

## Original Research Article

### **Growth and development of groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* H.) as influenced by different levels and timing of phosphogypsum nutrition**

Formatted: Centered

#### **ABSTRACT**

**Aims:** A field experiment entitled “Growth and development of groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) as influenced by different levels and timing of phosphogypsum nutrition” was planned to ascertain the role of phosphogypsum an industrial by product in promoting growth of groundnut.

**Study design:** –Experiment was carried out at Agronomy field unit, Zonal Agricultural Research Station, University of Agricultural Sciences, GKVK, Bangalore, during kharif 2019. Experiment was planned with eleven treatments of which eight received sulphur through phosphogypsum at different levels (50, 75, 100 & 125 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup>) as basal and split (30 DAS) and one through gypsum (500 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) as basal. Whereas, other two treatments with NPK and NK alone are included for comparison. Design of the experiment is RCBD with eleven treatments replicated thrice.

**Comment [mk1]:** in the crop years 2019 in kharif Province.

**Results:** Among different treatments, application of phosphogypsum @ 125 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup> in split recorded highest growth parameters i.e., plant height (42.49 cm), leaf area (1137 cm<sup>2</sup> plant<sup>-1</sup>), dry matter per plant (29.30 g) and number of branches plant<sup>-1</sup> (8.62). Whereas, application of phosphogypsum @ 100 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup> in split found on par with 125 kg with respect to all growth parameters. While lowest values of all the parameters were noticed in treatment receiving N and K fertilizer alone.

**Keywords:** Phosphogypsum, groundnut, growth, plant height, development.

**Comment [mk2]:** Arrange keywords alphabetically

#### **I. Introduction**

Probably for a typical Indian from south, day doesn't end without relishing the taste of peanut at least once. Perhaps the day starts with tasty peanut chutney early in the morning and goes on interceding in different ways. Thanks to Spaniards for introducing, it into country, right from the early days of its introduction people accepted it and has spread very rapidly. Area under peanut has increased from 1600 ha in 1850-51 to about 4.8 m ha in 2018. In India peanut contribute to 17.3 and 24 per cent, of area and production, respectively to total oilseed statistics. Groundnut is valued for its wealthy source of oil (45–50%) and protein

**Comment [mk3]:** Reference should be mentioned And

(25–28%) in the kernels. They provide 564 Kcal of energy per 100 g of kernels (Jambunathan 1991). For any oilseed crop, sulphur particularly becomes most essential nutrient (Meena *et al.* 2007) as it aids in biosynthesis of oil (Yadav *et al.* 2019). Sulphur is the fourth major plant nutrient followed by N, P and K thus making it an important part of equitable fertilization and nutrition for oilseed crops in general and groundnut in particular. There are many sources of sulphur which are in use, one such source is phosphogypsum.

**Comment [mk4]:** Reference??

Phosphogypsum is a solid waste by-product of wet phosphoric acid production from rock phosphate. It supplies sulphur (13-16%), calcium (21%) in significant quantities. Unlike other sulphur sources which needs microbial action, phosphogypsum provides readily available sulphate form of sulphur (Biswas and Sharma 2008). Relative low solubility of phosphogypsum made it a long-lasting mineral with residual effect of nutrients on succeeding crops (Rashid *et al.*, 1989). Having all these beneficial properties it has created interest in us to study the response of groundnut to phosphogypsum as a fertilizer, so as to ascertain its worthiness.

## II. Materials and methods

Experiment was conducted at Zonal Agricultural Research Station (ZARS), Gandhi Krishi Vignana Kendra (GKVK), University of Agricultural Sciences (UAS), Bangalore, Eastern Dry Zone (Zone - V) of Karnataka which is located in between 12° 58" N Latitude and 77° 33' Longitude at an altitude of 930 m above mean sea level (MSL). Soil of the experimental site was red sandy loam with slightly acidic in pH (6.1) with nutrient composition of 247.6, 36.14, 278.41 and 18 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of NPK and S, respectively. Experiment was carried out with eleven treatments replicated thrice in RCBD design.

