

Response of Varieties and Nutrient Treatments on Physiological and Phenological Parameters of Summer Greengram (*Vigna radiata* L.)

Response of summer green gram (*Vigna radiata* L.) to Varieties and nutrient treatments at....your site and country

Or

Effect of Varieties and Nutrient treatments on physiological and phenological parameters at....your site and country

ABSTRACT

The present investigation was conducted ~~during during the~~ summer season of 2020 at....please add the site where the experiment was done here to study the response of green gram to different varieties and nutrient treatments on physiological and phenological parameters of green gram.

The experiment was laid out in split-plot design with four replications. The main plot consisted of varieties (MH-421, MH-318 and SML-668) and sub-plot consisted of nutrient treatments (Control, 100% RDF, 75% RDF + 25% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB, 50% RDF + 50% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB).

The findings suggest that variety MH-318 ~~recorded significantly~~ gave significantly higher no. of branches, leaf area, leaf area index and leaf area duration as well as phenological characters such as 50% flowering over SML-668 and MH-421. Among the nutrient treatments, application of 75% RDF + 25% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB demonstrated superior performance across physiological and phenological traits over 100% RDF, 50% RDF + 50% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB and control.

Keywords: Greengram, Physiological, Phenological, Variety, Nutrient Management.

1. INTRODUCTION

Greengram (*Vigna radiata* L.), commonly known as “mung bean” or “moong”, is a highly valued pulse crop that holds a pivotal position in global agriculture. With origins in the Indian subcontinent, greengram has evolved into a versatile and resilient crop. Greengram cultivation in India spanned across 5.5 million hectares, generating a total output of 3.17 million tonnes, with an average productivity rate of 570 kg per hectare during 2022 (Anonymous, 2022). In Haryana, a

Comment [WU1]: Please use either of the below titles. Note that the response is expected from the dependent variable and not from the independent. In your case the crop is dependent on your treatments

Comment [WU2]: Please add the statement of problem, numerical values for the result and conclusion in addition to the one written below.

Comment [WU3]: At which variety? Please indicate it here. Do not also forget that the experiment is factorial and you have to look for the interaction as well.

Comment [WU4]: Rearrange by their alphabetical order

Comment [WU5]: The statement of problems is not well stated please add the production problem of the crop and proper sources for the idea written above the objective of the.

region known for its semi-arid climate, greengram was grown on approximately 0.79 lakh hectares, achieving a production of 0.52 lakh tonnes, with a productivity rate of 661 kg per hectare (Statistical Abstract of Haryana 2021-22, 2023).

Comment [WU6]: Please use international units of measurements

Greengram exhibits exceptional adaptability to various agro-climatic conditions, thriving from the dusty plains of the Indian subcontinent to the lush slopes of south-east Asia, including both rain-fed and irrigated ecosystems. This adaptability, combined with its short duration and ability to fix atmospheric nitrogen, makes it an attractive choice for crop rotation and diversification (Dick and Gregorich, 2004). Varietal selection and proper nutrient management are key factors in enhancing the physiological parameters of greengram. Selecting suitable varieties adapted to specific agro-climatic conditions can lead to improved traits such as increased leaf area, enhanced photosynthetic efficiency, and better root development. Therefore, the current investigation was initiated to examine how varieties and nutrient treatments influence the physiological and phenological parameters of summer greengram.

Comment [WU7]: Citation is mandatory here. If not it is not reliable.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Description study site.

The experiment exploring the combined impact of diverse greengram varieties and nutrient management practices was conducted at RRS (Bawal), CCS Haryana Agricultural University during the summer of 2020. The experiment field boasts loamy sand soil with well-defined characteristics.

Comment [WU8]: Please add extra information that can detail describe the study location. Like geographical location from well-known are like distance, altitude, latitude, longitude rain fall temperature cropping system and the like.

