

1
2
3
4
5
6

**Optimizing Groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.)
Yields: An Effect of Sowing Dates and Planting
Densities in India's Hot Arid Regions Under a
Changing Climate**

7 **ABSTRACT**

8 Groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) holds immense significance as an oilseed crop on a global scale.
9 The growth and development of plants, along with crop productivity, are substantially impacted by the
10 adverse effects of global climate change. In view of this, a research initiative was undertaken to
11 investigate the effects of distinct sowing dates and planting densities on the yield and economic
12 aspects of groundnut in the hot arid region of Rajasthan, India. The experiment, conducted over a
13 span of three years during the kharif seasons of 2017, 2018, and 2019 at Swami Keshwanand
14 Rajasthan Agricultural University, Bikaner, Rajasthan, India. The experimental design utilized a split-
15 plot layout with four replications, comprising nine treatments. The main plot treatments involved three
16 different sowing dates (15th May, 30th May, and 15th June), while the sub-plot treatments
17 encompassed three planting densities (1.67 lakh, 2.50 lakh, and 3.33 lakh plants per hectare).
18 Notably, the diverse sowing dates and planting densities exhibited notable effects on groundnut yield
19 and economic viability. Comparative analysis revealed that sowing on May 30th, while statistically
20 comparable to June 15th sowing, yielded the highest number of branches, pegs, pods per plant, kernel
21 and pod yield, net return, and benefit-cost ratio. Interestingly, the highest haulm yield per hectare was
22 achieved with the May 15th sowing, yet the harvest index improved progressively as sowing was
23 delayed from May 15th to June 15th. However, the various sowing dates had no discernible effect on
24 kernels per pod, seed index, and shelling percentage. Furthermore, employing a planting density of
25 1.67 lakh plants per hectare was resulted in the highest counts of branches, pegs, pods, kernels per
26 pod, seed index, and shelling percentage. Remarkably, the elevation in planting density up to 2.50
27 lakh plants per hectare led to enhanced kernel and pod yields, harvest index, and net return. In an
28 intriguing interaction between sowing dates and plant populations, the most favorable pod yield,
29 kernel yield, and net return were recorded with a planting density of 2.50 lakh plants per hectare for
30 the May 30th sowing. These findings underscore the significant effect of sowing date and planting
31 density on yield attributes and ultimately on groundnut yield in the challenging hot arid region.
32 Therefore, the timing of sowing and the density of planting play pivotal roles in enhancing groundnut
33 productivity within this region, particularly in light of the changing climate conditions.

34
35
36

Keywords, Economics, groundnut, planting density, time of sowing, yield

37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96

1. INTRODUCTION

Groundnut (*A. hypogaea* L.) stands as a significant legume crop on a global scale [1, 2]. Groundnut cultivated in tropical, subtropical, and temperate climates, holds significance as an essential oilseed, confectionery, and livestock crop [3, 4]. Global groundnut production reaches approximately 50.7 million tonnes annually, cultivated across 26.4 million hectares of land [5]. Groundnut holds a crucial position as an oilseed crop in India, where it takes the lead in terms of cultivation area and secures the second position in production, right after soybean. China takes the lead in groundnut production with 17.57 million tonnes, closely trailed by India with 6.73 million tonnes (FAO, 2021). The seeds of groundnut are rich in essential nutrients, encompassing approximately 44–56% oil and 22–30% protein content [6, 7]. Additionally, groundnut seeds serve as a valuable reservoir of calcium, phosphorus, iron, and vitamins [8]. Additionally, groundnut serves as a significant source of animal feed, both in the form of haulms and groundnut cake. Moreover, its suitability for crop rotation is notable, given its ability to facilitate atmospheric nitrogen fixation, which proves advantageous for subsequent crops [9]. The growth and development of groundnut are intricately influenced by a multitude of uncontrollable environmental factors. Optimal diurnal air temperatures for groundnut's photosynthesis and vegetative growth fall within the range of 30 to 35°C, as documented by Prasad *et al.* [10] and Craufurd *et al.* [11]. In contrast, the ideal diurnal temperature for reproductive growth and eventual yield is somewhat cooler, approximately 25 to 28°C, according to Ketring [12] and Prasad *et al.* [10]. Elevated daytime temperatures surpassing 35°C during the reproductive phases have been shown to diminish dry matter production, the formation of flowers into pegs, pod count per plant, individual seed size, harvest index, and pod yield, as demonstrated by Craufurd *et al.* [11], Ketring [12], and Prasad *et al.* [10, 13]. The duration of daylight significantly influences the growth dynamics. Longer days (exceeding 13 hours) enhance vegetative growth and crop growth rate, while reducing the allocation of photosynthate to pods [61-63]. Conversely, shorter days (less than 12 hours) foster an increase in the number of flowers, pegs, and pods in groundnut, as highlighted by Bagnall and King [14, 15] and Nigam *et al.* [16]. In addition, incident solar radiation and the duration of sunshine play pivotal roles in shaping the growth and development of groundnut [14-16].

Cultivar selection, sowing timing, and the duration of a cultivar's lifecycle are all crucial factors in managing a crop, impacting the growth, yield, and seed quality of groundnut. Among these, the timing of sowing holds particular significance as it can be manipulated to mitigate the negative impact of environmental stress. By strategically adjusting sowing dates, it is possible to avoid subjecting plants to unfavorable environmental conditions during critical growth stages. Sowing date and planting density research for groundnut has been conducted in various groundnut-growing nations worldwide [4, 17-22]. Achieving a substantial groundnut yield and ensuring profitable economic outcomes hinge significantly on optimal plant density, which defines the spacing between individual plants. Several authors have underscored the significance of higher plant densities for achieving the highest or most favorable groundnut yields [23-27]. In the Indian context, specific recommendations have been put forth, such as an optimal population of 330,000 plants per hectare (with a spacing of 30 cm x 10 cm) for Spanish/Valencia cultivars, and 148,000 plants per hectare (with a spacing of 45 cm x 15 cm) for Virginia cultivars [23]. Plant density plays a significant role in governing growth, pod production rate, and the eventual pod and kernel yield in groundnut cultivation [28]. Utilizing low plant population density often leads to reduced yields, whereas higher population densities coupled with better management practices can potentially yield a remarkable increase in pod production, sometimes reaching as high as 150-250%. The objective of plant population studies in crop plants is to ascertain the optimal plant density that yields maximum productivity [29]. Manipulating the planting date emerges as a crucial element of production that can be strategically adjusted to mitigate the detrimental impacts of environmental stress. Aligning the crop's phenology with favorable conditions by meticulously selecting appropriate sowing dates to bypass periods of stress becomes pivotal for maximizing yield. The fine-tuning of sowing dates holds great significance in optimizing the climatic environment with respect to the growth and yield of the groundnut crop, as emphasized by Caliskan *et al.* [4].