**Comment [mk5]:** Chemical features of soil at the experimental field show in the table

Urea, Single super phosphate and Muriate of potash were used as source of NPK, respectively. An ICRISAT variety ICGV-91114 was used in the study. Growth parameters like plant height, leaf area, number of branches plant<sup>-1</sup> and dry matter accumulation plant<sup>-1</sup> at 30, 60, 90 DAS and at harvest were recorded.

Treatment details:

T<sub>1</sub>: Recommended dose of NPK + 500 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of gypsum (PoP)

T<sub>2</sub>: 50 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup> (100 % at the time of sowing)

T<sub>3</sub>: 75 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup> (100 % at the time of sowing)

T<sub>4</sub>: 100 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup> (100 % at the time of sowing)

T<sub>5</sub>: 125 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup> (100 % at the time of sowing)

T<sub>6</sub>: 50 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup> (50 % at the time of sowing + 50 % at 30 days after sowing)

T<sub>7</sub>: 75 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup> (50 % at the time of sowing + 50 % at 30 days after sowing)

T<sub>8</sub>: 100 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup> (50 % at the time of sowing + 50 % at 30 days after sowing)

T<sub>9</sub>: 125 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup> (50 % at the time of sowing + 50 % at 30 days after sowing)

T<sub>10</sub>: Recommended dose of fertilizers (NPK only)

T<sub>11</sub>: Recommended dose of fertilizers (N and K only)

(Note: - In T<sub>2</sub> to T<sub>9</sub> Phosphogypsum was used as source of sulphur along with NPK)

(POP: package of practice, eq: equivalent, S: sulphur)

(Recommended dose includes 25: 75: 37.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>: K<sub>2</sub>O)

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

### III. Results and discussion

#### a. Growth and development

At 30 DAS, application of 125 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup> of phosphogypsum as basal recorded highest plant height (9.26 cm), dry matter accumulation (2.21 g) (Table 1), number of branches (4.11) and leaf area (286 cm<sup>2</sup> plant<sup>-1</sup>) (Table 2). Whereas at 60, 90 DAS and at harvest application of 125 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup> of phosphogypsum in split recorded significantly higher plant height (36.61, 40.82 ~~&-and~~ 42.49 cm respectively), dry matter accumulation (21.63, 26.29 ~~&-and~~ 29.30 g respectively), number of branches (8.56, 8.62 ~~&-and~~ 8.62, respectively) and leaf area (1137, 762 ~~&-and~~ 157 cm<sup>2</sup> plant<sup>-1</sup>, respectively). While application of 100 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup> of phosphogypsum in split recorded on par results with all growth parameters. With the application of phosphogypsum @125 kg S eq in split, sufficient quantities of calcium and sulphur were ensured throughout crop growth along with NPK which promoted rapid growth of plant. Since, calcium enhances cell division in apical region which promotes rapid growth of plants. More importantly calcium is essential to plant at peg initiation, fruit formation and pod maturation (Kabir *et al.* 2013) without of which new tissue development is inhibited and pod filling is incomplete. Sulphur has role in both protein synthesis and photosynthesis which led to rapid expansion of leaf and higher dry matter production. This ultimately ended up in giving highest yield (Anthati 2011). Compared to

basal application of same amounts, split application recorded highest growth parameters right from its application compared to basal application it is because when entire quantities of phosphogypsum was applied as basal alone, there may be leaching losses at the time of excess rainfall events, which are most familiar during *kharif*. Moreover, greater quantity of sulphur is used at peg initiation so application of phosphogypsum at times of requirement is more essential, which was also supported by Sakal *et al.* (1998); Sivakumar and Dash (2014); Rout and Jena (2009).

