

Effect of different planting methods and high density planting on yield and economic parameters in banana cv. Williams

Abstract

High density planting is one of novel concepts and it's effectively increase productivity of per unit area without affecting the fruit quality. Gross yield of banana per hectare mainly depends on yield of per plant and number of plants per hectare. The study was carried out at ICAR- All India Coordinated Research Project on Fruits, Kittur Rani Channamma College of Horticulture, Arabhavi to study influence of different planting density on both yield and economic parameters of banana cv. Williams during 2021-22. It was laid out in Randomized Complete Block Design with three replications and eight treatments. The results revealed that, the highest values for bunch parameters like bunch length (97.77 cm), bunch width (93.57 cm), number of hands per bunch (11.93), number of fingers in third hand (21.53) and weight of third hand (2.97 kg) was recorded in wider spacing treatment T₄ (Single row - 2.4×1.8 m). Regarding to yield parameters like highest bunch weight per hill (36.09 kg) was recorded in T₆ (3 plants per hill- 2.7×1.8×0.3 m). While, highest yield per hectare (108.75 t/ha) was found in treatment T₈ (Paired row with zig-zag - 2.1×1.2×1.2 m). With respect to the highest gross returns (10.33, 125.00 Rs/ha), net returns (5, 53,725.00 Rs/ha) and highest benefit cost ratio (2.15) was observed in T₈ (paired row system of with zig-zag planting).

Comment [KD1]: Mention District and State

Comment [KD2]: Check is it 10.33 or 10,33

Keyword: Banana, Williams, Planting methods, bunch, economic attributes

Introduction

Banana is a short duration fruit crop and provides ample scope for production per unit area. Williams (AAA) is a cultivar of Giant Cavendish type in the Cavendish subgroup of banana. It is medium to tall plant (2.4-3.7 m). The pseudostem of Williams has dark brown with black or red streaks. It has a very larger, cylindrical bunch with 300 evenly sized fruits (Sarrwy *et al.*, 2012 in cv. Williams). The high density planting system is one of the improved technology to increasing the productivity without affecting the quality of fruits. Main aim is to achieve the productivity by maintaining a balance between vegetative and reproductive stage without

Comment [KD3]: Cultivar name must be in italic in all places

Comment [KD4]: How many plants were grown and what was area? Either in hector or in acre

impairing the plant health. Principle of high density planting is effective use of both vertical and horizontal space of crop per unit area. Hence it can significantly increase the yield per unit area as compared to traditional planting methods. In India, the success of this technology has been proved in different fruit crops *viz.*, pineapple, banana, papaya, mango, apple and citrus. There are several advantages like early production, high returns per hectare, efficient use of fertilizers and irrigation water (Naik *et al.*, 2016a)

The necessity of high density planting is increased as there is decline in cultivated land. It is an intensive system of cultivation in banana not to only provide high production and net returns but also to facilitate efficient utilization of solar radiation and increase the photosynthetic efficiency of the plant. It also depends on the variety grown, method of cultivation, the height and spread of banana. It is amenable to modern input application techniques such as drip irrigation, fertigation and mechanization *etc.* This leads to a larger yield per unit area which in turn boosts productivity and profitability (Aphsara and Sathiamoorthy, 1999). For the highest possible yields of good quality fruit, there is an optimum plant density, which should be maintained for sustaining the economic life of the plantation. This optimum plant density varies with the location, cultivar, soil fertility, management level and economic considerations. The plant density with proper management of nutrients is considered to be novel concept to solve the problem very effectively. There is a scope for study the influence of planting density on both yield and economic attributes of banana *cv.* Williams. |

Comment [KD5]: Try omitting references older than 10-15 years

Comment [KD6]: Italic

Comment [KD7]: Remove excess space

Material and methods

The experiment was conducted at ICAR- All India Coordinated Research Project on Fruits, Kittur Rani Channamma College of Horticulture, Arabhavi, Belagavi district, Karnataka during 2021-22. The experiment was laid out in Randomized Complete Block Design with three replications and eight treatments *viz.*, T₁ (Single row – 1.5×1.5 m), T₂ (Single row -1.8×1.8 m), T₃ (Single row -2.1×1.8 m), T₄ (Single row - 2.4×1.8 m), T₅ (2 plants per hill - 2.7×1.8×0.3 m),

T₆ (3 plants per hill - 2.7×1.8×0.3 m) T₇ (Paired row system- 2.4×1.2×1.0 m) and T₈ (Paired row with zig zag system- 2.1×1.2×1.2 m).