2.2. Treatments and experimental design

Three varieties (MH-421, MH-318 and SML-668) were tested alongside four different nutrient management treatment (Control, 100% RDF(20:40:0 kg/ha NPK), 75% RDF + 25% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB, 50% RDF + 50% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB). The experiment followed a split-plot design with four replications, featuring plots of 3m x 5m each. The row to row spacing was 30 cm. The crop was sown on April 25th with specific nutrient and seed treatment protocols.

2.3. Experimental procedures and field management

Comment [WU9]: This part is totally missed in your case.

2.4. Data collected and collecting procedure

The observations for no of branches per plant were recorded from five randomly selected plants from each treatment at various growth stages. The visual observations were taken to estimate the 50% germination and 50 flowering of the crop. The leaf area was measured using leaf area meter at 30, 60, 90 DAS and at harvest and expressed as cm²per plant.

Leaf area index: It is the ratio of leaf area to ground area. It was computed by using following formula:

$$\text{Leaf area index} = \frac{\text{Leaf area}}{\text{Ground area}}$$

Leaf Area Duration (days): LAD is the ability of a plant to maintain the green leaves over unit area of land during a period of time. It is expressed in days.

$$\text{Leaf area duration} = \frac{LA_1 + LA_2}{2} \times (t_2 - t_1)$$

Where,

LA₂ and LA₁ are leaf area of plants at time t₂ and t₁, respectively.

The data analysis relied on ANOVA methods with comparisons made at a 5% significance level. The data obtained in this research were subjected to statistical analysis using the analysis of variance (ANOVA) method for the Split-plot design (Gomez and Gomez, 1984). The F-test at a 5% probability level was employed to ascertain the significance of treatment effects. To assess the notable distinction between the means of two treatments, the critical difference (C.D.) was calculated using the formula below:

$$CD = \sqrt{\frac{2 \times EMS}{n}} \times t \text{ value at 5\%}$$

Where,

CD = Critical difference.

EMS = Error mean sum of square.

n = Number of observations.

t = Value of t-distribution at 5% level of error degree of freedom

[2.5. Data analysis](#)

[3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION](#)

[3.1. No. of Branches per plant](#)

No of branches plant⁻¹ (Table 1) was significantly influenced by variety and nutrient treatments throughout growth (except 30 DAS). Variety MH-318 had significantly higher no. of branches at harvest as compared to SML-668 and MH-421, while the 75% RDF + 25% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB treatment produced the most branches overall. There was no significant difference in no. of branches at 30 DAS in both varieties and nutrient treatments. The higher no. of branches in variety MH-421 might be attributed to its superior genetic composition, which promotes the development of more branches as suggested by Mote *et al.* (2022) and Singh and Jambukiya (2020). The superiority of 75% RDF + 25% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB over other treatment suggests that a combination of adequate nutrients, organic matter and beneficial microbes might have promoted

Comment [WU10]: This is totally missed. Thus, please include it. How did you analyse your data

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.39", No bullets or numbering

higher growth and branching. Similar results were observed by Ghosh *et al.*(2022) and Mondal and Sengupta (2019).

2. 3.2. Leaf Area (cm²/plant)

Leaf area (Table 1. And Fig 1.) increased significantly between 30 and 45 DAS, followed by a period of slower but continued growth until harvest where a decline in leaf area was observed among both varieties and nutrient treatment. Variety MH-318 (438.2) recorded significantly higher leaf area(cm²/plant) at harvest as compared to SML-668 (423.3) and MH-421 (409.8). Similarly, nutrient treatments 75% RDF + 25% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB (464.4), 100% RDF (449.8) and 50% RDF + 50% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB (411.8) demonstrably enhanced leaf area compared to the control (368.8) at harvest. Treatment 75% RDF + 25% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB exhibited the highest leaf area at harvest, followed by a statistically significant increase of 25.9% relative to the control. These findings suggest that superior genetic makeup of varieties and strategic nutrient application might have improved no. of branches and leaves on greengram plant which resulted in higher leaf area. Similar findings in leaf area were made by Nayak *et al.*(2014) and Patil *et al.*(2021).

