

Nutrient uptake of maize as influenced by intercropping with different genotype of groundnut under temperate Kashmir valley

Abstract :

A field experiment on "Nutrient uptake of maize as influenced by intercropping with different genotype of groundnut under temperate Kashmir valley" was conducted at Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology of Kashmir, Wadura, Sopore during 2021 and 2022. The experimental soil exhibited silty clay loam characteristics with adequate drainage and normal levels of both reaction and salinity. The experimental treatments comprised of sole crops and various row proportions of maize intercropped with groundnut. The experimental design was randomized complete block design, consist nineteen treatments that were replicated three times. Treatment comprised of T₁ (Sole maize, 60cm), T₂ (sole paired maize, 75-45-75 cm), T₃ (Sole paired maize, 90-30-90 cm), T₄ (Sole groundnut TG-84), T₅ (Sole groundnut TG-37-A), T₆ (Sole groundnut TG-88), T₇ (Sole groundnut TG-89), T₈ Alternate row of maize + groundnut TG-84 (30 + 30cm), T₉ Paired row of maize + groundnut TG-84 (75-45-75 cm maize in between 25-25cm groundnut), T₁₀ Paired row of maize + groundnut TG-84 (90-30-90 cm maize in between 30-30cm groundnut), T₁₁ Alternate row of maize + groundnut TG-37-A (30 + 30 cm) T₁₂ Paired row of maize + groundnut TG-37-A (75-45-75 cm maize in between 25-25cm groundnut), T₁₃ paired row of maize + Groundnut TG-37-A (90-30-90 cm maize in between 30-30cm groundnut), T₁₄ Alternate rows of maize + Groundnut TG-88 (30 + 30 cm), T₁₅ Paired row of maize + groundnut TG-88 (75-45-75 cm maize in between 25-25cm groundnut), T₁₆ Paired row of maize + groundnut TG-88 (90-30-90 cm maize in between 30-30cm groundnut), T₁₇ Alternate rows of maize + groundnut TG-89 (30 + 30 cm), T₁₈ Paired row of maize + groundnut TG-89 (75-45-75 cm maize in between 25-25cm groundnut), T₁₉ Paired row of maize + groundnut TG-89 (90-30-90 cm maize in between 30-30cm groundnut). The two years of result revealed that intercropping increased the total N, P and K enhancing yield of both the crop. Total N, P and K uptake was recorded significantly higher with paired row of maize (75/45 cm spacing) in intercrop with groundnut variety TG-37 as compared to sole maize. In intercrop N, P and K uptake was recorded significantly higher in sole groundnut variety TG-37 followed by TG-84, TG-88 and TG-89.

Introduction

Current global agriculture is under significant pressure due to the challenges of continuous population growth, the looming threat of climate change, reduction in available farmland, and the depletion and pollution of water resources. Additionally, evolving consumer demands contribute to the complex landscape faced by agriculture today (Hossain et al., 2021; Zaman et al., 2017; Maitra et al., 2018). In nations such as India, where a substantial proportion of farmers fall within the small and marginal categories, challenges abound. These include the year-round engagement of family labour, the imperative to produce an ample supply of nutritionally rich foods, and the pursuit of livelihood enhancement. Given these circumstances, there is a recognized necessity to maximize productivity per unit area and optimize resource utilization. Intercropping emerges as a viable solution in this context, holding the potential to enhance both crop yield and farm income within a unit area, showcasing superior land use efficiency (Gitari et al., 2020). Additionally, intercropping is acknowledged for its reduced input requirements, specifically in terms of chemical fertilizers and pesticides, leading to the production of environmentally safe food in a sustainable manner (Maitra and Gitari, 2020; Duvvada and Maitra, 2020). Intercropping is a traditional agricultural practice involving the simultaneous cultivation of two or more crops in the same field (Willey, 1979; Maitra, 2020). In essence, it can be affirmed that intercropping has the potential to contribute to poverty alleviation, hunger reduction, and the provision of nutritious foods for small-scale farmers. In this context, maize (*Zea mays* L.) stands out as a particularly

