated by using electronic balance into tha^{-1}.

Haulm yield (tha^{-1})

Fifteen plants selected from each plotof net plot area were removed and properly Dried, and the mass of the vines was documented in kilogramsplot^{-1}.

Harvest index (%)

$$= \frac{\text{Tuber's yield (tha}^{-1})}{\text{(Tuber's yield + Vine's yield) (tha}^{-1})} \times 100$$

Result and Discussion

Growth Parameter

Data presented in Table No.- 1 revealed thatResponse of different nutrients level onPlant emergence (%) at 30 DAP,Plant height(cm), Number of Shoots plant^{-1}and Number leaves plant^{-1}reading were significantly increased by the application of different levels of NPK compare with control. Generally, the maximum value of growth parameter was observed with the was noted in treatment T_{10}(240N, 120P_2O_5 150K_2O kg ha^{-1}) as compared to other treatments and these are statistically at par with the T_7 (300N, 80P_2O_5 150K_2O kg ha^{-1}) and T_6 (240N, 80P_2O_5 150K_2O kg ha^{-1}). In plant emergence different treatments had a non-significant effect on germination in percent at 30 DAP.Fertilizer levels generally had almost no impact on germination as compared to alternative treatments, NPK kg ha^{-1} had uneven germination at 30th day after planting.Additionally, it was shown that increasing fertiliser levels caused a delay in the development of tubers (Adhikari 2009). The same conclusions were reached Marthha *et al*. (2017) and Barman *et al*. (2014).The height of the dominant(44.27cm) plant was measured in treatment T_{10}(240N, 120P_2O_5 150K_2O kg ha^{-1}) at several growth stages. Statistics showed that treatment T_{10} was comparable at par with T_7 (300N, 80P_2O_5 150K_2O kg ha^{-1}) but in T_6 (240N, 80P_2O_5 150K_2O kg ha^{-1}) at only 60 days after planting at par with T_{10}.This is due to the fact that applying a relatively large amount of nitrogen causes the plant to develop quickly (Adhikari 2009) similar findings was documented by Thirupal *et al.* (2020).The maximum shoot's (5.60) numberplant^{-1} was recorded with T_{10}(240N, 120P_2O_5 150K_2O kg ha^{-1}) it is statistically at par with treatment T_6 (240N, 80P_2O_5 150K_2O kg ha^{-1}) deliberately more than remained treatmentsWhen applying different chemical fertiliser dosages to potatoes, the number of shoots per plant did not alter significantly Marthha *et al*. (2017) These kinds of results as reported Singh and Gupta (2005) and Kumar *et al.* (2008). Number of leaves plant^{-1} (56.3) are affected by different level of fertilizers markedly varied between treatments respectively the maximum leaves number plant^{-l} was found in T_{10}.It was statistically similar with T_6 and T_7.The response of different potato level to NPK treatment varies significantly, demonstrating a significant interaction between varieties and Application of NPK based on the number of leaves at distinct development stages.The greatest and smallest leaf counts per plant were measured using the application of NPK Thirupal *et al.* (2020) The current findings were similar to research conclusions of Marthha *et al.* (2017).

Table 1. Response of different nutrients level onPlant emergence (%) at 30 DAP,Plant height(cm), Number of Shoots plant^{-1}and Number leaves