3. 3.3. Leaf Area Index

Table 2. revealed leaf area index(LAI) values for greengram varieties and nutrient treatments measured at various growth stages. MH-318 recorded significantly higher LAI at all growth stages over SML-668 and MH-421, except 30 and 45 DAS where it was at par with SML-668. MH-318 observed 3.5 and 6.9% higher LAI over SML-668 and MH-421 at harvest, respectively. Nutrient treatments 75% RDF + 25% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB (1.548), 100% RDF (1.499), 50% RDF + 50% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB (1.373) resulted in significantly higher LAI compared to the control (1.229) at all growth stages. Treatment 75% RDF + 25% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB resulted in the highest LAI at each stage, with statistically significant differences compared to other treatments except 30 and 45 DAS where they were statistically at par. The increase in LAI may be attributed to increased leaf area under increased nutrient concentration as well better micronutrient availability and varietal characters. Similar findings in leaf area index were made by Moteet *et al.*(2022) and Arutkumaran *et al.*(2023).

4. 3.4. Leaf Area Duration (days)

MH-318 consistently exhibited significantly higher leaf area duration (Table 2.) compared to SML-668 and MH-421, except at 30 and 45 DAS where it was statistically similar to SML-668. At harvest, MH-318 showed 3.0 and 6.3% higher LAD than SML-668 and MH-421, respectively. Among nutrient treatments, LAD was observed maximum under 75% RDF + 25% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB at all stages as compared to other treatments. Application of 75% RDF + 25% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB exhibited the highest LAD at each growth stage, showing statistically significant differences compared to other treatments, except at 30 and 45 DAS where they were similar. The

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.39", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.39", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.39", No bullets or numbering

enhanced LAD may be attributed to improved leaf area index, better varietal characteristics as well as better nutrient availability. Similar findings in leaf area index were made by Biswas *et al.* (2002) and Chaudhary *et al.* (2023).

5. 3.5. Phenological Studies

The data presented in Table 3 revealed that the number of days taken to 50% germination was significantly affected by varieties and nutrient treatment. However, MH-318 (5.8) took least no. of days to germinate followed by SML-668 (5.6) and MH-421 (5.9). Among the nutrient treatments, application of 75% RDF + 25% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB (5.6) took least number of days to achieve 50% germination followed by 100% RDF (5.7) while control (6.0) took maximum no. of days.

Days taken to 50% flowering differ significantly with varieties as well nutrient treatment, MH-318 (38.6) recorded significantly lowest number of days to 50% flowering as compared to SML-668 (40.2) and MH-421 (41.0). Among different nutrient treatment application of 75% RDF + 25% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB (38.1) recorded significantly less of no. of days to 50% flowering as compared to control which took highest no. of days (41.4) while being at par with 100% RDF (39.6). Similar findings in phenological studies were also made by Phule and Raundal (2022) and Patel *et al.* (2013).

4. CONCLUSION

On the basis of above study, it can be concluded that, variety MH-318 and 75% RDF + 25% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB was superior to SML-668 and MH-421 in respect of no. of branches, leaf area, leaf area index and leaf area duration. Similarly, in phenological characters such as 50% flowering MH-318 and 75% RDF + 25% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB demonstrated superior performance over other varieties and nutrient treatments, respectively.