Comment [KD8]: If possible try to add photograph for more clarity

Measurements were taken for various yield parameters like bunch length, bunch width, bunch weight, number of hands per bunch, finger length, finger width and number of fingers per bunch and economic attributes such as gross return, net return and benefit cost ration. The obtained data which are related to yield and economic parameters were organized into tables and statistically analyzed in a randomized complete block design (RCBD) by using analysis of variance by Fisher and Yates (1963). When the F-test showed significance in comparing treatment means, critical differences (C.D. at 5%) were calculated.

Results and Discussion

In the present study, data on bunch characteristics of banana cv. Williams were influenced by effect of different planting density among the all treatments. The wider spacing treatment T₄ (Single row - 2.4×1.8 m) recorded the higher values for bunch length (97.77 cm), bunch width (93.57 cm), number of hands per bunch (11.93), number of fingers in third hand (21.53) and weight of third hand (2.97 kg). In contrast, lower values for bunch length (72.47 cm), bunch width (74.83 cm), number of hands per bunch (7.13), number of fingers in third hand (15.47) and weight of third hand (1.74 kg) was observed in T₆ (3 plants per hill - 2.7×1.8×0.3 m).

Comment [KD9]: Should be graphically representation

The wider spacing treatments was achieved the maximum value for bunch length, bunch width, number of hands per bunch, number of fingers in third hand and weight of third hand than compare to closer spacing. Due to low population, there is reduction in competition for sunlight and nutrients and also more leaf area will be exposed to light which in turn increased photosynthetic activity led to more accumulation of biomass causes positive effect on bunch

Comment [KD10]: Reference

Table 1. Effect of different planting methods and high density planting on bunch characteristics in banana cv. Williams

Comment [KD11]: Justified

Treatments	Bunch length (cm)	Bunch width (cm)	Hands per bunch	No. of fingers in 3 rd hand	Weight of 3 rd hand (kg)
T ₁ (1.5×1.5 m)	83.40	84.07	9.93	18.20	2.16
T ₂ (1.8×1.8 m)	91.67	87.27	10.20	19.03	2.63
T ₃ (2.1×1.8 m)	93.33	91.60	10.50	19.37	2.73
T ₄ (2.4×1.8 m)	97.77	98.57	11.93	21.53	2.97
T ₅ (2.4×1.8×0.3 m)	80.80	83.20	8.27	17.20	1.94
T ₆ (2.7×1.8×0.3 m)	72.47	74.83	7.13	15.47	1.74
T ₇ (2.4×1.2×1.0 m)	84.47	85.10	8.93	17.60	2.15
T ₈ (2.1×1.2×1.2 m)	84.20	85.27	9.27	18.27	2.20
S. Em. ±	1.75	2.69	0.44	0.67	0.08
CD @ 5 %	5.31	8.15	1.35	2.04	0.23
CV %	3.53	5.40	8.07	6.35	5.75

T₁– High density planting

T₂ - Single row system

T₃ - Single row system

T₄ - Single row system

T₅ - Two plants per hill

T₆ - Three plants per hill

T₇ - Paired row system

T₈ - Paired row with zig-zag system

Table 2. Effect of different planting methods and high density planting on finger and yield characteristics in banana cv. Williams

