

Effect of different nutrient management practices on Productivity and Profitability of Double Zero Indian Mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.)

Gajjela Indira, R.B. Yadav, Vivek; R.K. Naresh; M Sharath Chandra; Shivangi;

Ashish Nath and Roop Kishor Pachauri

Department of Agronomy, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel University of Agriculture & Technology, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India

ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted at Crop Research Center, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel University of Agriculture & Technology, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh in Rabi season 2021 with a view to compare the production potential under different nutrient management practices and also to find out the economic viability of this cultivar for soil quality. The experiment was analysed in Randomised block design (RBD) and the treatments comprised of Control (T₁), 100% N (T₂), 100% NP (T₃), 100% NPK (T₄), 125%NPK (T₅), 100% NPK+ S@40kg ha⁻¹ (T₆), 100%NPK+ Zn@5kg ha⁻¹ (T₇), 100%NPK + B@1kg ha⁻¹ (T₈), 75% NPK+ VC@ 2t ha⁻¹ (T₉), 75%NPK+FYM@ 6t ha⁻¹ (T₁₀), 75%NPK + VC@ 2t ha⁻¹+ Azotobacter (T₁₁) and 75% NPK + FYM@6t ha⁻¹ + Azotobacter (T₁₂). Results revealed that treatment T₁₁ and T₁₂ exhibited significant influence on yield attributes and yields of mustard as compared to the application of 100% NPK alone. The maximum gross return was obtained in T₁₂ followed by T₁₁. The highest net return was obtained in T₅ followed by T₁₂, T₆ and T₁₁, whereas, minimum gross return and net return was obtained in T₁. T₁₁ recorded higher gross return and net return but the B:C ratio was lower due to higher cost of vermicompost. Higher values of B: C ratio (4.23) was obtained in T₆ and T₅ respectively. The current study reveals that T₁₁ and T₁₂ exhibited significant beneficial for yield, yield attributes and profitability of mustard.

Keywords: Indian mustard, nutrient management practices, production potential, profitability

1. Introduction

Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea*L.) is commonly known as *raya* or *laha*. It is an important oilseed crop in the world. It plays an important role in meeting edible oil demand of the country. Indian mustard is chiefly cultivated in Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Haryana, and Gujarat. Its cultivation is also being extended to non-traditional areas of cultivation in southern states like Karnataka, Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh. Among the various cultivated oilseed crops the contribution of Rapeseed and Mustard is around 26%. Rapeseed and Mustard is grown on an area of 6.9 million hectares, 7.2 M Mt of production and 1.0375 Mt ha⁻¹ productivity in India [1]. India is ranked third after Canada and China sharing about 11.0% of the global rapeseed-mustard production (72.41 mt) and 24.7% and 29.4% in terms of area and production, respectively, of oilseeds in

India during 2018-19. The estimated demand of oilseeds by 2030 is 82-101 mt and contribution of rapeseed-mustard is projected to be 16.4-20.5 mt, accounting its share of 20-25% in production [2].

Among the various agronomic factors that are known to enhance crop production, fertilizer and nutrient management play a significant role. The efficiency of fertilizer nitrogen is only 40-50%, phosphorous 15-20% and Sulphur 10-12% in Indian soils and this could be enhanced by efficient use of inputs [3]. For sustainable crop production, integrative effect of organic, inorganic and bio- fertilizers is important. Biofertilizers and organic manures play a significant role in sustaining soil health. Nitrogen, phosphorous and potassium as major nutrients and Sulphur, boron among the secondary nutrients play an important role in influencing the yield and quality of mustard. Moreover balanced fertilization is an important aspect of crop production technology.

The purpose of the current study was to evaluate the response of Indian Mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) for their yield, yield attributes and economic potential under different nutrient management practices.

