

# Yield gap analysis of Ginger in Arunachal Pradesh

Comment [1]:

## Abstract

A demonstration on ginger (variety: Nadia) was performed at selected villages in Tirap district of Arunachal Pradesh during 2021-22 and 2022-23 respectively. Before demonstration a field survey was carried out to know the ground reality farmer's practice of ginger. During first years of demonstration the total 15 numbers of plots were demonstrated having per plot size of 0.20 ha while 20 plots were second years with same size of plots. The demonstration yield was recorded as 118 q/ha & 142 q/ha as compared 99 & 108 q/ha respectively. The B:C ratio was 4.68 & 3.95 as compared 2.27 & 2.66.

Comment [2]: ???

Comment [3]: SI unit format should be used for all units

**Keywords:** Demonstration, ginger, technology gap, technology index

## Introduction

India is aptly referred to as the "Spice Bowl of the World" due to the rich diversity and excellent quality of spices it produces. India holds a significant global ginger production share of approximately 33%, with China and Nepal following suit. Vedic documents from as far back as 6000 B.C. mention its varied characteristics. From North to South, East to West, temperate to subtropical climates, ginger grow. The world's largest variety of spices is found in India. The popular spice ginger comes from the rhizomes of the *Zingiber officinale* plant. Since ancient times, ginger has been utilized as a food supplement and to treat a wide range of illnesses and afflictions.

Tribal farmers grow the crop commercially to augment their income and use it as a spice, condiment, and medicinal [1]. In addition to being used as an ingredient to enhance flavor, ginger can reduce bloating, intestinal gas, constipation, and other fermentation-related issues. It has antioxidants in it. These molecules aid in the control of free radicals, which are substances that can harm cells in excess of a certain quantity.

Ginger is grown on 116.90 thousand hectares of land in India; its average yield was 529.30 thousand MT, and its average productivity was 4.30 MT/ha. As of 2022 [2], the states of Madhya Pradesh, Karnataka, and Assam are the top producers of ginger in India. However, the tribal farmers partially harvest their ginger three months after planting and use a high seed rate of 800-1000 kg/acre. These activities raise the risk of rhizome rot disease. It is for this reason that the crop has suffered greatly over the last 15 to 20 years, leading to a decrease in output [3]

Still, yield in the Arunachal Pradesh affected by many biotic and abiotic issues, including not using raised bed systems, inadequate field drainage and the prevalence of ginger rhizome rot disease, can be blamed for yield loss in real agricultural circumstances [3,4,5]. Despite having a favorable climate and soil, mostly as a result of a lack of awareness and implementation of new technologies in the areas of integrated nutrient management (INM), planting protection techniques, seed treatment and variety selection.

Transferring innovative ideas from their original origins to final users is known as technology transfer [6,5]. In order to close these gaps, Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK) – Tirap, Arunachal Pradesh conducted front-line demonstrations (FLDs) in the fields of farmers, showcasing to them the superiority of the Nadia ginger variety and its in addition to other agronomic practices.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The Nadia variety of ginger were used for demonstration during the years of 2021-22 and 2022-23 respectively. The Deomali, Mopaya, Lapnan, Jum dang, Old Subang, New Subang villages were selected for demonstration of trials during the both years. During 2021-22, total 03 ha area was demonstrated with 15 numbers of demonstrations while during 2022-23, 04 ha area with 20 numbers of demonstrations. The first week of April was the transplanting time of ginger. The ginger tubers having 5-6 cm length and average weight 22 gm were planted at farmers field; with a spacing of 45 cm x 30 cm in the raised bed facilitated better rhizome development while also avoiding rhizome rot disease. FYM 20 t/ha and Neem cake 2t/ha was also applied during last ploughing. Spraying of Neem oil at 5 ml/l (1500 PPM) for control of shoot borer and drenching of *Trichoderma viride* at 5 g/liter for control of rhizome rot (Table 1).

The fresh rhizomes harvested at maturity stage. Performance and yields of ginger with full package and practices were compared against normal farmer practice. The extension parameters such as Extension Gap, Technology Gap, and Technology Index were calculated by formulae suggested by Samui et al. [11], Renbomo and Pijush Kanti [12], and Kale et al. [13] to study the impact of front-line demonstrations over traditional practices by farmers.

$$\text{Technology Gap} = P_i (\text{Potential yield}) - D_i (\text{Demonstration yield})$$

$$\text{Extension Gap} = D_i (\text{Demonstration yield}) - F_i (\text{Farmers yield})$$

$$\text{Potential Yield} - \text{Demonstration yield}$$

$$\text{Technology index} = \frac{\text{Potential yield}}{\text{Net income (Rs ha}^{-1}\text{)}} \times 100$$

$$\text{Benefit Cost ratio (B:C ratio)} = \frac{\text{Improved practices} - \text{Farmers practice}}{\text{Cost of cultivation (Rs ha}^{-1}\text{)}}$$

$$\text{Percent increase of over farmer's practices} = \frac{\text{Improved practices} - \text{Farmers practice}}{\text{Farmers practices}} \times 100$$