Comment [KD12]: Italic

Treatments	Finger length (cm)	Finger girth (cm)	Finger weight (g)	Finger per bunch	Bunch weight (kg/hill)	Yield (t/ha)
T ₁ (1.5×1.5 m)	15.31	12.57	123.62	162.27	20.51	90.24
T ₂ (1.8×1.8 m)	15.67	12.71	135.63	172.73	25.32	75.96
T ₃ (2.1×1.8 m)	15.77	13.20	139.07	174.87	27.28	70.98
T ₄ (2.4×1.8 m)	17.01	14.23	147.12	186.07	33.59	77.25
T ₅ (2.4×1.8×0.3 m)	14.11	12.27	116.18	126.60	34.53	67.33
T ₆ (2.7×1.8×0.3 m)	13.23	11.58	114.40	102.47	36.09	72.80
T ₇ (2.4×1.2×1.0 m)	14.11	12.11	120.64	152.13	21.06	103.19
T ₈ (2.1×1.2×1.2 m)	14.90	12.20	121.21	153.20	21.75	108.75
S. Em. ±	0.37	0.62	2.11	3.54	0.94	3.92
CD @ 5 %	1.12	1.90	6.41	10.74	2.85	11.90
CV %	4.30	8.58	2.88	3.99	5.92	8.18

T₁– High density planting

T₂ - Single row system

T₃ - Single row system

T₄ - Single row system

T₅ - Two plants per hill

T₆ - Three plants per hill

T₇ - Paired row system

T₈ - Paired row with zig-zag system

characteristic in wider spacing. The parallel observations were recorded in different varieties of banana by Athani and Hulamani (2000) in cv. Rajapuri, Pawar *et al.* (2017) in cv. Grand Naine, Patel *et al.* (2018) in cv. Grand Naine, Kumar *et al.* (2020) in cv. Ney Poovan.

Comment [KD13]: Italic all variety names

Regarding the finger parameters, the maximum finger length (16.03 cm), finger width (13.97 cm), finger weight (147.12 g) and number of fingers per bunch (186.07) was observed in treatment T₄ (Single row - 2.4×1.8 m). Whereas, the minimum values for maximum finger length (17.01 cm), finger width (14.23 cm), finger weight (147.12 g) and number of fingers per bunch (186.07) was recorded in T₆ (3 plants per hill - 2.7×1.8×0.3 m).

The maximum finger length, width and weight were observed in low density planting. During early stage of growth, there was more number of functional leaves and maximum leaf area was recorded in wider spacing. This contribution of all the increased vegetative parameters appears to have strong impact on the finger characteristics of banana cv. Williams. Similar findings of banana was reported by Pujari and Marbhal (2009a) in cv. Basrai, Sarrwy *et al.* (2012) in cv. Williams, Gogoi *et al.* (2015) in cv. Jahaji, Naidu *et al.* (2015) in cv. Martaman, and Gaonkar (2019) in cv. Grand Naine.

Comment [KD14]: What is the reason behind this. Also add reference to support it

In this study, the yield parameters like bunch weight per hill and yield per hectare was significantly influenced by the different methods of planting and planting density on banana cv. Williams. The Treatments T₆ (3 plants per hill- 2.7×1.8×0.3 m) had the greatest bunch weight per hill (36.09 kg) which was found on par with T₅ (34.53 kg) and T₄ (33.59 kg). Conversely, lowest bunch weight per hill (21.06 kg) was recorded in treatment T₇ (Paired row system- 2.4 x 1.2 x 1.0 m). With respect to the highest yield per hectare (108.75 t/ha) was recorded in treatment T₈ (Paired row with zig-zag - 2.1×1.2×1.2 m), which was statistically at parity with T₇ (Paired row system - 2.4×1.2×1.0 m) that produced 103.19 t/ha. On the other hand, T₅ (2 plants per hill - 2.4×1.8×0.3 m) had the lowest yield per hectare (67.33 t/ha).