Many of these studies aimed to counteract drought or high-temperature stress that could occur during pivotal groundnut growth phases by adapting the sowing schedule. However, investigations specifically focusing on the effects of sowing dates and related environmental variables on groundnut growth and yield in hot arid regions are relatively scarce. The productivity of the crop is inherently linked to the interplay during its growth phases, a relationship intricately tied to the timing of sowing. Determining the optimal sowing time for groundnut allows for adjusting growth phases to synchronize with favourable weather conditions [30]. Further, the choice of sowing date is contingent on the local conditions, with significant influence stemming from factors such as soil temperature, available soil

97 moisture, and the prevailing growing season. In India, groundnuts are typically sown during the rainy
 98 season, commencing with the onset of rains between May and June. In the Hyper Arid Zone of
 99 Rajasthan, there is a growing emphasis on cultivating groundnut during the kharif season. However,
 100 due to the absence of well-defined sowing schedules and standardized plant populations, farmers
 101 tend to resort to heavy seed rates, even exceeding 240 kg per hectare [31]. Despite its costliness, this
 102 practice has become prevalent. The current study aims to investigate the effects of distinct sowing
 103 dates and planting densities on the yield and economic aspects of groundnut in the hot arid region of
 104 Rajasthan, India..

105

106 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

107 2.1 Experimental Site

108 Field experiments were conducted during the kharif seasons of 2017, 2018, and 2019 at the
 109 instructional farm of Krishi Vigyan Kendra in Bikaner, Rajasthan. The location is situated at 28° 01'N
 110 latitude and 73° 22'E longitude, at an elevation of 234.70 meters above mean sea level. The site
 111 experiences a hot arid climate with an annual rainfall of 263.5 mm, falling under the category of hyper
 112 arid conditions. The soil at the experimental site is classified as loamy sand, with nutrient content of
 113 258.7 kg/ha N, 17.4 kg/ha available P, 223.4 kg/ha K, and 0.79% organic carbon. The pH of the soil
 114 was measured at 8.3 using a 1,2.5 soil-to-water ratio. Soil properties in the 0-30 cm depth included a
 115 field capacity of 8.3%, a permanent wilting point of 1.83%, and a bulk density of 1.67 Mgm-3. The
 116 meteorological parameters observed throughout the growth and development of groundnut are
 117 presented in Table 1 and depicted in Figure 1.

118

119 **Table 1:** The average monthly meteorological data observed throughout the crop periods of 2017,
 120 2018, and 2019.

121

Months	Temperature (°C)						R.H. (%)						Total rainfall (mm)		
	Max.			Min.			RH1			RH2			2017	2018	2019
	2017	2018	2019	2017	2018	2019	2017	2018	2019	2017	2018	2019			
May	42.9	43.7	41.4	26.8	27.0	25.4	54.6	36.0	72.2	27.3	18.2	53.5	19.2	5.6	9.0
June	39.8	41.3	43.4	27.5	28.7	29.4	69.7	62.3	85.9	38.5	35.4	66.8	123.0	54.3	12.8
July	38.4	37.8	39.8	27.5	28.1	28.7	78.7	84.1	77.4	47.4	51.3	55.2	29.3	189.8	40.6
August	37.4	36.2	36.3	26.7	26.6	26.7	76.1	82.5	84.2	47.5	50.4	63.9	90.6	54.8	128.2
September	37.8	36.5	38.0	24.0	24.0	26.0	71.8	69.6	87.4	36.5	41.2	60.9	6.0	0.0	16.2
October	38.7	36.6	34.6	18.4	18.6	18.6	49.2	55.0	71.6	20.4	21.7	39.5	0.0	0.0	28.8
November	30.4	30.8	27.1	11.2	11.4	12.8	69.7	69.6	84.2	27.2	27.4	48.6	1.4	0.8	27.2

122

Source: Agricultural Research Station, Bikaner

123

124




Figure 1: Monthly meteorological averages throughout the crop seasons of 2017, 2018, and 2019.

The monthly average maximum temperatures (T max) showed variations within the ranges of 42.9°C to 30.4°C in 2017, 43.7°C to 30.8°C in 2018, and 43.4°C to 27.1°C in 2019. Concurrently, the minimum temperatures (T min) ranged between 11.2°C and 27.5°C in 2017, 11.4°C and 28.7°C in 2018, and 12.8°C and 29.4°C in 2019. Notably, the highest maximum temperature was recorded in May, while the lowest minimum temperature was observed in November, both within the growing periods. Relative humidity data revealed morning relative humidity (RH-I) fluctuations from 49% to 78.7%, 36.0% to 84.1%, and 71.6% to 87.4% for the years 2017, 2018, and 2019 respectively during the growing periods. As for afternoon relative humidity (RH-II), the range spanned from 27.2% to 47.5% in 2017, 18.2% to 51.3% in 2018, and 39.5% to 66.8% in 2019. The maximum rainfall was received during the months of June to August, encompassing the growing period.

2.2 Treatment

The experimental design utilized a split-plot layout with four replications, comprising nine treatments. The main plot treatments involved three different sowing dates (15th May, 30th May, and 15th June), while the sub-plot treatments encompassed three planting densities (1.67 lakh, 2.50 lakh, and 3.33 lakh plants per hectare). The plot size was 4.8 x 5.0 meters. Plant spacing was set at 30 x 10 cm for 3.33 lakh plants per hectare, 40 x 10 cm for 2.50 lakh plants per hectare, and 60 x 10 cm for 1.67 lakh plants per hectare. Groundnut variety HNG-69 was sown according to the specified sowing dates at different planting densities, with corresponding seed rates of 80 kg, 120 kg, and 160 kg per hectare for the respective density treatments. The recommended dose of nitrogen (20 kg N/ha) and phosphorus (40 kg P₂O₅/ha) fertilizers were applied during planting. Urea and single super phosphate were used as the sources for supplying nitrogen and phosphorus nutrients, respectively. Alongside the variations in sowing dates and planting densities, the cultivation followed the prescribed package of recommended practices.

2.3 Data Collection and Analysis

The net plots were harvested by uprooting the entire plant, including the pods, using a hoe. Any remaining pods in the soil were also collected. Subsequently, the pods were separated from the haulms and allowed to dry for about 7-8 days under direct sunlight. During the harvesting period, 20 plants were randomly selected from each plot to measure the number and weight of pods per plant. The seed yield (in kilograms per hectare) was calculated from the plants in four ridges within each

160 plot, determining the overall yield per hectare. After harvesting, data regarding 100-kernel weight and
 161 shelling percentage were obtained, following the methodology outlined by Gulluoglu *et al.* [8]. The
 162 collected data were subjected to statistical analysis using a Split Plot Design. An analysis of variance
 163 (ANOVA) was performed to assess the significance of treatment effects at a 0.05% level of probability
 164 ($\alpha = 0.05$). To compare means, the Least Significant Difference (LSD) test was applied at the same
 165 0.05% significance level.

166

167 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

168

169 3.1 Effect of sowing date on yield and its components across each year

170

171 Groundnut is globally significant as an oilseed crop, and its growth, development, and crop
 172 productivity face significant challenges due to the adverse impacts of global climate change. This
 173 study focuses on assessing the influence of varying sowing dates and planting densities on groundnut
 174 cultivation in the hot arid region of Rajasthan, India. Remarkably, our investigation revealed
 175 substantial effects of different sowing dates and planting densities on groundnut's yield components,
 176 overall harvest, and economic feasibility. In this study, we conducted experiments with three distinct
 177 planting dates, May 15th, May 30th, and June 15th revealed that the number of branches per plant,
 178 pegs per plant, and pods per plant were significantly influenced by different sowing dates (Table 2).

178

179 **Table 2:** The effect of various sowing dates and planting densities on the yield components of
 180 groundnut, considering the pooled data from 2017 to 2019.