suitable choice, as highlighted in research findings (Panda et al., 2021). The primary goal of intercropping is to enhance productivity within a given land area and time frame by utilizing land resources and farming inputs, including labour, in an equitable and judicious manner. This is achieved without compromising the yield of the main crop, as emphasized by Marer et al., 2007. In maize-based cropping systems, incorporating legumes is considered a favourable alternative for enhancing nitrogen economy and increasing maize yield. Additionally, legumes contribute to bonus yield, heightened productivity per unit of time and space, and increased net returns compared to monoculture (Seran and Brintha, 2010). This is attributed to the differential rooting habits, varied growth patterns, resource demands, and complementary interactions facilitated by nitrogen fixation in legumes, which result in substantial organic biomass (leaves, nodules, roots, etc.). According to Kamanga et al. (2010), The observation in farmers' fields revealed that intercropping legume crops with maize resulted in the greatest quantity of vegetative biomass (Amos et al., 2012). Globally, maize is cultivated across an expanse of 193.7 million hectares, yielding a total production of 1147.7 million metric tonnes and achieving a productivity rate of 5.75 tonnes per hectare (FAO, 2020). Within the roster of maize-growing nations, India holds the 4th position in terms of cultivated area and the 7th position in terms of production (Anonymous, 2022). The United States stands as the leading maize producer, accounting for approximately 36% of the total production, which amounts to 30.2 million metric tonnes (DES, 2020). In the region of Jammu and Kashmir, maize is cultivated across an area spanning 0.31 million hectares, resulting in a production output of 0.51 million tonnes and a productivity rate of 1.65 tonnes per hectare.

Material and Methods

The study took place at the Faculty of Agriculture during the kharif season of 2021 and 2022 at Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology of Kashmir, Wadura, Sopore. The experimental soil exhibited silty clay loam characteristics with adequate drainage and normal levels of both reaction and salinity. Throughout the crop period, during 2021 the mean temperature varied between 35.5°C and 6.7°C. During 2022 the mean temperature varied between 32.6°C and 4.6°C. The cumulative precipitation amounted during 2021 was approximately 476.3 mm, and during 2022 was 420.8 mm evenly distributed throughout the crop period. The levels of soil organic carbon and available NPK fell within the medium range. The experimental treatments comprised sole crops and various row proportions of maize intercropped with groundnut. The experimental design was randomized complete block design, consist nineteen treatments that were replicated three times. Treatment comprised of T₁ (Sole maize, 60 cm), T₂ (sole paired maize, 75-45-75 cm), T₃ (Sole paired maize, 90-30-90 cm), T₄ (Sole groundnut TG-84), T₅ (Sole groundnut TG-37-A), T₆ (Sole groundnut TG-88), T₇ (Sole groundnut TG-89), T₈ Alternate row of maize + groundnut TG- 84 (30 + 30cm), T₉ Paired row of maize + groundnut TG- 84 (75-45-75 cm maize in between 25-25cm groundnut), T₁₀ Paired row of maize + groundnut TG- 84 (90-30-90 cm maize in between 30-30cm groundnut), T₁₁ Alternate row of maize + groundnut TG- 37-A (30 + 30 cm) T₁₂ Paired row of maize + groundnut TG- 37-A (75-45-75 cm maize in between 25-25cm groundnut), T₁₃ paired row of maize + Groundnut TG- 37-A (90-30-90 cm maize in between 30-30cm groundnut), T₁₄ Alternate rows of maize + Groundnut TG- 88 (30 + 30 cm), T₁₅ Paired row of maize + groundnut TG- 88 (75-45-75 cm maize in between 25-25cm groundnut), T₁₆ Paired row of maize + groundnut TG- 88 (90-30-90 cm maize in between 30-30cm groundnut), T₁₇ Alternate rows of maize + groundnut TG- 89 (30 + 30 cm), T₁₈ Paired row of maize + groundnut TG- 89 (75-45-75 cm maize in between 25-25cm groundnut), T₁₉ Paired row of maize + groundnut TG- 89 (90-30-90 cm maize in between 30-30cm groundnut). Other management operations were carried out following the recommended package of practices for both the main and intercrops. During 2021 and 2022 the crop was sown during 22nd and 21st standard meteorological week (SMW) and harvest during 39th and 40th standard meteorological week. Statistical comparisons were conducted for all the parameters among the treatments.