5. REFERENCES

- Anonymous (2022). ICAR-Indian Institute of Pulses (<https://iipr.icar.gov.in/mungbean/>)
- Arutkumaran, M., Suseendran, K., Kalaiyaran, C., Sriramachandrasekharan, S. J., and Thiruppathi, M. (2023). Effect of foliar nutrition on growth and yield of irrigated greengram (*Vigna radiata*) cv. Vamban 4. *The Pharma Innovation Journal*, **12**(3): 3584-3588
- Biswas, D.K., Haque, M.M., Hamid, A., Ahmed, J.U., Rahman, M.A. (2002). Influence of plant population density on growth and yield of two black gram varieties. *Journal of Agronomy*, **1**:83-85.
- Chaudhary, K.B., Macwan, S.J., Dhruv, J.J., Ghadiali, J.J., and Shruti, S. (2023). Impact of plant growth regulators and chemicals on growth and quality in green gram (*Vigna radiata* L.) cv. GAM-5. *The Pharma Innovation Journal*, **12**(3), 1938-1941.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.39", No bullets or numbering

Dick, W.A. and Gregorich, E.G. (2004). Developing and maintaining soil organic matter levels. *Managing Soil Quality*. CAB International, 103-120.

Ghosh, D., Brahmachari, K., Sarkar, S., Dinda, N.K., Das, A., and Moulick, D. (2022). Impact of nutrient management in rice-maize-green gram cropping system and integrated weed management treatments on summer green gram productivity. *Indian Journal of Weed Science*. **54**(1): 25–30.

Gomez, K.A. and Gomez, A.A. (1984). *Statistical procedures for agricultural research*. John Wiley & Sons: 154-172.

Mondal, R. and Sengupta, K. (2019). Study on the performance of mungbean varieties in the new alluvial zone of West Bengal. *Journal of Crop and Weed*, **15**(1): 186-191.

Mote, S.M., Bagade, A.B., Thombre, P.R., and Bhadarge, H.H. (2022). Physiological analysis of growth and yield of green gram cultivars. *The Pharma Innovation Journal*, **11**(12): 2238-2241.

Nayak, S., Chavan, D.A., and Waghmare, Y.M. (2014). Effect of different spacings on growth and yield of black gram (*Vigna mungo* (L.) Hepper) varieties. 3rd International Conference on Agriculture & Horticulture (October 27-29, 2014) Hyderabad International Convention Centre, India.

Patel, R.D., Patel, D.D., Chaudhari, M.P., Vaishali, S., Patel, K.G. and Andel, B.B. (2013). Response of different cultivars of green gram [*Vignaradiata*(L.) Wilczek] to integrated nutrient management under south Gujarat condition. *AGRES - An International e-Journal*, **2**(2): 132-142.

Patil, V.R., Patil, J.B., Patil, M.J., and Gedam, V.B. (2021). Effect of nutrient management on growth attributes, yield and quality of summer green gram (*Vigna radiata* L.). *International Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, **17**: 150-154.

Phule, K.K., and Raunda, P.U. (2022). Effect of foliar nutrient sprays on summer green gram (*Vignaradiata* L.) under sub mountain zone of Maharashtra. *Journal of Agriculture Research and Technology*, **47**: 200-204.

Singh, C., and Jambukiya, H. (2020). Effect of foliar application of plant growth regulators on growth and yield attributing characters of green gram (*Vigna radiata* L. Wilczek). *Journal of Crop and Weed*, **16**(2): 258-264.

Statistical Abstract of Haryana 2021-22 (2023). Department of Economic and Statistical Affairs, Haryana. (<https://esaharyana.gov.in/state-statistical-abstract-of-haryana/>)

Table 1: Influence of varieties and nutrient treatments on no. of branches and leaf area of summer greengram