Treatments	Branches per plant	Pegs per plant	Pods per plant	kernel s per pod	100 kernel weight (g)	Shelling %
Date of sowing						
Sowing at 15 May	9.75b	85.02b	25.98b	1.45a	45.49a	72.22a
Sowing at 30 May	12.01a	89.28a	28.68a	1.44a	45.16a	71.02a
Sowing at 15 June	11.90a	90.19a	28.71a	1.41a	44.99a	70.49a
SEm±	0.25	1.04	0.60	0.03	0.19	0.70
CD at 5%	0.75	3.09	1.79	NS	NS	NS
Planting density						
1.67 lac ha ⁻¹	12.88a	94.21a	34.20a	1.54a	45.81a	76.14a
2.50 lac ha ⁻¹	11.53b	91.88b	27.24b	1.39b	45.18b	69.40b
3.33 lac ha ⁻¹	9.25c	78.39c	21.93c	1.37b	44.65c	68.19b
SEm±	0.22	0.91	0.56	0.02	0.17	0.77
CD at 5%	0.63	2.57	1.58	0.07	0.47	2.19

181

182

a is significantly superior to b; b is significantly superior to c. SEm is standard error of the mean; CD denotes the critical difference. NS represents non-significance.

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

Sowing on May 30th showed statistically similar results to sowing on June 15th, producing the highest number of branches per plant, pegs per plant, and pods per plant-1, which was significantly greater than the results obtained from sowing on May 15th. The number of branches per plant, pegs per plant, and pods per plant increased with delayed sowing up to May 30th and then decreased with sowing on June 15th. These findings align with those reported by Rasekh *et al.* [32]. Sowing dates did not have an effect on the number of kernels per pod, seed index, and shelling percentage (Table 2). However, numerically, the highest number of kernels per pod, seed index, and shelling percentage was observed when sown on May 15th, while the lowest values for these parameters were recorded for sowing on June 15th. Taller plants observed during early sowing periods may be attributed to the

194 more favourable environmental conditions experienced by crops sown early, even when receiving
195 similar inputs as those planted later. The reduced number of nodes and narrower internodal spaces
196 resulting from suboptimal sowing times could also contribute to the decrease in plant height when
197 sowing is delayed.
198

199 **3.2 Influence of planting density on yield attributes**

200 The data also revealed significant effects of different planting densities on various parameters,
201 as shown in Table 2. A planting density of 1.67 lac ha⁻¹ resulted in the highest number of branches
202 per plant, pegs per plant, pods per plant, kernels per pod, seed index, and shelling percentage, which
203 was significantly greater than the results obtained with planting densities of 2.50 and 3.33 lac ha⁻¹ (the
204 kernels per pod and shelling percentage for planting densities of 2.50 and 3.33 lac ha⁻¹ were
205 statistically similar). As planting density increased up to 3.33 lac ha⁻¹, there was a decrease in the
206 number of branches per plant, pegs per plant, pods per plant, kernels per pod, seed index, and
207 shelling percentage. This decrease could be attributed to heightened competition among plants for
208 essential growth resources such as nutrients, water, and light as the number of plants per unit area
209 increased. The optimal utilization of these resources at lower planting densities per unit area
210 ultimately led to an increase in the number of branches per plant, pegs per plant, pods per plant,
211 kernels per pod, seed index, and shelling percentage in groundnut. The choice of planting density
212 should be carefully considered based on specific conditions and objectives. These studies collectively
213 underline the importance of selecting the appropriate planting density to optimize groundnut yields,
214 taking into account various environmental and regional factors. This reduction in weed competition
215 was achieved through the smothering effect of groundnut on late-emerging weeds, which was more
216 effective with narrow plant spacing compared to wider spacing. In the context of our study, the
217 application of recommended double weeding likely contributed to increased yield by facilitating the
218 efficient utilization of available resources when plants were optimally spaced. They suggested a
219 medium planting density of 166,700 plants per hectare (60 cm × 20 cm with two plants per hill) and
220 200,000 plants per hectare (50 cm × 20 cm with two plants per hill) as optimal. These findings are
221 consistent with earlier studies conducted by Sternitzke *et al.* [33], and Ahmad *et al.* [34]. Further,
222 Ajeigbe *et al.* [27] reported that in Nigeria, pod yields were 31% higher when using a planting density
223 of 133,333 hills per hectare (75 cm × 10 cm with two plants per hill) compared to 66,667 hills per
224 hectare (75 cm × 20 cm with two plants per hill) and 40% higher compared to 44,444 hills per hectare
225 (75 cm × 30 cm with two plants per hill). Similarly, in Ethiopia, it was found that planting densities of
226 250,000 plants per hectare (40 cm × 10 cm) and 200,000 plants per hectare (50 cm × 10 cm) were
227 ideal for increasing seed yield in groundnut cultivars with different architectures [35]. In the Northern
228 Guinea Savannah zone of Ghana, it was observed that the lowest sowing density of 80,000 plants per
229 hectare resulted in the lowest pod and seed yields in groundnut, while medium (120,000 plants per
230 hectare) and high (200,000 plants per hectare) sowing densities yielded higher pod and seed yields,
231 with no significant difference between the latter two densities [36]. Sowing at a medium density
232 enhanced pod yield by 8–10% compared to sowing at a low density. Additionally, crop simulation
233 studies have suggested that increasing the plant density to 400,000 plants per hectare could
234 significantly boost yields in areas of Africa where drought is not a limiting factor [37]. The results
235 obtained for the rainy season appear to contradict those reported by Ajeigbe *et al.* [27], who found
236 that increasing plant density to 133,333 hills per hectare (two plants per hill) resulted in a 14-22%
237 increase in haulm yield compared to 44,444 hills per hectare (two plants per hill) and a 7-10%
238 increase over 66,667 hills per hectare (two plants per hill) in the Sudanian agroecology of Nigeria.
239 Many other studies have also reported that increasing plant spacing (wider spacing) leads to a higher
240 number of pods per plant. For example, in Bangladesh, wider row and plant spacing were associated
241 with a greater number of mature pods per plant and a higher dry weight of pods per plant [24]. This
242 could be attributed to wider spacing allowing the plants to access more nutrients and solar energy
243 while reducing competition for other resources. In Turkey, reducing plant density resulted in an
244 increased number of pods and pod weight per plant, with specific planting densities (e.g., 70 cm × 25
245 cm and 75 cm × 25 cm) yielding the highest pod weight and pod number per plant for Virginia market
246 types [25]. Similarly, in Sudan, increased plant density was linked to reduced seed yield per plant and
247 a lower number of pods per plant due to increased competition in high-density plantings [38].
248 However, high-density planting produces pods of similar age and developmental stage, facilitating
249 harvest decisions and positively impacting post-harvest processes such as shelling, sorting, and grain
250 quality [39]. It's worth noting that while increasing plant density may lead to greater uniformity and
251 potentially reduce weed growth due to canopy closure, it can also result in higher production costs for
252 growers, including the need for more seeds and potentially increased labor costs [37]. The choice of

253 planting density should be carefully considered based on specific conditions and objectives. These
 254 studies collectively underline the importance of selecting the appropriate planting density to optimize
 255 groundnut yields, taking into account various environmental and regional factors. Our findings
 256 emphasize the importance of tailoring planting densities and spacing to the specific characteristics of
 257 the groundnut variety and local agroecological conditions for optimal yield. These diverse findings
 258 underscore the importance of considering local agroecological conditions, rainfall patterns, and
 259 cultivar characteristics when determining the most suitable planting density and row spacing for
 260 groundnut cultivation to maximize yield potential.