Treatments					Plant height(cm)				Number of Shoots plant^{-1}				Number leaves plant^{-1}			
	N (kg ha^{-1})	P_2O_5 (kg ha^{-1})	K_2O (kg ha^{-1})	Plant emergence (%) at 30 DAP	45 DAP	60 DAP	75 DAP	At harvest	45 DAP	60 DAP	75 DAP	At harvest	45 DAP	60 DAP	75 DAP	At harvest
T_1	Control			87.79	18.9	22.5	24.63	27.96	2.53	2.97	3.27	3.27	27.33	32.33	36.23	21.8
T_2	150	90	100	92.45	27.4	34	36	38.6	3.65	4.44	4.9	4.9	39.83	45.64	47.56	33.04
T_3	0	80	150	90.48	23.2	24.04	28.6	33.33	2.6	3.33	3.78	3.78	32.54	35.78	37.8	24.56
T_4	120	80	150	92.33	26.6	34.57	34.54	37.8	3.53	4.2	4.83	4.83	39.3	43.9	46	32
T_5	180	80	150	93.2	28.17	35.07	38.9	41	4	4.9	5.04	5.04	40.6	47.6	51.6	34.27
T_6	240	80	150	93.78	29	35.9	39.63	41.8	4.27	5.33	5.42	5.42	42.7	50.77	54.6	35.33
T_7	300	80	150	92.01	30.9	37	41.5	43.1	4.07	5.23	5.19	5.19	41.67	49.93	53.7	34.37
T_8	240	0	150	88.23	24.74	31.46	32.44	36	2.97	3.74	4.17	4.17	36.67	40.8	43.8	29.43
T_9	240	40	150	92	25.7	33.9	34	37	3.23	3.97	4.78	4.78	38	43.33	45.8	31.8
T_{10}	240	120	150	94	32.3	37.8	42	44.27	4.5	5.47	5.6	5.6	43.2	52.43	56.3	37.5
T_{11}	240	80	0	89.52	24.6	28.38	31	34.8	2.8	3.6	3.9	3.9	34	37.27	39.9	27.8
T_{12}	240	80	50	91.86	25	32.5	33.3	36.4	3.08	3.8	4.47	4.47	37.6	42	45.12	30.8
T_{13}	240	80	100	92.9	27.9	34.87	37.6	39	3.8	4.78	5	5	40.36	46.33	49.9	33.9
SEm (±)				3.14	1.11	0.93	0.91	1	0.15	0.18	0.13	0.13	0.92	1.37	1.56	0.88
LSD (*p*=0.05)				NS	3.23	2.71	2.65	2.92	0.43	0.53	0.39	0.39	2.69	3.99	4.56	2.57

plant^{-1}

Yield Components

As shown in Table (2), in the most cases treatment T_{10} (240N, 120P_2O_5 150K_2O kg ha^{-1})exhibited high significant increases of yield components included Dry matter accumulation (g $plant^{-1}$), Bulking rate (g day^{-1} $plant^{-1}$), Harvest index (%) haulm yield, (t ha^{-1}) and Tuber yield (t ha^{-1})tested seasons compared to control treatment. Dry matteraccumulati0n (g$plant^{-1}$) was recorded maximum (85.5) withT_{10} and it was statistically similar with treatment T_5 (81.90 g $plant^{-1}$), T_6(83.95 g $plant^{-1}$) T_7(83.05 g $plant^{-1}$). The total DMA rose as crop ages increased, while the total DMP was significantly influenced by NPK levels (Banerjee *et al.*2016).Chemical fertilizer supply plant nutrients easily that can be quite significant in photosynthetic activity of and dry matter accumulation activity of plants. These research's conclusions concur with those of Kushwah *et al.* (2005), Alam *et al.* (2007), Lal and Khurana (2013), and Patel (2013).tuber bulking rate difference that is statistically significant between all of the treatments The bulking rate was registered maximum (7.87) at 60 DAPwith treatment T_{10} and lowest (0.97) bulking rate at 75DAP was observed with T_1 (control). This was primarily caused by plants satisfying dosages diverting more sugars and photosynthates for cr0p growth and development, increasing the amount of radiation captured, an increase in the production of photosynthates. this outcome comparable to the end of Meena *et al.* (2016) and Banerjee *et al.*2016).The observed mean data for harvest index showed that, despite statistical analysis of the no effects of various fertilizers level on various treatments, The partitioning of photosynthates to sink and the greater photosynthetic rate during the tuberization stage may be to blame for this. This result was supported by Nag (2006) and Patel (2013).The quintessential haulms yields were considered and recorded maximum (11.85 t ha^{-1}) with T_{10} (240N, 120P_2O_5 150K_2O kg ha^{-1}). These are statistically at par with treatments T_6 and $T_{7.}$ finding of Shaaban and Kisetu (2014) and Uzatunga *et al.* (2021).the key factor contributing to the rise in the haulms yield seems to be the availability of nitrogen at increasing at a particular level.The tuber yield (tha^{-1}) data gathered showed that different level of fertilizes treatments had a significant impact on the tuber yield (tha^{-1}). best tuber yield (26.53) with all possible treatments was produced with treatment $T_{10.}$Higher growth and production may be attributable to the crop's improved nutrient availability, which may have raised the plant's photosynthetic capacity and metabolic activity with an up to a particular amount of NPK dose increase. (Adhikari 2009) the current research finding conform to findingsof Sharma and Singh (1988) and Rykbost*et al.* (1993).