Treatments	No. of Branches plant ⁻¹				Leaf Area (cm ² /plant)			
	30 DAS	45 DAS	60 DAS	At harvest	30 DAS	45 DAS	60 DAS	At harvest
Varieties								
V1	3.03	4.56	5.05	5.42	160.6	321.5	488.5	409.8
V2	3.22	5.14	5.70	6.14	172.1	334.6	517.6	438.2
V3	3.17	5.08	5.42	5.73	167.8	329.1	503.9	423.3
SEm±	0.17	0.13	0.10	0.15	1.3	2.36	2.65	2.84
CD(p≤0.05)	NS	0.47	0.35	0.52	4.5	8.16	9.16	9.82
Nutrient Treatments								
T1	2.91	4.63	4.83	5.14	144.3	285.0	454.7	368.8
T2	3.25	5.04	5.57	5.95	176.6	349.5	523.7	449.8
T3	3.44	5.25	5.86	6.62	179.9	357.9	539.7	464.4
T4	3.07	4.88	5.30	5.68	166.4	321.2	495.2	411.8
SEm±	0.17	0.16	0.13	0.18	1.2	3.54	4.18	3.71
CD(p≤0.05)	NS	0.47	0.38	0.54	3.45	10.26	12.12	10.8

*Significant at p≤0.05; DAS: Days after sowing; RDF: Recommended Dose of Fertilizer; V1: MH-421; V2: MH-318; V3: SML-668; T1: Control; T2:100% RDF; T3: 75% RDF + 25% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB; T4: 50% RDF + 50% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB; NS: Non-Significant.

Comment [WU11]: The tables you have put here including this and the other found below are basic to the result and discussion part of your paper. Thus, you have to take them to above part. Only the subsidiary parts have to be here. But, in your case they are not subsidiary rather they are fundamental.

Table 2: Influence of varieties and nutrient treatments on leaf area index and leaf area duration of summer greengram

Treatments	Leaf Area Index				Leaf Area Duration (days)			
	30 DAS	45 DAS	60 DAS	At harvest	0-30 DAS	30-45 DAS	45-60 DAS	60 DAS to harvest
Varieties								
V1	0.535	1.072	1.628	1.366	8.03	12.06	20.25	22.46
V2	0.574	1.115	1.725	1.461	8.60	12.67	21.30	23.89
V3	0.559	1.097	1.680	1.411	8.39	12.42	20.82	23.18
SEm±	0.004	0.008	0.009	0.009	0.065	0.09	0.19	0.24
CD(p≤0.05)	0.015	0.027	0.030	0.032	0.225	0.30	0.67	0.82
Nutrient Treatments								
T1	0.481	0.950	1.516	1.229	7.22	10.73	18.49	20.59
T2	0.589	1.165	1.746	1.499	8.83	13.15	21.83	24.34
T3	0.600	1.193	1.799	1.548	9.00	13.45	22.44	25.10
T4	0.555	1.071	1.651	1.373	8.32	12.19	20.41	22.68
SEm±	0.004	0.118	0.014	0.012	0.06	0.13	0.22	0.30
CD(p≤0.05)	0.011	0.034	0.040	0.056	0.173	0.37	0.65	0.86

*Significant at p≤0.05; DAS: Days after sowing; RDF: Recommended Dose of Fertilizer; V1: MH-421; V2: MH-318; V3: SML-668; T1: Control; T2:100% RDF; T3: 75% RDF + 25% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB; T4: 50% RDF + 50% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB; NS: Non-Significant.

Table 3: Influence of varieties and nutrient treatments on phenological characters of summer greengram

Treatments	Days taken to	
	50% Germination	50% Flowering
Variety		
V1	5.9	41.0
V2	5.6	38.6
V3	5.8	40.2
SEm±	0.2	0.37
CD(p≤0.05)	NS	1.28
Nutrient Treatments		
T1	6.0	41.4
T2	5.7	39.6
T3	5.6	38.1
T4	5.8	40.7
SEm±	0.2	0.36
CD(p≤0.05)	NS	1.05

*Significant at p≤0.05; DAS: Days after sowing; RDF: Recommended Dose of Fertilizer; V1: MH-421; V2: MH-318; V3: SML-668; T1: Control; T2:100% RDF; T3: 75% RDF + 25% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB; T4: 50% RDF + 50% FYM + *Rhizobium* + PSB; NS: Non-Significant.




Fig. 1: Effect of varieties and nutrient treatments leaf area of summer greengram at 30, 45, 60 DAS and at harvest