Result and Discussion

The uptake of nutrients by maize and intercrops was influenced by the specific combination and proportion in the intercropping system. Nutrient like Nitrogen, Phosphorus and Pottasium uptake of maize during both the year of 2021 and 2022 were recorded significantly higher with paired row of maize (75-45-75 cm spacing) intercrop with groundnut variety TG-37 (25-25 cm) as compared to sole maize, but paired row of maize (75-45-75 cm spacing) was at par with paired row of maize (90-30-90 cm spacing) intercrop with groundnut variety TG-89. In intercrop during 2021 and 2022 nutrient uptake was recorded significantly higher with sole groundnut variety TG-37 and lowest was with TG-89, within the intercrop highest nutrient uptake were recorded with paired row of groundnut intercrop with maize (90-30-90 cm spacing). This might be due to increased nutrient uptake could be attributed to the improved availability and supply of nitrogen provided by the leguminous crops intercropped with maize. intercropping with legumes could have stimulated a diverse array of rhizosphere microbes, facilitating the mobilization of inherent phosphorus (P) and potassium (K) nutrients. This process, coupled with the fixation of nitrogen and enhancing availability by legume components, likely increased the uptake of nutrients by plants. Nutrient absorption is increased in the maize-legume intercropping system compared to sole maize cultivation (Chalka and Nepalia, 2006). Legumes and maize intercropped successfully inhibited weed development and increased potassium, phosphorus, and nitrogen uptake (Katsaruware and Manyanhaire 2009; Eskandari and Ghanbari 2010).

Table 1: Nutrient uptake of maize as influenced by intercropping with different genotype of groundnut

Treatment	Maize Nutrient Uptake kg ha ⁻¹						Treatment	Intercrop Nutrient Uptake kg ha ⁻¹					
	N		P		K			N		P		K	
	2021	2022	2021	2022	2021	2022		2021	2022	2021	2022	2021	2022
MS(60cm)	88.9	92.5	34.7	35.8	160.20	164.27	TG84(30cm)	151.83	156.61	17.53	18.92	67.06	69.33
MS (75-45-75)	97.9	97.4	42.1	42.4	164.13	179.30	TG37(30cm)	166.59	170.55	18.97	19.53	71.98	73.85
MS(90-30-90)	94.5	95.4	40.9	39.5	175.10	165.29	TG88 (30cm)	151.94	151.59	17.65	18.07	66.74	67.45
M+TG84(1:1) 30cm	105.6	107.8	43.5	49.6	183.74	186.22	TG89(30cm)	145.07	153.74	17.04	17.63	66.21	69.52
M+TG84(2:2)25cm	114.2	113.8	48.8	50.6	188.04	187.79	M+TG84(1:1) 30cm	48.03	47.22	5.07	5.19	23.02	22.38
M+TG84(2:2)30cm	105.9	110.3	45.0	47.9	183.46	186.08	M+TG84(2:2)25cm	48.46	49.35	5.44	5.77	23.45	24.25
M+TG37(1:1)30cm	112.1	114.4	46.3	50.5	180.39	185.93	M+TG84(2:2)30cm	50.34	51.85	5.78	6.24	24.05	25.00
M+TG37(2:2)25cm	116.9	119.7	53.3	54.7	199.77	201.01	M+TG37(1:1)30cm	50.94	54.18	5.52	6.03	24.00	26.14
M+TG37(2:2)30cm	112.0	117.0	50.4	50.8	197.22	199.16	M+TG37(2:2)25cm	54.30	56.42	6.30	6.55	25.67	26.88
M+TG88(1:1)30cm	101.9	107.2	43.9	46.5	175.23	177.07	M+TG37(2:2)30cm	55.16	57.65	6.38	6.58	26.38	27.23
M+TG88(2:2)25cm	111.8	107.1	50.0	50.7	184.80	185.87	M+TG88(1:1)30cm	36.83	40.90	3.99	4.41	17.37	19.19
M+TG88(2:2)30cm	107.2	107.7	44.7	48.7	181.17	185.28	M+TG88(2:2)25cm	39.19	42.29	4.16	4.79	18.42	20.35
M+TG89(1:1)30cm	102.8	103.1	47.0	47.2	189.01	192.75	M+TG88(2:2)30cm	41.07	43.25	4.60	5.24	19.13	20.52
M+TG89(2:2)25cm	110.5	116.5	49.2	52.7	187.75	192.57	M+TG89(1:1)30cm	42.65	44.66	4.52	5.15	19.58	21.59
M+TG89(2:2)30cm	108.8	114.2	43.7	50.8	184.40	190.32	M+TG89(2:2)25cm	42.19	47.20	4.70	5.94	19.44	23.39
							M+TG 89(2:2)30cm	43.93	50.40	4.94	6.22	20.27	25.33
SEM (±)	4.0	2.9	3.1	1.8	4.83	4.85	SEM (±)	4.09	3.62	0.34	0.37	1.36	0.95

CD(p<0.05)

11.7

8.3

9.0

5.4

13.99

14.05

CD(p<0.05)

11.82

10.46

0.97

1.08

3.92

2.75

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Conclusion

From the above findings it can be concluded that nutrient uptake was significantly higher with paired row of maize (75-45-75 cm spacing) in intercrop with groundnut variety TG-37 as compared to sole maize crop during both the year 2021 and 2022.