Table 2. Response of different nutrients level onDry matter accumulation (g plant^{-1}), Bulking rate (g day^{-1} plant^{-1}), Harvest index (%), haulm yield(t ha^{-1}) and Tuber yield (t ha^{-1})

Treatments				**Dry matter accumulation (g plant^{-1})**				**Bulking rate (g day^{-1} plant^{-1})**			**Harvest Index (%)**	**Haulm yield (t ha^{-1})**	**Tuber yield (t ha^{-1})**
	N (kg ha^{-1})	**P_2O_5 (kg ha^{-1})**	**K_2O (kg ha^{-1})**	**45 DAP**	**60 DAP**	**75 DAP**	**At harvest**	**45 DAP**	**60 DAP**	**75 DAP**			
T_1	Control			19.64	22.64	29	11.28	2.52	3.43	0.97	63.62	6.45	11.28
T_2	150	90	100	26.23	22.24	45.43	77.19	3.25	68.31	2.94	68.31	10.32	22.24
T_3	0	80	150	21.33	15.94	33.76	56.91	2.63	68.15	1.42	68.15	7.45	15.94
T_4	120	80	150	25.46	21.54	43.96	75.05	3.14	68.61	2.61	68.61	9.86	21.54
T_5	180	80	150	27.77	23.64	49.32	81.9	3.68	69.09	3.37	69.09	10.58	23.64
T_6	240	80	150	29.25	25.23	52.23	83.95	3.95	68.43	3.64	68.43	11.64	25.23
T_7	300	80	150	28.57	24.63	51.09	83.05	3.83	68.9	3.56	68.9	11.12	24.63
T_8	240	0	150	23.65	17.05	36.07	65.05	2.76	63.86	1.86	63.86	9.65	17.05
T_9	240	40	150	24.79	20.18	39.9	71.1	3.04	66.98	2.39	66.98	9.95	20.18
T_{10}	240	120	150	30.83	26.53	55.74	85.5	4.33	69.12	3.92	69.12	11.85	26.53
T_{11}	240	80	0	22.25	16.45	35.7	61.43	2.7	63.83	1.71	63.83	9.32	16.45
T_{12}	240	80	50	24.11	19.85	37.6	67.06	2.96	66.97	2.05	66.97	9.79	19.85
T_{13}	240	80	100	26.86	23.17	47.54	77.65	3.42	68.89	3.1	68.89	10.47	23.17
SEm (±)				0.73	0.8	1.43	0.93	0.11	0.17	0.07	1.95	0.42	0.93
LSD (p=0.05)				2.13	2.34	4.18	2.69	0.34	0.48	0.2	NS	1.24	2.69

CONCLUSION

Out of thirteen treatments tested during the research work, treatment T_{10} (240N, $80P_2O_5$ $150K_2O$ kg ha^{-1})was showed that the higher number of leaves, shoots, dry matter accumulati0n, plant height, tuber bulking rate and tuber, haulm yield and harvest index. However, variety *Kufri Lalit* responded significantly to the levels of NPK application and resulted better responses and trends were observed with the use of 240N, $80P_2O_5$ $150K_2O$ level of fertilizer. The germination percentage at 30 days after planting and harvest index showed no discernible variation between the treatments. at several growth stages, including 45, 60, 75 and at harvest the number of leaves, shoots, plant height dry matter accumulati0n, tuber bulking rateon a plantwas significantly impacted by different treatments.

References

Adhikari, R. C. (2009). Effect of NPK on vegetative growth and yield of Desiree *and Kufri Sindhuri* potato. *Nepal Agriculture Research Journal*, ***9***, 67-75.

Alam, M. N., Jahan, M. S., Ali, M. K., Ashraf, M. A., & Islam, M. K. (2007). Effect of vermicompost and chemical fertilizers on growth, yield and yield components of potato in barind soils of Bangladesh. *Journal of Applied Sciences Research*, ***3*****(12)**, 1879-1888.