261

262 3.3 The effect of the sowing date on crop yield

263 The haulm yield was significantly influenced by different sowing dates, as depicted in Table 3.
 264 Sowing on May 15th resulted in the highest haulm yield per hectare (5878.28 kg ha⁻¹), which was
 265 markedly superior to yields obtained from other sowing dates. Haulm yield exhibited a decline as the
 266 sowing was delayed up to June 15th. Kernel and pod yield for groundnut displayed significant
 267 variations across different sowing dates (Table 3).
 268

269 **Table 3:** Influence of various sowing dates and planting densities on groundnut yield and economic
 270 outcomes, considering the combined data from 2017 to 2019.

Treatmen ts	kernel yield (kg ha ⁻¹)	Pod yield (kg ha ⁻¹)	Haulm yield (kg ha ⁻¹)	Harve st Index (%)	Net Return (ha ⁻¹)	B : C Rati o
Date of sowing						
Sowing at 15 May	2405.7 b	3370.6 b	5878.3 a	36.1c	105986 b	3.93 b
Sowing at 30 May	2791.2 a	3948.2 a	5543.7 b	41.5b	126232 a	4.68 a
Sowing at 15 June	2734.8 a	3895.1 a	5211.0 c	42.7a	124465 a	4.80 a
SEm±	40.9	53.7	28.9	0.28	2004	0.06
CD at 5%	121.5	159.5	86.1	0.82	5953	0.18
Planting density						
1.67 lac ha ⁻¹	2473.5 b	3269.9 b	5361.9 c	37.7b	105701 b	4.49 b
2.50 lac ha ⁻¹	2745.6 a	3971.1 a	5578.1 b	41.5a	127357 a	4.71 a
3.33 lac ha ⁻¹	2712.6 a	3972.9 a	5692.9 a	41.1a	123625 a	4.21 c
SEm±	34.97	46.8	24.6	0.26	1746	0.05
CD at 5%	99.1	132.6	69.7	0.74	4951	0.15

271 a is significantly superior to b; b is significantly superior to c. SEm is standard error of the mean; CD
 272 denotes the critical difference. NS represents non-significance.

273

274

275

276 Sowing on May 30th, while statistically similar to sowing on June 15th, recorded significantly
 277 higher kernel and pod yields compared to sowing on May 15th. Kernel and pod yields increased with
 278 delayed sowing from May 15th to May 30th, followed by a decrease in yields for sowing on June 15th.
 279 Sowing on June 15th resulted in the highest harvest index percentage, which was significantly superior
 280 to other sowing dates (Table 3). The harvest index exhibited an increase with delayed sowing from
 281 May 15th to June 15th. It's crucial to emphasize that groundnut performance exhibited variation across
 282 different sowing dates, with May 30th and June 15th sowings yielding superior results. The pronounced
 283 effect of sowing dates on various growth and yield parameters of groundnuts, including plant height,
 284 number of branches per plant, pegs per plant, pods per plant, and haulm dry weight, underscores the
 285 influence of environmental factors like temperature, daylight duration, and rainfall, which fluctuate with
 286 sowing dates, on groundnut performance. Similar findings were reported by Sardana and Kandhola

287 [40]. Ramani *et al.* [41] similarly voiced this perspective, noting that early-sown crops tend to yield
288 more seeds than late-sown crops. The significant effect of sowing dates on various growth and yield
289 parameters of groundnuts, such as plant height, number of branches per plant, pegs per plant, pods
290 per plant, and haulm dry weight, suggests that environmental factors like temperature, daylight
291 duration, and rainfall, which vary with sowing dates, affect groundnut performance. This underscores
292 the importance of selecting the appropriate sowing time to ensure optimal environmental conditions
293 for improved yield parameters and ultimately, grain yield. The substantial yield increase observed in
294 early sowing compared to delay sowing dates could be attributed to the allocation of a larger
295 proportion of total dry matter into various plant components. This highlights the significance of
296 selecting the appropriate sowing time to ensure optimal environmental conditions for improved yield
297 parameters and ultimately, grain yield.

298 3.4 The influence of planting density on crop yield

299 The data also showed that a planting density of 2.50 lac ha⁻¹, along with a planting density of
300 3.33 lac ha⁻¹, resulted in the highest kernel yield, pod yield, and harvest index for groundnut, and
301 these two planting densities were statistically comparable (Table 3). In contrast, a planting density of
302 1.67 lac ha⁻¹ yielded the lowest kernel and pod yield, as well as the lowest harvest index. This lower
303 yield at the 1.67 lac ha⁻¹ planting density can be attributed to the very low plant population. This lower
304 yield at the 1.67 lac ha⁻¹ planting density can be attributed to the very low plant population [42]. The
305 higher harvest index associated with higher plant populations can be explained by the fact that while
306 the yield per individual plant decreased with increased plant density, the total number of plants per
307 hectare increased with higher planting density. Consequently, the kernel yield and pod yield per
308 hectare increased with higher planting densities. These results align with previous studies by Rasekh
309 *et al.* [32] and Kumawat *et al.* [43]. The higher harvest index associated with higher plant populations
310 can be explained by the fact that while the yield per individual plant decreased with increased plant
311 density, the total number of plants per hectare increased with higher planting density. Consequently,
312 the kernel yield and pod yield per hectare increased with higher planting densities. Furthermore,
313 haulm yield exhibited a significant increase with increasing planting density from 1.67 lac ha⁻¹ to 3.33
314 lac ha⁻¹ (Table 3). This increase in haulm yield may be attributed to the higher plant height and
315 increased dry matter production per hectare, owing to the higher plant population per unit area. These
316 findings are consistent with the research conducted by Jadhav *et al.* [44], Hirwe *et al.* [45], and
317 Soumya *et al.* [46]. Various studies in different regions have highlighted the effect of planting density
318 and row spacing on groundnut yield, Onat *et al.* [25] in Turkey observed that increasing plant density
319 resulted in higher pod yield per hectare. In Pakistan, narrow-row planting with a spacing of 30 cm
320 yielded significantly more (3739 kg/ha) compared to wide-row planting with a spacing of 60 cm (1903
321 kg/ha) [34]. Research in Vietnam found that plant densities and row spacing of 350,000 plants per
322 hectare (25 cm × 25 cm with two plants per hill) and 400,000 plants per hectare (25 cm × 20 cm with
323 two plants per hill) were suitable for achieving high yields [26]. In Australia, Bell *et al.* [47] reported an
324 increase in total dry matter and pod yields with increasing plant density under fully irrigated
325 conditions. Different cultivars showed varying responses, with the best cultivar (chico) achieving the
326 highest total dry matter and pod yields at a density of 352,000 plants per hectare. These findings are
327 consistent with Wright and Bell [48] and Kaushik *et al.* [42], who also observed that increased inter-
328 row spacing led to higher pod yield per hectare. However, the results from Dapaah *et al.* [49]
329 indicated a different outcome during drier seasons in 2009. They found that the highest plant density
330 of 333,000 plants per hectare increased pod yield by 29 to 46% and seed yield by 28 to 44%
331 compared to lower plant densities. This suggests that in drier seasons, higher plant density might
332 provide an advantage in moisture conservation, especially once crop canopy closure is achieved.
333 Ojelade *et al.* [50] attributed the enhanced growth and yield of groundnut with narrow intra-row
334 spacing to reduced competition from weeds for vital resources like light, nutrients, space, and water.
335 This reduction in weed competition was achieved through the smothering effect of groundnut on late-
336 emerging weeds, which was more effective with narrow plant spacing compared to wider spacing. In
337 the context of our study, the application of recommended double weeding likely contributed to
338 increased yield by facilitating the efficient utilization of available resources when plants were optimally
339 spaced. However, Dapaah *et al.* [49] recommended different planting densities under favourable
340 conditions in the forest-savannah transitional agroecological zone of Ghana. They suggested a
341 medium planting density of 166,700 plants per hectare (60 cm × 20 cm with two plants per hill) and
342 200,000 plants per hectare (50 cm × 20 cm with two plants per hill) as optimal. In Bangladesh,
343 research indicated that the optimal spacing for maximum yield varied depending on groundnut variety.
344 Erect (bunch) groundnut varieties were found to perform best with narrower spacing (30 cm × 10 cm),