2. Material and Methods

The experiment was carried out at Crop Research Centre, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel University of Agriculture and Technology, Meerut (U.P.) to study the influence of different nutrient management practices on productivity and profitability of Double Zero Indian Mustard in Randomized Block Design with 12 treatments (Table 1), replicated three times. The maximum and minimum temperatures recorded were 35.21 °C and 4.89 °C during the crop growth period. Maximum temperature ranged from 18.13 °C to 34.01 °C during maturity phase of the crop. Relative humidity varied from 26.57% to 94.86% during crop growth period. The area receives mean annual rainfall of 845mm. The soil of the experimental field was sandy loam in texture, low in available nitrogen (220.7 kg ha⁻¹) and organic carbon (0.48%), medium in available phosphorous (13.8 kg ha⁻¹) and potassium (247.2 kg ha⁻¹) and slightly alkaline (pH 7.8) in reaction with electrical conductivity of 0.22 dS m⁻¹. The gross and net plot size were 6m X 4.5m and 4.8m X 2.7m respectively. The crop variety Pusa Mustard 31(PDZM-31) was sown on 19 October 2020 and harvested on 20 March 2021. The seed rate was 5 kg ha⁻¹. Seeding was done in the row to row spacing of 45 cm and plant to plant spacing of 15cm. The recommended dose of nitrogen (120kg ha⁻¹) was applied in two equal split, the half as basal and the remaining half was top dressed 2 times at the time of first and second irrigation. The whole quantity of potassium (40 kg ha⁻¹) was applied as basal dose through Murate of Potash at 8-10 cm depth along with half dose of nitrogen prior to sowing. Phosphorous was applied as basal dose (60kg

ha⁻¹) through DAP. Vermicompost (2t ha⁻¹) and FYM (6t ha⁻¹) were applied in the field as per treatments and was thoroughly mixed at the time of sowing. The sulphur was applied through Gypsum in the field as per treatments. Boron was applied through borax at the time of sowing. Zinc was applied at the time of sowing in the form of Zinc sulphate. The seed was treated with Azotobacter @200g / 10 kg seed which was applied as per treatments before the sowing. One thinning was done after 30 days of sowing to maintain a plant to plant distance of about 15 cm. Weeding and hoeing operation were performed manually after first and second irrigation at proper soil moisture condition of the soil. At the harvest, seeds per siliqua, 1000 seed weight, seed yield and stover yield were calculated. Economics of treatments were computed on the basis of prevailing market price of inputs and outputs under each treatment. The total cost of cultivation of crop was calculated on the basis of different operations performed and materials used for raising the crop including the cost of fertilizers and seeds. The cost of labour incurred in performing different operation was also included. Statistical analysis of the data was done as per the standard analysis of variance technique for the experimental designs following SPSS software based programme, and the treatment means were compared at P<0.05 level of probability using t-test and calculating CD values.

3. Result and Discussion

3.1 Influence of different nutrients on yield attributes of Indian mustard

Yield attributes viz., Number of siliqua plant⁻¹, Siliqua length (cm), Number of seeds per siliqua and weight of 1000 seeds of Indian mustard were affected significantly by various treatments involving different nutrient management practices (Table 1 and fig 1a & 1b).

Table 1: Influence of different nutrients on yield attributes of Indian mustard.

Treatments		No. of siliqua plant ⁻¹	Siliqua length(cm)	Number of seeds siliqua ⁻¹	1000 seed weight(g)
T ₁	Control	148.0	4.17	12.4	3.46
T ₂	100% N	207.0	4.22	12.9	3.53
T ₃	100% NP	240.7	4.29	13.3	3.55
T ₄	100% NPK	257.3	4.32	13.3	3.64
T ₅	125%NPK	251.3	4.37	14.4	3.63
T ₆	100% NPK+ S@40kg ha ⁻¹	259.2	4.34	15.6	3.67
T ₇	100%NPK+ Zn@5kg ha ⁻¹	255.0	4.33	14.2	3.62

T₈	100%NPK + B@1kg ha ⁻¹	235.7	4.43	14.6	3.61
T₉	75% NPK+ VC@ 2.5t ha ⁻¹	256.0	4.50	15.5	3.74
T₁₀	75%NPK+FYM@ 6t ha ⁻¹	257.0	4.51	15.5	3.75
T₁₁	75%NPK + VC@ 2t ha ⁻¹ +Azotobacter	259.3	4.53	16.0	3.77
T₁₂	75% NPK + FYM@6t ha ⁻¹ + Azotobacter	254.7	4.54	16.1	3.78
SEm ±		7.7	0.03	0.19	0.03
C D (P=0.05)		22.7	0.09	0.55	0.08