The yield of per plant was a complex and highly polygenic in nature. It was influenced by both vegetative parameters like functional leaves, leaf area and reproductive parameters such as bunch weight, number of fingers per bunch and finger weight. Although these traits are achieved lower values in closer planting, but yield per unit area was significantly having higher values. This is due to accommodation of more number of plant population in per unit area is high

Table 3. Effect of different planting methods and high density planting on benefit cost ratio in banana cv. Williams

Treatments	Total cost of cultivation Rs/100 m ²	Total cost of cultivation (Rs/ha)	Yield (Kg/100 m ²)	Yield (t/ha)	Gross returns Rs/100 m ²	Gross returns Rs/ha	Net returns Rs/100 m ²	Net returns Rs/ha	Benefit: cost ratio
T₁ (1.5×1.5 m)	4630	463000	902.44	90.24	8573	857280	3943	394280	1.85
T₂ (1.8×1.8 m)	3886	388600	759.60	75.96	7216	721620	3330	333020	1.86
T₃ (2.1×1.8 m)	3777	377700	709.28	70.93	6738	673835	2961	296135	1.78
T₄ (2.4×1.8 m)	3695	369500	772.50	77.25	7339	733875	3644	364375	1.98
T₅ (2.4×1.8×0.3 m)	4488	448800	673.30	67.33	6396	639635	1908	190835	1.42
T₆ (2.7×1.8×0.3 m)	4492	449200	728.00	72.80	6916	691600	2424	242400	1.53
T₇ (2.4×1.2×1.0 m)	4767	476700	1031.90	103.19	9803	980305	5036	503605	2.05
T₈ (2.1×1.2×1.2 m)	4794	479400	1087.5	108.75	10331	1033125	5537	553725	2.15

T₁– High density planting

T₂ - Single row system

T₃ - Single row system

T₄ - Single row system

Selling price – Rs 9.5/kg

T₅ - Two plants per hill

T₆ - Three plants per hill

T₇ - Paired row system

T₈ - Paired row with zig-zag system

in closer spacing. So, lower values of bunch and finger characteristic were compensated by higher value of yield in closer spacing than wider spacing. These results were in agreement with previous findings as reported by Panjavarnam *et al.* (2018) in cv. Ney Poovan, Gaonkar (2019) in cv. Grand Naine and Naika *et al.* (2022) in cv. Williams (1st Ratoon).

The highest gross returns (Rs.10,33,125/ha), net returns (Rs. 5,53,725/ha) and benefit cost ratio (2.15) was recorded in treatment T₈ (paired row system with zig-zag planting) followed by T₇ (Paired row system) had gross returns of (Rs.9,80,305/ha), net returns (Rs. 5,03,605/ha) and benefit cost ratio (2.05). While treatment T₅ (2 plants per hill - 2.4×1.8×0.3 m) was observed the lowest gross returns (Rs. 6,39,635/ ha), net returns (Rs. 1,90,835/ha) and benefit cost ratio (1.42).

In paired row system, the yield of individual plants may be reduced, while total yield of per unit area was increased due to a greater number of plants accommodate in unit area. Similar findings are reported by Behera *et al.* (2016) in banana cv. Grand Naine and Basrai. Although cost of cultivation for unit area was high in high density planting system compare to normal planting due to higher input cost. However, overall total production of unit area leads to increase in benefit-cost ratio of banana. These results of banana were supported with the previous findings by Puttanna (2016) in cv. Grand Naine, Gaonkar (2019) in cv. Grand Naine and Naika *et al.* (2022) in cv. Williams (1st Ratoon).

Conclusion

The maximum bunch length, bunch width, number of hands per bunch, number of fingers in third hand and weight of third hand, maximum finger length, finger girth, finger weight and number of fingers per bunch was recorded in the treatment with wider spacing T₄ (Single row - 2.4×1.8 m) followed by T₃ (Single row - 2.1×1.8 m).

Among all the treatments, treatment T₆ (3 plants per hill- 2.7×1.8×0.3 m) had the highest bunch weight per hill (36.09 kg). With respect to the highest yield per hectare (108.75 t/ha) was

recorded in treatment T₈ (Paired row with zig-zag - 2.1×1.2×1.2 m), which was statistically at parity with T₇ (Paired row system - 2.4×1.2×1.0 m) that produced 103.19 t/ha.