345 while spreading or semi-spreading groundnut varieties required wider spacing (40 cm × 20 cm) to
 346 achieve their full yield potential [24]. These findings emphasize the importance of tailoring planting
 347 densities and spacing to the specific characteristics of the groundnut variety and local agroecological
 348 conditions for optimal yield. These diverse findings underscore the importance of considering local
 349 agroecological conditions, rainfall patterns, and cultivar characteristics when determining the most
 350 suitable planting density and row spacing for groundnut cultivation to maximize yield potential.
 351 Moreover, interaction between sowing dates and planting density was notably significant, especially in
 352 relation to pod yield and kernel yield (as shown in Table 4 and represented in Figure 1, 2, and 3).

353 **Table 4:** The combined effect of sowing date and planting density on groundnut yield (kg/ha),
 354 considering the pooled data from 2017 to 2019.
 355

Treatment s	Pod yield (kg ha ⁻¹)			Kernel yield (kg ha ⁻¹)			Haulm yield (kg ha ⁻¹)		
	Sowin g at 15 May	Sowin g at 30 May	Sowin g at 15 June	Sowin g at 15 May	Sowin g at 30 May	Sowin g at 15 June	Sowin g at 15 May	Sowin g at 30 May	Sowin g at 15 June
Planting density									
1.67 lac ha ⁻¹	2717.0	3575.7	3517.3	2075.9 d	2702.2 b	2642.4 b	5561.9	5432.9	5090.9
2.50 lac ha ⁻¹	3451.4	4235.1	4226.8	2403.8 c	2921.6 a	2911.5 a	5887.8	5577.3	5269.3
3.33 lac ha ⁻¹	3943.5	4033.9	3941.2	2737.6 b	2749.7 b	2650.5 b	6185.2	5620.8	5272.7
SEm±	81.03			60.56			42.58		
CD at 5%	229.76			171.71			120.73		

356 a is significantly superior to b; b is significantly superior to c. SEm is standard error of the mean; CD
 357 denotes the critical difference. NS represents non-significance.
 358

359



360

361
 362
 363
 364

Figure 2: The combined effect of sowing date and planting density on groundnut pod yield (kg/ha) for the pooled years 2017-2019.




Figure 3: The synergistic influence of sowing date and planting density on groundnut kernel yield (kg/ha) across the collective years of 2017 to 2019.

3.5 The combined influence of sowing dates and planting density on crop yield

The interaction effect between sowing dates and planting density was found to be significant, particularly concerning pod yield and kernel yield (Table 4 and Figure 1, 2, and 3). The highest pod yield and kernel yield were recorded when the planting density was 2.50 lac ha⁻¹, regardless of whether sowing was done on May 30th or June 15th. However, when sowing occurred on May 15th, the highest haulm yield was obtained with a planting density of 3.33 lac ha⁻¹. Increasing planting density significantly increased pod yield, kernel yield, and haulm yield when sowing took place from May 15th to May 30th, up to a planting density of 3.33 lac ha⁻¹. However, for groundnut sown on May 30th and June 15th, the optimal planting density was 2.50 lac ha⁻¹. Optimal plant population densities also have a positive effect on growth hormones such as auxins and their interaction with light [51]. These optimal plant populations are particularly beneficial in favorable environmental conditions, contributing to optimized growth and yield parameters in short-season production systems. Further, variations in environmental factors such as temperature and rainfall during different growth periods, interacting with plant density, may have played a role in differences in crop phenology. These findings are consistent with the research conducted by Giayetto *et al.* [52] and Rasekh *et al.* [32]. A strong association between the mean photosynthetically active radiation (PQ) and the number of pods and seeds in pea, which is another leguminous crop [53]. It was also reported that variations in haulm yield associated with different sowing dates. The increased yield attributes observed during early sowing dates likely played a role in achieving a higher harvest index. This outcome can be attributed to the more efficient partitioning of produced dry matter, resulting in a greater grain yield. Billore *et al.* [54] similarly noted that early sowing led to higher yields, which they attributed to the elevated values of the harvest index in soybean. Furthermore, Bagnall and King [14, 15] highlighted a significant reduction in dry matter production due to the low irradiance levels. The taller plants observed at a planting density of 3.33 lac ha⁻¹ can be attributed to increased competition among crops to intercept radiation. Moreover, plants at higher densities tend to allocate more resources to stem growth at the expense of reproductive tissue, ultimately resulting in increased haulm yield. It was also reported that variations in haulm yield associated with different sowing dates. The increased yield attributes observed during early sowing dates likely played a role in achieving a higher harvest index.

365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397

398 **3.6 The effect of sowing date on the Benefit-to-Cost (B,C) ratio**

399 The net return and benefit-to-cost (B,C) ratio of groundnut exhibited significant differences
 400 among various sowing dates (Table 3). Sowing on May 30th, while statistically similar to sowing on
 401 June 15th, resulted in significantly higher net returns and B,C ratios compared to sowing on May 15th.
 402 This difference in profitability can be attributed to the increased pod and haulm yield of the groundnut
 403 crop, which was more pronounced in the treatment where sowing occurred on May 30th. Halvankar *et*
 404 *al.* [55] reported an increase in test weight associated with early sowing. Further, early sowing
 405 demonstrated higher gross returns, net returns, and B, C ratios compared to delayed sowing. Among
 406 the various sowing dates, June 28th sowing resulted in the highest gross returns, net returns, and B, C
 407 ratio, surpassing the results of July 14th and July 29th sowings in soybean [56].
 408