**Comment [mk6]:** Due to the novelty of your research, it is better to use new and up-to-date references

UNDER PEER REVIEW

**Table 1. Plant height and dry matter of groundnut at different stages as influenced by different levels and time of phosphogypsum nutrition**

Treatments	Plant height (cm)				Dry matter production (g plant <sup>-1</sup> )			
	30 DAS	60 DAS	90 DAS	At harvest	30 DAS	60 DAS	90 DAS	At harvest
<b>T<sub>1</sub></b>	9.17	31.79	38.02	39.03	1.91	18.70	22.82	25.81
<b>T<sub>2</sub></b>	7.22	27.69	32.04	33.03	1.59	12.85	18.37	22.43
<b>T<sub>3</sub></b>	8.12	29.10	34.43	34.06	1.80	15.18	19.41	23.74
<b>T<sub>4</sub></b>	8.89	31.21	38.00	38.91	2.06	18.89	22.82	26.37
<b>T<sub>5</sub></b>	9.26	32.01	38.41	39.54	2.21	20.26	23.22	27.44
<b>T<sub>6</sub></b>	7.10	30.48	34.68	33.72	1.32	14.74	19.15	23.33
<b>T<sub>7</sub></b>	7.59	31.06	36.00	35.41	1.41	15.59	20.26	24.46
<b>T<sub>8</sub></b>	7.88	35.06	40.01	41.95	1.62	20.59	25.10	28.11
<b>T<sub>9</sub></b>	8.24	36.61	40.82	42.49	1.72	21.63	26.29	29.30
<b>T<sub>10</sub></b>	6.26	25.71	29.43	30.33	1.30	12.38	16.61	20.18
<b>T<sub>11</sub></b>	6.13	23.77	28.28	29.55	1.18	10.26	13.66	16.93
<b>S.Em±</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<b>0.99</b>	<b>0.06</b>	<b>0.68</b>	<b>0.87</b>	<b>0.67</b>
<b>C.D. (p=0.05)</b>	<b>1.01</b>	<b>2.57</b>	<b>1.99</b>	<b>2.93</b>	<b>0.19</b>	<b>2.01</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>1.97</b>

DAS: Days after sowing

T<sub>1</sub>: Recommended dose of NPK + 500 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of gypsum (PoP), T<sub>2</sub>: 50 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>3</sub>: 75 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>4</sub>: 100 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>5</sub>: 125 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>6</sub>: 50 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>7</sub>: 75 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>8</sub>: 100 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>9</sub>: 125 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>10</sub>: NPK and T<sub>11</sub>: N & K.

(In T<sub>2</sub> to T<sub>5</sub> entire dose of recommended phosphogypsum was applied as basal & In T<sub>6</sub> to T<sub>9</sub> phosphogypsum was applied in split (basal and 30 DAS) @-50:50 proportion)

**Table 2. Number of branches and leaf area plant<sup>-1</sup> at different growth stages of groundnut as influenced by different levels and time of phosphogypsum nutrition**

Formatted: Centered

Treatments	Number of branches plant <sup>-1</sup>				Leaf area (cm <sup>2</sup> plant <sup>-1</sup> )			
	30 DAS	60 DAS	90 DAS	At harvest	30 DAS	60 DAS	90 DAS	At harvest
<b>T<sub>1</sub></b>	4.00	7.23	7.42	7.42	279	962	638	133
<b>T<sub>2</sub></b>	3.70	6.41	6.51	6.51	188	800	528	123
<b>T<sub>3</sub></b>	3.69	6.64	6.73	6.73	198	828	547	125
<b>T<sub>4</sub></b>	4.08	7.12	7.32	7.32	275	959	619	128
<b>T<sub>5</sub></b>	4.11	7.34	7.60	7.60	286	1038	655	139
<b>T<sub>6</sub></b>	3.34	6.78	6.58	6.58	167	811	529	131
<b>T<sub>7</sub></b>	3.41	6.88	6.73	6.73	174	893	587	130
<b>T<sub>8</sub></b>	3.52	8.42	8.51	8.51	179	1064	706	148
<b>T<sub>9</sub></b>	3.61	8.56	8.62	8.62	180	1137	762	157
<b>T<sub>10</sub></b>	3.49	6.21	6.23	6.23	149	717	453	111
<b>T<sub>11</sub></b>	3.33	6.03	6.12	6.12	137	641	418	110
<b>S.Em±</b>	<b>0.18</b>	<b>0.18</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>C.D. (p=0.05)</b>	<b>0.54</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>1.01</b>	<b>1.01</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>11</b>