References

- Amos RN, Jens BA and Symon M 2012. On-farm evaluation of yield and economic benefits of short-term maize legume intercropping systems under conservation agriculture in Malawi, *Field Crops Research* 132: 149-157.
- Anonymous. 2022. Maize Statistics. ICAR- Indian Institute of Maize Research. <https://iimr.icar.gov.in>
- Chalka MK and Nepalia V 2006. Nutrient uptake appraisal of maize intercropped with legumes and associated weeds under the influence of weed control. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Research* 40(2): 86-91.
- Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Department of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, 2020. Pocket Book of Agriculture Statistics.
- Duvvada, S.K. and Maitra, S. 2020. Sorghum-based intercropping system for agricultural sustainability. *Indian J. Nat. Sci.*, 10(60): 20306-20313.
- Eskandari H and Ghanbari A 2010. Effect of different planting pattern of wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) and bean (*Vicia faba*) on grain yield, dry matter production and weed biomass. *Notulae Scientiae Biologicae* 2(4): 111-115.
- FAOSTAT, 202. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy. <http://www.fao.org/faostat/en#data/QC>
- Gitari, H.I., Nyawade, S.O., Kamau, S., Karanja, N.N., Gachene, C.K.K., Raza, M.A., Maitra, S. and Schulte Geldermann, E. 2020. Revisiting intercropping indices with respect to potato-legume intercropping systems. *Field Crops Res.*, 258: 107957.
- Hossain, A., Skalicky, M., Brestic, M., Maitra, S., Alam, M.A., Syed, M.A., Hossain, J., Sarkar, S., Saha, S., Bhadra, P., Shankar, T., Bhatt, R., Chaki, A.K., Sabagh, A.E.L. and Islam, T.

2021. Consequences and mitigation strategies of abiotic stresses in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) under the changing climate. *Agronomy*, 11(2): 241.
- Kamanga BC, Waddington GSR, Robertson MJ and Giller KE 2010. Risk analysis of maize-legume crop combinations with smallholder farmers varying in resource endowment in central Malawi. *Journal of Experimental Agriculture* 46: 1-21.
- Katsaruware RD and Manyanhaire IO 2009. Maize-cowpea intercropping and weed agronomy and soil science. Suppression in leaf stripped and detasselled maize in Zimbabwe. *Electronic Journal of Environmental, Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 8: 1218-1226.
- Maitra S., Zaman, A., Mandal, T.K. and Palai, J.B. 2018. Green manures in agriculture: A review, *J. Pharmacog. Phytochem.*, 7(5): 1319-1327
- Maitra, S. and Gitari, H.I. 2020. Scope for Adoption of Intercropping system in organic agriculture. *Indian J. Nat. Sci.*, 11(63): 28624-28631.
- Marer SB, Lingaraju, BS and Shashidhara GB 2007. Productivity and economics of maize and pigeon pea intercropping under rainfed condition in northern transitional zone of Karnataka. *Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Sciences* 20(1): 1-3.
- Panda, S.K., Maitra, S., Panda, P., Shankar, T., Pal, A., Sairam, M. and Praharaj, S. 2021. Productivity and competitive ability of rabi maize and legumes intercropping system. *Crop Res.*, 56(3-4): 98-104.
- Seran TH and Brintha I 2010. Review on maize-based intercropping. *Journal of Agronomy* 9(3): 135-145.
- Willey, R.W. 1979. Intercropping its importance and research needs. Part 1, Competition and yield advantages. *Field Crop Abstr.*, 32: 1-10.
- Zaman, A., Zaman, P. and Maitra, S. 2017. Water resource development and management for agricultural sustainability. *J. Appl. Adv. Res.*, 2(2): 73-77.

UNDER PEER REVIEW