409 **3.7 The influence of planting density on the Benefit-to-Cost (B,C) ratio**


410 There were significant differences in net returns among various planting densities for groundnut.
 411 Planting densities of 2.50 lac ha⁻¹ and 3.33 lac ha⁻¹, while statistically similar to each other, resulted in
 412 significantly higher net returns compared to a planting density of 1.67 lac ha⁻¹ (Table 3). Similarly, the
 413 Benefit-to-Cost (B,C) ratio of groundnut varied significantly with different planting densities. A planting
 414 density of 2.50 lac ha⁻¹ yielded a significantly higher B,C ratio compared to planting densities of 1.67
 415 lac ha⁻¹ and 3.33 lac ha⁻¹. This difference in profitability can be attributed to the increased pod and
 416 haulm yield of the groundnut crop, which was more pronounced in the treatment with a planting
 417 density of 2.50 lac ha⁻¹. Despite the fact that all the yield-related characteristics exhibited better
 418 performance at wider spacing, these enhancements were not adequate to offset the yields achieved
 419 through a higher plant population per unit area resulting from closer spacing. Rajput and Kaushik [57]
 420 also reported a greater number of seed pods per plant at lower plant densities. Despite the fact that
 421 all the yield-related characteristics exhibited better performance at wider spacing, these
 422 enhancements were not adequate to offset the yields achieved through a higher plant population per
 423 unit area resulting from closer spacing. This increase in seed yield at closer spacings corresponds
 424 with the findings reported by Manjappa *et al.* [58] and Sundari [59]. Moreover, the interaction effect
 425 between the sowing date and planting density was found to be significant, particularly concerning
 426 economic parameters (as shown in Table 5 and depicted in Figure 4 and 5).
 427

428 **Table 5:** The interplay between sowing date and planting density's influence on the Net Return and
 429 Benefit-to-Cost (B:C) Ratio of groundnut, utilizing the pooled data from 2017 to 2019.
 430

Treatments	Net Return (Rs ha ⁻¹)			B : C Ratio		
	Sowing at 15 May	Sowing at 30 May	Sowing at 15 June	Sowing at 15 May	Sowing at 30 May	Sowing at 15 June
Planting density						
1.67 lac ha ⁻¹	85564	116867	114672	3.67	4.83	4.95b
2.50 lac ha ⁻¹	108829	136640a	136602a	4.02	4.96b	5.14a
3.33 lac ha ⁻¹	123566b	125189b	122121b	4.09	4.25	4.30
SEm±	3024.41			0.09		
CD at 5%	8575.20			0.26		


431 a is significantly superior to b; b is significantly superior to c. SEm is standard error of the mean; CD
 432 denotes the critical difference. NS represents non-significance.

433



434
435
436
437

Figure 4: The combined effect of sowing date and planting density on groundnut haulm yield (kg/ha), taking into account the years 2017 to 2019.




438
439
440
441
442
443
444

Figure 5: The combined effect of sowing date and planting density on groundnut's net returns (Rs/ha), considering the years 2017 to 2019.

3.8 The combined influence and interaction effects of sowing dates and planting density on the Benefit-to-Cost (B,C) ratio

445
446
447
448
449
450
451

The interaction effect between the sowing date and planting density was found to be significant, particularly concerning economic parameters (as shown in Table 5 and depicted in Figure 4 and 5). The highest net return and Benefit-to-Cost (B,C) ratio were recorded when the planting density was 2.50 lac ha⁻¹, regardless of whether sowing was done on May 30th or June 15th. However, for groundnut sown on May 15th, the optimal net return was achieved with planting densities ranging from 1.67 lac to 3.33 lac ha⁻¹. The increasing planting density significantly increased net returns up to a planting density range of 1.67 lac to 3.33 lac ha⁻¹ when sowing was conducted on May 15th (Figure 6).



452

453 **Figure 6:** The interplay between sowing date and planting density's influence on the Benefit-to-Cost
 454 (B:C) Ratio of groundnut (Rs/ha), aggregated for the years 2017 to 2019.

455 However, for groundnut sown on May 30th and June 15th, the net return was maximized at a
 456 planting density of 2.50 lac ha⁻¹. These disparities in crop performance and economic outcomes can
 457 be attributed to variations in environmental factors, including temperature and rainfall during different
 458 growth periods, which interacted with plant density and influenced crop phenology. These findings
 459 align with previous research conducted by Giayetto *et al.* [52] and Rasekh *et al.* [32]. The positive
 460 correlation observed between narrower plant spacing and increased plant height can be ascribed to
 461 heightened inter-plant competition. This competition leads to internodal elongation, a phenomenon
 462 that has been documented by Halvankar *et al.* [55] in soybean. Arnon [60] suggested that there is a
 463 linear increase in dry matter yield with higher plant density across various crops. Collectively, these
 464 findings demonstrated that the timing of sowing and the choice of planting density emerge as crucial
 465 factors for enhancing groundnut productivity in this specific region, particularly in light of the evolving
 466 climate conditions.

467

468 4. CONCLUSION

469

470 Groundnut is a highly significant oilseed crop worldwide. However, its growth, development, and
 471 overall productivity are significantly affected by the adverse impacts of global climate change. In this
 472 study, we examined the impact of various sowing dates and planting densities on the yield and
 473 economic aspects of groundnut in hot arid region of India. The findings showed that different sowing
 474 dates and planting densities significantly influenced groundnut yield and economic viability. A
 475 comparative analysis indicated that sowing on May 30th, although statistically similar to June 15th,
 476 resulted in the highest number of branches, pegs, pods per plant, kernel and pod yield, net return,
 477 and benefit-cost ratio. Interestingly, the highest haulm yield per hectare was achieved with the May
 478 15th sowing, yet the harvest index improved progressively as sowing was delayed from May 15th to
 479 June 15th. Furthermore, utilizing a planting density of 1.67 lakh plants per hectare yielded the
 480 maximum numbers of branches, pegs, pods, kernels per pod, seed index, and shelling percentage. In
 481 an intriguing interplay between sowing dates and plant populations, the most favourable pod yield,
 482 kernel yield, and net return were achieved with a planting density of 2.50 lakh plants per hectare for
 483 the May 30th sowing. These findings highlight the significant impact of sowing date and planting
 484 density on yield-related characteristics, which ultimately affect groundnut yield in the challenging hot
 485 arid region. Therefore, the timing of sowing and the choice of planting density are crucial for

486 enhancing groundnut productivity in this specific region, particularly in the context of changing climate
487 conditions. However, to fully maximize yield and profitability, further research is needed, including
488 studies on breeding and management practices tailored to such environments.
489

490 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

491 This project was supported by Researchers Supporting Project Number (RSP2025R7) King Saud
492 University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.
493

494 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

495 The manuscript was conceptualized, designed, and written by M.L.R., B.S.K., and M.S.K.. The
496 valuable feedback provided by S.C., N.K., R.P., S.-M.C., S.A.A., M.J.A., M.B., S.T., A.M., and S.K. All
497 authors have read and consented to the published version of the manuscript.
498
499

500 **DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**

501 Data is available in the manuscript.
502

503 **Disclaimer (Artificial intelligence)**

504 Option 1:

505 Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models
506 (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc) and text-to-image generators have been used during writing or editing of
507 manuscripts.
508

509 Option 2:

510 Author(s) hereby declare that generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models, etc have
511 been used during writing or editing of manuscripts. This explanation will include list the name, version,
512 model, and source of the generative AI technology and as well as the all input prompts provided to a
513 generative AI technology
514

515 Details of the AI usage are given below:

- 516 1.
- 517 2.
- 518 3.