T<sub>1</sub>: Recommended dose of NPK + 500 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of gypsum (PoP), T<sub>2</sub>: 50 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>3</sub>: 75 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>4</sub>: 100 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>5</sub>: 125 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>6</sub>: 50 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>7</sub>: 75 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>8</sub>: 100 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>9</sub>: 125 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>10</sub>: NPK and T<sub>11</sub>: N &and K.

(In T<sub>2</sub> to T<sub>5</sub> entire dose of recommended phosphogypsum was applied as basal &and In T<sub>6</sub> to T<sub>9</sub> phosphogypsum was applied in split (basal and 30 DAS) @ 50:50 proportion)

DAS: Days after sowing

UNDER PEER REVIEW

#### IV. Conclusion:

Though phosphogypsum is a by-product obtained from phosphorus industry, it can be valued as important fertilizer to those crops which require sulphur and calcium in greater quantities or in soils with poor nutrient status. Application of phosphogypsum @125 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup> in split yielded best results in terms of plant height, branching, leaf area and dry matter production which were on par with 100 kg S eq ha<sup>-1</sup> in split. When same quantity of nutrients was applied as basal alone, then results were significantly lower, suggesting the importance of nutrition timing.

#### V. Literature cited

Anthati, R. 2011. Effect of different levels of gypsum with different levels of pressmud cake on yield and uptake of nutrients in groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). M.Sc., Thesis, Acharya N. G. Ranga Agricultural University. 2011.

Biswas, P., Sharma, PD. 2008. Phosphogypsum a potential source of sulphur and calcium to crops. Indian Journal of Fertilizers. 2008;4(8): 49-52.

Jambunathan, R. 1989. "Groundnut quality characteristics," in Uses of Tropical Grain Legumes. Proceedings of a Consultants Meeting, March 27–30, (Patancheru: ICRISAT). 1989;267–275.

Kabir, R., Yeasmin, S., Islam, AkM., Sarkar, MR. 2013. Effect of phosphorus, calcium and boron on the growth and yield of groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). International Journal of Bioscience and Biotechnology. 2013;5:51–60.

Meena, S., Malarkodi, M., Senthil, VP. 2007. Secondary and micronutrients for groundnut - a review. Indian Journal of Agricultural Research. 2007;28:295.

Rashid, MMA., Dhanoon, AM., Abood, EK., Mahdi, WH. 1989. Effect of phosphogypsum application on the availability of some micronutrients in soil and its content in wheat shoot. Proceedings of 5th science conference/SRC-Iraq. 1989;1(2): 164-174.

Rout, KK., Jena, D. 2009. Effect of phosphogypsum and its combined use with lime in acid soils of orissa on crop productivity, crop and soil quality. Indian. Journal of Fertilizers. 2009;5(5): 44-54.

**Comment [mk7]:** References should be written based on the format of the journal

Sakal, R., Sinha, RB., Singh, AP., Bhogal, NS. [1998](#). Response of some rabi pulses to boron, zinc and sulphur application in farmer's field. Fertilizer News. [1998](#);43(11): 39-40.

Sivakumar, NLV., Dash, BB. [2014](#). Effect of phosphogypsum and papermill sludge on groundnut in groundnut-rice cropping system. M.Sc. Thesis, OUAT. [2014](#).

Yadav, N., Yadav, SS., Yadav, N., Yadav, MR., Kumar, R., Yadav, LR., ~~et al.~~ [2019](#). Sulphur management in groundnut for higher productivity and profitability under semi-arid condition of Rajasthan. Indian Journal of Legume Research. [2019](#);42(4).

UNDER PEER REVIEW