From the given data (Table 1) it can be inferred that the maximum number of siliqua plant⁻¹ (259) were produced in the treatment T₁₁ (75%NPK + VC@ 2t ha⁻¹+ Azotobacter) which was found to be at par with T₄ (100%NPK), T₆ (100% NPK+ S@40kg ha⁻¹), T₇(100%NPK+ Zn@5kg ha⁻¹), T₉ (75% NPK+ VC@ 2t ha⁻¹), T₁₀ (75%NPK+FYM@ 6t ha⁻¹) and T₁₂ (75% NPK + FYM@ 6t ha⁻¹ + Azotobacter). However, the lowest number of siliqua plant⁻¹ (148) were recorded in treatment T₁ (Control) which was significantly lower than rest of the other treatments. In mustard sink lies in siliqua and seeds. The results were in accordance with those reported by **Bhat *et al.* [4]; Kumar *et al.* [5] and Sharma *et al.* [6].**

Significantly higher siliqua length (3.54) was recorded in treatment T₁₂ which was statistically found to be at par with, T₉, T₁₀ and T₁₁. Treatment T₁ recorded the lowest siliqua length (4.17cm) and next in order was treatment T₂. The results were in accordance with those reported by **Kumar *et al* [5]; Singh and Siniswar [7] and Patel *et al* [8].**

It is evident from the data that the significantly higher number of seeds siliqua⁻¹ (16.1) were produced in treatment T₁₂ (75% NPK + FYM@6t ha⁻¹ + Azotobacter) which remained on par with, T₉ (75% NPK+ VC@ 2t ha⁻¹), T₁₀ (75%NPK+FYM@ 6t ha⁻¹) and T₁₁ (75%NPK + VC@ 2t ha⁻¹+ Azotobacter). Treatment T₁ recorded lowest number of seeds siliqua⁻¹ (12.4) followed by T₂ (100% N). Adequate nutrients availability to the crop as a result of increment in photosynthesis as well as growth led to increase in the no of seeds siliqua⁻¹. These findings were almost similar to the results reported by **Hussain *et al* [9]; Tripathi *et al* [10] and Dubey *et al* [11].**

Maximum test weight (3.78g) was recorded in T₁₂ (75% NPK + FYM@6t ha⁻¹ + Azotobacter) which was on par to T₉ (75% NPK+ VC@ 2t ha⁻¹), T₁₀ (75%NPK+FYM@ 6t ha⁻¹) and T₁₁ (75%NPK + VC@ 2t ha⁻¹+ Azotobacter), whereas the lowest test weight (3.46) was recorded in T₁ (Control). The integrated application of FYM, macro and micro nutrients

and biofertilizers might increase availability of plant nutrients which result into better nourishment of plants and the formation of bold seeds, ultimately increased weight of seeds. The results were similar to the findings reported by **Kumar *et al.* [5]; Sharma *et al.* [6] and Dubey *et al* [11].**

3.2 Influence of different nutrient management practices on Productivity

Data with regard to the effect of different nutrient management practices on seed yield, stover yield, biological yield and harvest index of mustard crop are mentioned in Table 2 and depicted in fig 2.

Table 2: Influence of different nutrients on Yield of Indian mustard

Treatments		Seed yield (q ha ⁻¹)	Stover yield (q ha ⁻¹)	Biological yield (q ha ⁻¹)	HI (%)
T ₁	Control	8.89	46.33	55.22	16.08
T ₂	100% N	13.79	58.70	72.49	19.05
T ₃	100% NP	16.75	61.45	78.20	21.43
T ₄	100% NPK	18.77	63.25	82.02	22.89
T ₅	125%NPK	22.38	76.41	98.80	22.66
T ₆	100% NPK+ S@40kg ha ⁻¹	21.96	75.90	97.86	22.45
T ₇	100%NPK+ Zn@5kg ha ⁻¹	20.17	69.68	89.86	22.48
T ₈	100%NPK + B@1kg ha ⁻¹	18.37	64.87	83.25	22.06
T ₉	75% NPK+ VC@ 2t ha ⁻¹	20.07	70.80	90.87	22.08
T ₁₀	75%NPK+FYM@ 6t ha ⁻¹	20.67	71.88	92.56	22.33
T ₁₁	75%NPK + VC@ 2t ha ⁻¹ +Azotobacter	22.54	74.70	97.25	23.19
T ₁₂	75% NPK + FYM@ 6t ha ⁻¹ + Azotobacter	22.66	75.08	97.74	23.21
SEm ±		0.48	1.83	1.96	0.58
C D (P=0.05)		1.41	5.39	5.74	1.72