**Table 1: Improved practices vs farmer's practices of Ginger**

| Particular | Technological intervention | Existing practices | Gap      |
|------------|----------------------------|--------------------|----------|
| Variety    | Nadia                      | Very Old variety   | Full gap |
| Seed rate  | 1600 kg/ha                 | 2200 kg /ha        | Full gap |

|   |   |                                      |             |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| Seed treatment                            | Seed was treated  | Not treated                          | Full gap    |
| Sowing method                             | Line sowing   | Line sowing                          | Partial gap |
| Spacing                                   | 45 x 30 cm with 6 cm depth of sowing                          | 60 x 30 cm with 8 cm depth of sowing | Partial gap |
| Application of recommended dose of manure | 20 t/ha   | Nil/without recommendation           | Full gap    |
| Application of Bio fertilizer             | Soil application of Azospirillum & PSB @ 2 kg/ha mix with FYM | No application                       | Full gap    |
| Drenching                                 | drenching of <i>Trichoderma viride</i> at 5 g/liter           | Not applied                          | Full gap    |
| Weed management                           | Done at 20, 40 and 60 days after planting                     | Not common                           | Full gap    |
| Spraying of Biopesticide                  | Neem oil @ 5ml/litre of water                                 | Not sprayed                          | Full gap    |
| Harvesting                                | Manual  | Manual                               | No Gap      |

**Table 2 : Production and other extension parameters of Ginger**

| Year    | Area | Variety | No of Demos | Potential Yield | Average Yield (q/ha) |     | % increase over Check | Technology gap (q/ha) | Extension gap (q/ha) | Technology index (%) |
|---------|------|---------|-------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
|         |      |         |             |                 | D                    | C   |                       |                       |                      |                      |
| 2021-22 | 3    | Nadia   | 15          | 210             | 118                  | 99  | 19                    | 92                    | 19                   | 43                   |
| 2022-23 | 4    | nadia   | 20          | 210             | 142                  | 108 | 31                    | 68                    | 34                   | 32                   |

Comment [4]: N

Where D stands for Demonstration and C stands for Check

**Table 3 : Economics of Ginger cultivation**

| Year    | Yield(q/ha) |     | Cost of Cultivation (Rs/ha) |        | Gross Return (Rs/ha) |        | Net Return (Rs/ha) |        | Benefit Cost ratio B:C Ratio |      |
|---------|-------------|-----|-----------------------------|--------|----------------------|--------|--------------------|--------|------------------------------|------|
|         | D           | F   | D                           | F      | D                    | F      | D                  | F      | D                            | F    |
| 2021-22 | 118         | 99  | 83000                       | 121000 | 472000               | 396000 | 389000             | 275000 | 4.68                         | 2.27 |
| 2022-23 | 142         | 108 | 81000                       | 118000 | 568000               | 432000 | 320000             | 314000 | 3.95                         | 2.66 |

Comment [5]: Check B; C ratio formula

Comment [6]: Check the B:C ratio formula

Where D stands for Demonstration and C stands for Check

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data from table 2 revealed that there was potential of 210 q/ha of ginger. During the first year of demonstration, 118 q/ha demonstration yield was recorded as compared 99 q/ha under farmer's practice. Meanwhile during the second year; demonstration yield was recorded higher (142 q/ha) as compared previous years as compared farmer's practices of 108 q/ha. The higher yield under demonstration may be the result of tuber's treatment before transplanting, application of sufficient amount of manure, azospirillum, which help suppress the growth of *Phythium myriotylum* fungus, the rhizome rot disease and raised bed that facilitates excess water drained out. And also avoidance of rhizome rot incidence. This finding is also supported by Sarmah et al. [14], Borah et al. [15], and Sial and Tarai [1]. Shah and Zala [12] obtained an average yield of ginger (133 q/ha) under Gujarat conditions.

Comment [7]: amount

The Nadia variety resulted 19 & 31 % higher yield respectively during the both year over farmers' practices. The significant increase in yield may be attributed to improved rhizome development due to the application of Tricoderma in demonstration fields; which may lead healthy spouts development, better growth and development of plants which turned into better yield Sarmah et al. [14], Borah et al. [15].

Comment [8]: Check spelling

The extension gap during the both year's of demonstration was recorded: 19 & 34 q/ha which can easily be minimized by different dissemination technologies among farming community. Only adoption of improved varieties can minimize this extension gap; as reported by Hiremath and Nagaraju's [13] and Kale et al. [9].

The technology gap may be attributed to variations in inherent soil fertility, adopted new practices, and weather conditions [14,12]. Variety-wise, location-specific trials and recommendations are required for minimizing the technology gap in yield in different situations. Ashok Kumar et al. [5], Kale et al. [13], Singh et al. [17], and Chapke [15] have also wrote similar results.

The Technology index was 43 during first year of demonstration as compared to 32 during the second years of demonstration. Lower the value of Technology Index indices that there is much more scope of introducing technology to reach a desired target. Thus, there is much scope for demonstrated technology growing ginger in Tirap district of Arunachal Pradesh.