519 **REFERENCES**

- 520 1. Zhang X, Zhu L, Ren M, Xiang C, Tang X, Xia Y, *et al.* Genome-Wide Association Studies
521 Revealed the Genetic Loci and Candidate Genes of Pod-Related Traits in Peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*
522 L.). *Agronomy*. 2023;13(7):1863.
- 523 2. Stalker H. Peanut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *Field crops research*. 1997;53(1-3):205-17.
- 524 3. Ansari M, Prakash N, Punitha P, Baishya L. Post-harvest management and value addition of
525 groundnut. ICAR Research Complex for NEH Region, Manipur Centre, Lamphelpat, Imphal-795004.
526 2015.
- 527 4. Caliskan S, Caliskan M, Arslan M, Arioglu H. Effects of sowing date and growth duration on growth
528 and yield of groundnut in a Mediterranean-type environment in Turkey. *Field Crops Research*.
529 2008;105(1-2):131-40.
- 530 5. Variath MT, Janila P. Economic and academic importance of peanut. *The Peanut Genome*. 2017;7-
531 26.
- 532 6. Reddy T, Reddy V, Anbumozhi V. Physiological responses of groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) to
533 drought stress and its amelioration: a critical review. *Plant Growth Regulation*. 2003;41:75-88.
- 534 7. Toomer OT. Nutritional chemistry of the peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*). *Critical Reviews In Food*
535 *Science and Nutrition*. 2018;58(17):3042-53.
- 536 8. Gulluoglu L, Bakal H, Bihter O, Cemal K, Arioglu H. The effect of harvesting date on some
537 agronomic and quality characteristics of peanut grown in the Mediterranean region of Turkey. *Turkish*
538 *Journal of Field Crops*. 2016;21(2):224-32.
- 539 9. Ndjunga J, Ibro A, Cisse Y, Ben Ahmed MI, Moutari A AA, Kodio O MS, *et al.* Characterizing
540 village economies in major groundnut producing countries in West Africa: cases of Mali, Niger and
541 Nigeria. ICRISAT, 89 pp. 2010.
- 542 10. Vara Prasad P, Craufurd P, Summerfield R. Effect of high air and soil temperature on dry matter
543 production, pod yield and yield components of groundnut. *Plant and Soil*. 2000;222(1-2):231-9.
544

- 545 11. Craufurd P, Prasad PV, Summerfield R. Dry matter production and rate of change of harvest
546 index at high temperature in peanut. *Crop Science*. 2002;42(1):146-51.
- 547 12. Ketring D. Temperature effects on vegetative and reproductive development of peanut 1, 2. *Crop*
548 *Science*. 1984;24(5):877-82.
- 549 13. Prasad PVV, Craufurd PQ, Kakani VG, Wheeler TR, Boote KJ. Influence of high temperature
550 during pre-and post-anthesis stages of floral development on fruit-set and pollen germination in
551 peanut. *Functional Plant Biology*. 2001;28(3):233-40.
- 552 14. Bagnall D, King R. Response of peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*) to temperature, photoperiod and
553 irradiance 1. Effect on flowering. *Field Crops Research*. 1991;26(3-4):263-77.
- 554 15. Bagnall D, King R. Response of peanut (*Arachis hypogaea*) to temperature, photoperiod and
555 irradiance 2. Effect on peg and pod development. *Field Crops Research*. 1991;26(3-4):279-93.
- 556 16. Nigam S, Nageswara Rao R, Wynne J. Effects of temperature and photoperiod on vegetative and
557 reproductive growth of groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *Journal of Agronomy and Crop Science*.
558 1998;181(2):117-24.
- 559 17. Desmae H, Sako D, Konate D. Optimum plant density for increased groundnut pod yield and
560 economic benefits in the semi-arid tropics of West Africa. *Agronomy*. 2022;12(6):1474.
- 561 18. Morla F, Giayetto O, Fernandez E, Cerioni G, Cerliani C. Plant density and peanut crop yield
562 (*Arachis hypogaea*) in the peanut growing region of Córdoba (Argentina). *Peanut Science*.
563 2018;45(2):82-6.
- 564 19. Bell M. Effect of sowing date on growth and development of irrigated peanuts, *Arachis hypogaea*
565 L. cv. Early Bunch, in a monsoonal tropical environment. *Australian Journal of Agricultural Research*.
566 1986;37(4):361-73.
- 567 20. Gardner F, Auma E. Canopy structure, light interception, and yield and market quality of peanut
568 genotypes as influenced by planting pattern and planting date. *Field Crops Research*. 1989;20(1):13-
569 29.
- 570 21. Mazingo RW, Coffelt TA, Wright FS. The influence of planting and digging dates on yield, value,
571 and grade of four Virginia-type peanut cultivars. *Peanut Science*. 1991;18(1):55-62.
- 572 22. Ntare B, Williams J, Ndunguru B. Effects of seasonal variation in temperature and cultivar on yield
573 and yield determination of irrigated groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea*) during the dry season in the Sahel
574 of West Africa. *The Journal of Agricultural Science*. 1998;131(4):439-48.
- 575 23. Janila P, Mula M. Cultural Management Practices of Groundnut: Scaling-up of Improved
576 Groundnut Varieties through Established Seed System in Various Cropping Systems of Smallholder
577 Farmers in Odisha. 2015.
- 578 24. Howlader S, Bashar H, Islam M, Mamun M, Jahan S. Effect of plant spacings on the yield and
579 yield attributes of groundnut. *International Journal of Sustainable Crop Production* 2009;4(1):41-4.
- 580 25. Bihter O, Bakal H, Gulluoglu L, Arioglu H. The effects of row spacing and plant density on yield
581 and yield components of peanut grown as a double crop in Mediterranean environment in Turkey.
582 *Turkish Journal of Field Crops*. 2016;22(1):71-80.
- 583 26. Minh TX, Thanh NC, Thin TH, Tieng NT, Giang NTH. Effects of plant density and row spacing on
584 yield and yield components of peanut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) on the coastal sandy land area in Nghe
585 an province, vietnam. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Research*. 2021;55(4):468-72.
- 586 27. Ajeigbe HA, Kamara A, Kuniha A, Inuwa A, Adinoyi A. Response of groundnut to plant density
587 and phosphorous application in the Sudan Savanna zone of Nigeria. 2016.
- 588 28. Smith CW, Cothren JT. Cotton: origin, history, technology, and production. John Wiley & Sons;
589 1999.
- 590 29. Mukhtar A. Performance of three groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) varieties as affected by basin
591 size and plant population at Kadawa. A dissertation of Doctor of philosophy (Agronomy) submitted to
592 the School of Postgraduate Studies, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. 2009:148-9.
- 593 30. Babu C, Ramah K, Selvaraju R. Heat unit requirements of field grown groundnut varieties. *The*
594 *Madras Agricultural Journal*. 2004;91:184-9.
- 595 31. Ruigu GM. Integration of nutrition into agricultural and rural development projects. 2011.
- 596 32. Rasekh H, Asghari J, Massoumi S, Zakerinejad R. Effect of planting pattern and plant density on
597 physiological characteristics and yield of peanut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) in Iran. *Research Journal of*
598 *Biological Sciences*. 2010;5(8):542-7.
- 599 33. Sternitzke D, Lamb M, Davidson Jr J, Barron R, Bennet C. Impact of plant spacing and population
600 on yield for single-row nonirrigated peanuts (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *Peanut Science*. 2000;27(2):52-6.
- 601 34. Ahmad N, Rahim M, Khan U. Evaluation of different varieties, seed rates and row spacing of
602 groundnut, planted under agro-ecological conditions of Malakand Division. *Journal of Agronomy*.
603 2007.