Banerjee, H., Rana, L., Ray, K., Sarkar, S., Bhattacharyya, K., & Dutta, S. (2016). Differential physiological response in potato (Solanum tuberosum L.) upon exposure to nutrient omissions. *Indian Journal of Plant Physiology*, ***21*****(2)**, 129-136.

Barman, K. S., B. Ram and R. B. Verma (2014). Effect of Integrated Nutrient Management on Growth and Tuber Yield of Potato (*Solanum tuberosum*) cv. *Kufri Ashoka*. *Trends in Biosciences*, **7(9)**: 815-817.

Bhattarai, B., & Swarnima, K. C. (2016). Effect of potassium on quality and yield of potato tubers-A review. *International Journal of Agriculture & Environmental Science*, ***3*****(6)**, 7-12.

Kumar, M., Jadav, M. K., & Trehan, S. P. (2008, December). Contributing of organic sources to potato nutrition at varying nitrogen levels. In *Global potato conference* (Vol. 9, p. 12).

Kushwah, V.S., Singh, S.P. and Lal, S.S. 2005. Effect of manures and fertilizers on potato (*Solanum tuberosum*) production. *Potato Journal***32(3-4)**: 157-158.

Lal, M., & Khurana, S. C. (2013). Effect of organic manure, biodynamic compost and biofertilizers on potato. *Potato Journal*, ***34*****(1-2)**.

Marthha, D., Sahu, G. S., Sahu, P., & Mishra, N. (2017). performance of potato cv. *kufri asoka* as influnced by graded levels of N, P and K. *Plant Archives*, ***17*****(2)**, 1435-1438.

Meena, B. P., Kumar, A., Dotaniya, M. L., Jat, N. K., & Lal, B. (2016). Effect of organic sources of nutrients on tuber bulking rate, grades and specific gravity of potato tubers. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences, India section B: biological sciences*, ***86*****(1)**, 47-53.

Moinuddin, Singh, K., Bansal, S. K., & Pasricha, N. S. (2004). Influence of graded levels of potassium fertilizer on growth, yield, and economic parameters of potato. *Journal of plant nutrition*, ***27*****(2)**, 239-259.

Nag, G.P., Sarnaik, D.A., Verma, Satish K. and Tamrakar S.K. 2006. Integrated nutrient management in potato for Chhattisgarh plains. *The Orissa Journal of Horticulture*. **36(2)**: 158-161.

Owen, A. G., & Jones, D. L. (2001). Competition for amino acids between wheat roots and rhizosphere microorganisms and the role of amino acids in plant N acquisition. *Soil biology and biochemistry*, ***33*****(4-5)**, 651-657.

Pandey, S. K. (2007). Vegetable Science. *Central Potato Research Institute, Shimla*, *171001*.

Patel, B. 2013. Effect of different levels of NPK on growth, development and yield of potato cv. Kufri Ashoka under Chhattisgarh plain condition. M. Sc. (Ag) Thesis IGKV, Raipur. pp. 70-71.

Rykbost, K. A., Christensen, N. W., & Maxwell, J. (1993). Fertilization of Russet Burbank in short-season environment. *American Potato Journal*, ***70*****(10)**, 699-710.

Shaaban, H., & Kisetu, E. (2014). Response of Irish potato to NPK fertilizer application and its economic return when grown on an Ultisol of Morogoro, Tanzania. *Journal of Agricultural and Crop Research*, ***2*(9)**, 188-196.

Sharma, U. C., & Singh, K. (1988). Response of potato to NP and K in acidic hill soil of Meghalaya. *Journal Indian Potato Association*, ***15*(1)**, 40-44.

Singh, S. K. and V. K. Gupta (2005). Influence of farm yard, nitrogen and biofertilizer on growth, tuber yield of potato under rain fed condition in east khasi hill district of Meghalaya. *Agriculture Science Digest*, **25(4)**: 281-283

Thirupal, D., Ramanandam, G., Jyothi, K. U., Umakrishna, K., Sujatha, R. V., Rao, A. D., & Rao, M. P. (2020). Potato growth as influenced by planting date, spacing and NPK levels under Godavari conditions. *International Journal of Chemical Studies*, ***8*(4),** 3638-3643.

Uzatunga, I. (2021). Effects of fertilizer application on yield and yield related parameters of low yielding potato varieties in Uganda. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, ***17*(12)**, 1540-1546.