In terms of the highest gross returns, net returns and benefit cost ratio was recorded in treatment T₈ (paired row system with zig-zag planting) followed by T₇ (Paired row system - 2.4×1.2×1.0 m).

Comment [KD15]: Conclusions should be rewritten with emphasis on the main findings, knowledge generated, practical applications and future work.

REFERENCES

- Apshara S. E. and Sathiamoorthy S., 1999, Effect of planting density and spacing on growth and yield of banana cv. Nendran (AAB). *South Indian Hortic.*, 47(1): 1-6
- Athani S. I. and Hulamani N. C., 2000, Effect of plant density on crop duration and yield in banana cv. Rajapuri (*Musa* AAB). *Karnataka J. Agric. Sci.*, 13(1): 116-119.
- Behera S., Das A. K., Mishra N. and Mishra P. P., 2016, Effect of spacing on growth and yield of banana cv. Grand Naine and Bantala. *Intl J. Tropical Agric.*, 34(1): 39-43.
- Fisher R. A. and Yates, 1963, Statistical methods for research workers. 14th Edition. Hafner, New York.
- Gaonkar Y. A., 2019, Studies on plant density and nutrient requirement in banana cv. Grand Naine. *Ph. D. (Hort.) Thesis*, VNMKV, Parbhani, Maharashtra (India).
- Gogoi B., Khangia B., Brauh K. and Khousal A., 2015, Effect of high-density planting and nutrient on growth and yield of banana cv. Jahaji (*Musa* AAA). *Int. J. Agril. Inno. Res.*, 315(1): 1465-1469.
- Kumar H. Y., 2020, Effect of planting density and fertilizers on growth and development of tissue culture banana cv. Ney Poovan (AB) under hill zone of Karnataka. *Ph.D (Hort.)*

Comment [KD16]: Incomplete reference

- Naidu M. M., Mamata K., Lakshmi N. R and Rajashekaram T., 2015, Effect of plant density and fertigation on growth and productivity of banana cv. Martaman (AAB). *J. Agril. Engineering & Food Tech.*, 2(3): 178-180.
- Naika L., 2022, Effect of methods of planting and planting density in banana cv. Williams (Ratoon-1). *M. Sc. (Hort.) Thesis*, KRCCH, Arabhavi, Karnataka (India).
- Naik M. H., 2016a, Studies on high density planting, fertigation and postharvest chemical treatments in banana (*Musa acuminata* L.) cv. Grand Naine. *Ph.D (Hort.) Thesis*, YSRHU, Rajendranagar, Andhra Pradesh (India).
- Panjavarnam G., Parthiban A., Subbiah P. and Jeyakuma N., 2018, effect of planting density and nutrient management on yield, fruit quality and postharvest characters in banana cv. NeyPoovan. *Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci.*, 7(2): 515-525.
- Patel M. J., Sitapara H. H., Shah N. I. and Patel H. R., 2018, Effect of different levels of planting distance and fertilizers on growth, yield and quality of banana cv. Grand Naine. *J. pharmacogn. phytochem.*, 7(2): 649-653.
- Pawar D. D., Dingre S. K. and Bhoi P. G., 2017, Productivity and economics of drip-irrigated banana (*Musa* sp.) under different planting and fertigation techniques in subtropical India. *Communications in Soil Sci. and Plt. Analysis*, 48(4): 449-458.
- Pujari C. V. and Marbhal S. K., 2009a, Effect of bio-regulators and different levels of N and K on the finger size and yield on banana cv. Grand Naine (AAA). *Asian J. Hortic.*, 5(2): 453-457.
- Puttanna C., 2016, Effect of high density planting and nutrition on growth, yield and quality of tissue culture banana cv. Grand Naine under transitional zone of Karnataka. *M. Sc. (Hort.) Thesis*, KSHUAHS, Shivamogga, Karnataka (India).
- Sarrwy S. M. A., Mostafa E. A. M. and Hassan H. S. A., 2012, Growth, yield and fruit quality of Williams banana as affected by different planting distances. *Int. J. Agric. Res.*, 7(5): 266-275.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