Similar results have earlier been reported in mustard by Jeeng et al. [16], Kale et al. [13],

Katare et al. [11], Keshavareddy et al. [12] and Dayanand [18] and Ashok Kumar et al. [5].

It is clear from Table 3 that cost of cultivation was higher in farm's practice as compared to demonstration; during both years. The demonstration cost/ha was Rs. 83000 & 81000 respectively as compared to 121000 & 118000. The gross return was higher in demonstrations (Rs. 472000 & 568000 as compared to 396000 & 320000) during the both year. The superiority of gross return over farmer's practice is due to higher yield of demonstration plots. This is also supported by Prasanta et al. [19], Ali et al. [18], Dorhoo [20], and Rahman et al. [16].

The Net returns were also higher in the demo plots as compared to farmer's practice during both years (Rs. 389000 & Rs 477000 as compared to 275000 & 314000).

The benefit cost ratio was also higher (4.68 & 5.88) as compared to farmer's plot (2.27 & 2.66) during both years of study.

The findings proving that growing ginger (var. Nadia) in the demonstration plots will help to fill the gaps of technology and also assist the tribal area region's ginger growers in achieving higher yields.

### CONCLUSION

The Nadia variety of ginger produced higher yields (118 & 142 q/ha) during the both years as compared to farmer's yield (99 & 108 q/ha). Which turned into good economic return as well as impressive benefit cost ratio.

### REFERENCES

1. Sial PRK, Tarai. Popularization of organic ginger cultivation in the Eastern Ghat highland Zone of Odisha. International Journal of Minor Fruits, Medicinal and Aromatic Plants. 2017;3(1):25-30.
2. NHB. Indian Horticulture Database- 2022 National Horticulture Board, Gurgaon, Govt. of India; 2022. Available: www.nhb.gov.in.
3. Mukhopadhyay B, Mukhopadhyay S, Majumder PP. Blood pressure profile of Lepcha of the Sikkim Himalayas: Epidemiological study. Hum Biol. 1996;68(1):131-145.
4. Arora V. The forest of symbols embodied in the Tholung sacred landscape of North Sikkim, India. Conservation and Society. 2006;4(1):55-83.
5. Ashok Kumar RK, Avasthe B, Lepcha A, Mohanty K, Shukla G. Impact of front lined demonstrations on yield enhancement of ginger (var. Majauley) in Tribal Reserve Biosphere of Sikkim Himalaya. J Agri Sci. 2012;3(2):121-123.
6. Prasad C, Chaudhary BN, Nayar BB. First Line Transfer of Technology Project. New Delhi: ICAR; 1987.
7. Subbaiah BV, Asija GL. A rapid procedure for the determination of available Nitrogen in soils. Current Science. 1956;25:256-260.
8. Samui SK, Maitra S, Roy DK, Mondal AK, Saha D. Evaluation on front lined demonstration on groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). J. Indian Soc. Coastal Agric. Res., 2000;18:180-183.
9. Renbomo N, Biswas P. Impact of front lined demonstration on the yield of chilli (*Capsicum annuum* L.), Agric. Update, 2016;11(3):283-287.
10. Kale SM, Barikar Umesh, Mahesh C. Popularization of Tomato Hybrid (Arka Rakshak) for Yield and Economic Analysis in Kalyan Karnataka Region. Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci. 2020;9(06):1675-1679.

Comment [9]: Spellings should be corrected

11. Sarmah K, Neog P, Rajbongsh R, Sarma A. Verification and usability of medium range weather forecast for North Bank Plain Zone of Assam. MAUSAM. 2018; 66(3): 585-594.
12. Borah LC, Deuri D, Sarkar R, Nath B, Kakaki L. Assessment of rhizome rot in ginger germplasm of North east India and biological management. Asian Academic Res. J. Multidisc. 2014; 1(24): 232-250.
13. Shah SP, Zala C. Cost-benefit analysis of ginger cultivation in middle Gujarat. Agricultural Economic Research Review. 2006; 19: 206
14. Ali SA, Safar RK, Prathak RK. Varietal performance of ginger against rhizome rot. Plant Disease Research. 1995; 10(2): 153-155.
15. Dorhoo NP. New record of bacterial wilt of ginger in Himachal Pradesh. Indian Phytopath. North Zone Meeting. April. 1990; 20-30, 16-18.
16. Bandyopadhyay S, Bhattacharya PM. Management of rhizome rot of ginger using physical, chemical and biological methods. Journal of Mycology and Plant Pathology. 2012; 42(3): 314-316.
17. Mukherjee N. Participatory learning and action. Concept, Publishing Company, New Delhi. 2003; 63-65.
18. Chapke RR. Impact of Frontline Demonstration on Jute (*Corchorus solitorius*). Journal of Human Ecology. 2012; 38(1): 37-41.
19. Jeengar KL, Panwar P, Pareek OP. Frontline demonstration on maize in Bhilwara District of Rajasthan. Current Agriculture. 2006; 30(1/2): 115-116.
20. Mokiduel, Mohanty AK, Sanjay K. Correlating growth, yield and adoption of urd-bean technologies. Indian J. Ex. Edu. 2011; 11(2): 20-24.