- 604 35. Tana MGT, Urage E. Effect of planting density on yield components and yield of Groundnut
605 (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) varieties at Abeya, Borena Zone Southern Ethiopia. 2017.
- 606 36. Naab J, Tsigbey F, Prasad P, Boote K, Bailey J, Brandenburg R. Effects of sowing date and
607 fungicide application on yield of early and late maturing peanut cultivars grown under rainfed
608 conditions in Ghana. *Crop Protection*. 2005;24(4):325-32.
- 609 37. Vadez V, Halilou O, Hissene HM, Sibiry-Traore P, Sinclair TR, Soltani A. Mapping water stress
610 incidence and intensity, optimal plant populations, and cultivar duration for African groundnut
611 productivity enhancement. *Frontiers in Plant Science*. 2017;8:432.
- 612 38. M El Naim A, A Eldouma M, A Ibrahim E, Zaied M. Influence of plant spacing and weeds on
613 growth and yield of peanut (*Arachis hypogaea* L) in rain-fed of Sudan. 2011.
- 614 39. Okello DK, Kaaya AN, Bisikwa J, Were M, Oloka HK. Management of aflatoxins in groundnuts: A
615 manual for farmers, processors, traders and consumers in Uganda. National Agricultural Research
616 Organization; 2010.
- 617 40. Sardana V, Kandhola S. Productivity of semi-spreading and bunch type varieties of groundnut as
618 influenced by sowing dates. 2007.
- 619 41. Ramani B, Modhwadia M, Malaviya D. Response of soybean to dates of sowing and row spacings
620 under varying plant densities. *Gujarat Agricultural University Research Journal*. 1996;21:93-5.
- 621 42. Kaushik M, Chaubey A. Response of rainy season bunch groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) to row
622 spacing and seed rate. *Crop Research (Hisar)*. 2000;20(3):407-10.
- 623 43. Kumawat BMS, Yadav R. Effect of planting geometry and nitrogen management on groundnut
624 (*Arachis hypogaea*) in loamy sand soil of Rajasthan. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*.
625 2011;81(1):86-8.
- 626 44. Jadhav G, Shinde B, Suryawanshi M. Comparative performance of groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea*
627 L.) genotypes under varying row and plant spacing in post-monsoon environment. *Journal of Oilseeds*
628 *Research*. 2000;17(1):70-6.
- 629 45. Hirwe N, Ulemale R, Paslawar A, Thakur M, Anokar D. Productivity and economics of groundnut
630 influenced by plant density under polythene film mulch. *Annals Of Plant Physiology*. 2006;20(1):148.
- 631 46. Soumya B, Devi KS, Lakshmi YS, Maheshwari K. Studies on seed rate for promising groundnut
632 varieties under rainfed conditions of Southern Telangana zone, Andhra Pradesh. The Global users
633 can now retrieve the articles from Journal on the repository of Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux
634 International (CABI) on. 2011.
- 635 47. Bell M, Harch G, Wright G. Plant population studies on peanut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) in
636 subtropical Australia. 1. Growth under fully irrigated conditions. *Australian Journal of Experimental*
637 *Agriculture*. 1991;31(4):535-43.
- 638 48. Wright G, Bell M. Plant population studies on peanut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) in subtropical
639 Australia. 3. Growth and water use during a terminal drought stress. *Australian Journal of*
640 *Experimental Agriculture*. 1992;32(2):197-203.
- 641 49. Dapaah H, Mohammed I, Awuah RT. Phenological development and yield of three groundnut
642 varieties as influenced by plant density in a forest-savanna transition zone. *International Journal of*
643 *Agricultural Research*. 2014;9(2):87-98.
- 644 50. Ojelade OB, Lagoke ST, Adigun JA, Babalola O, Daramola O, Osipitan O. Intra-row spacing and
645 weed control influence growth and yield of groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *Advances in Agricultural*
646 *Science*. 2018;6(4):01-11.
- 647 51. Gan Y, Liu P, Stevenson F, McDonald C. Interrelationships among yield components of chickpea
648 in semiarid environments. *Canadian Journal of Plant Science*. 2003;83(4):759-67.
- 649 52. Giayetto O, Cerioni G, Asnal W. Effect of sowing spacing on vegetative growth, dry matter
650 production, and peanut pod yield. *Peanut Science*. 1998;25(2):86-7.
- 651 53. Poggio S, Satorre E, Dethiou S, Gonzalo G. Pod and seed numbers as a function of photothermal
652 quotient during the seed set period of field pea (*Pisum sativum*) crops. *European Journal of*
653 *Agronomy*. 2005;22(1):55-69.
- 654 54. Billore S, Joshi O, Ramesh A. Performance of soybean (*Glycine max*) genotypes on different
655 sowing dates and row spacings in Vertisols. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 2000;70(9):577-
656 80.
- 657 55. Halvankar G, Taware S, Raut V. Response of soybean varieties to sowing dates during summer
658 season. *Journal of Maharashtra Agricultural Universities*. 2001;26(1-3):223-4.
- 659 56. Sivakumar B, Reddy MS, Kavitha P, Reddy ST. Influence of sowing dates and plant densities on
660 yield attributes and yield of soybean (*Glycine max* (L.) Merrill). *Journal of Pharmacognosy and*
661 *Phytochemistry*. 2018;7(5):2960-3.
- 662 57. Rajput R, Kaushik J. Effect of irrigation, phosphorus and row spacing on yield and economic
663 return of soyabean. *Gujarat Agricultural University Research Journal (India)*. 1992.

664 58. Manjappa K, Mutnal S, Joshi V. Influence of spacing and fertilizer levels on seed yield of soybean
665 grown on residual moisture in paddy fallows. *Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Sciences*.
666 2002;15(1):139-41.

667 59. Sundari A. Response of soybean to sowing dates, plant density and phosphorus levels. *Advances*
668 *in Plant Sciences*. 2003;16(1):243-6.

669 60. Arnon I. *Crop production In dry regions. Volume 1: Background and principles*. London, Leonard
670 Hill.; 1971.

671

672 61. Reddemma, K., Reddy, M. S., & Tej, M. K. (2024). Performance of Rabi Blackgram (*Vigna*
673 *mungo*L.) under Different Sowing Windows. *Journal of Experimental Agriculture International*, 46(6),
674 30–44. <https://doi.org/10.9734/jeai/2024/v46i62454>

675 62. T. Mends-Cole, M., K. Banful, B., & K. Tandoh, P. (2019). Flower Abortion and Fruit Yield
676 Responses of Two Varieties of Chilli Pepper (*Capsicum frutescens* L.) to Different Planting Dates and
677 Plant Densities. *Archives of Current Research International*, 16(1), 1–11.
678 <https://doi.org/10.9734/ACRI/2019/46845>

679 63. Khan A, Najeeb U, Wang L, Tan DK, Yang G, Munsif F, Ali S, Hafeez A. Planting density and
680 sowing date strongly influence growth and lint yield of cotton crops. *Field Crops Research*. 2017 Aug
681 1;209:129-35.

682

683

684

685

686

687

688

689

690