Among the various nutrient levels, the treatment T₁₂ exhibited significantly higher seed yield (22.66 q ha⁻¹) which was statistically on par to T₅, T₆ and T₁₁. Treatment T₁ (Control) with no application of any fertilizer recorded lowest grain yield of 8.89 q ha⁻¹. About 20.7%, 20.1%, 19.2% and 16.9% increase in seed yield was recorded by T₁₂, T₁₁, T₅ and T₆ respectively over treatment T₄, also T₉ and T₁₀ recorded increase in seed yield of 6.9% and 10.1% respectively over T₄ respectively. Treatment T₂ and T₃ showed an increment in seed yield of 55.1% and 88.4% respectively over T₁. Addition of Sulphur (T₆) and Zinc (T₇) to RDF (100% NPK) recorded an increase of 16.9 % and 7.4% seed yield respectively over

T₄. It can also be seen from the data (Table 2) that by the addition of Biofertilizer treatment T₁₂ showed 12.3% seed yield increment over T₉. Similarly T₁₂ recorded 9.6 % increase in seed yield over T₁₀. The maximum seed yield was recorded due to integrated application of FYM, chemical fertilizers and biofertilizers. This might be due to slow release of nutrient from FYM leading to reduced loss of nitrogen and efficient use of Macro and micronutrients. The production of growth promoting and antifungal substances by Azotobacter and nitrogen fixation was possibly the reason for higher yields.

In the same way, stover yield of mustard (Table 2) was significantly influenced by different nutrient management treatments. Results revealed that the differences in stover yield were found significant due to different treatments. Though significantly higher stover yield 76.41q ha⁻¹ was recorded under T₅, it was statistically on par with T₆, T₁₀, T₁₁ and T₁₂. The lowest stover yield (46.33 q ha⁻¹) was recorded in T₁ (control). Similar trend was observed in Biological yield, whereas maximum harvest index (23.21 %) was recorded in T₁₂ which was on par with T₄, T₅, T₆, T₇, T₈, T₉, T₁₀ and T₁₁. The increase in straw yield was mainly due to increased growth attributing characters like plant height and number of primary and secondary branches plant⁻¹. These findings are in conformity with the results of *Sharma et al.* [6]; *Singh and Singh* [12]; *Kumar et al.* [13]; *Dhruwet et al.* [14] and *Shivendu et al.* [15].

3.3 Influence of different nutrient management practices on Economics


From Table 3 it can be seen that among the various nutrient levels, the cost of cultivation (Rs. ha⁻¹) varied from 26,299 to 39,542 Rs. ha⁻¹. The highest cost of cultivation was registered with the application of T₁₁ followed by T₉, T₁₂ while the application of no fertilizer registered the lowest cost of cultivation. Maximum gross returns (175479 Rs. ha⁻¹) was obtained by the application of T₁₂ followed by T₁₁, T₅ and T₆.



Table 3: Influence of different nutrient combinations on Economic analysis of Indian mustard


Treatments		Cost of cultivation (Rs. Ha ⁻¹)	Gross income (Rs. Ha ⁻¹)	Net income (Rs. Ha ⁻¹)	B:C Ratio
T ₁	Control	26,299	73906	47607	1.81
T ₂	100% N	27,833	110693	82859	2.97
T ₃	100% NP	30,186	131498	101311	3.35
T ₄	100% NPK	31,312	145673	114360	3.65
T ₅	125%NPK	33,230	173988	140758	4.23
T ₆	100% NPK+ S@40kg ha ⁻¹	32,662	171000	138338	4.23
T ₇	100%NPK+ Zn@5kg ha ⁻¹	38006	157051	119045	3.13

T₈	100%NPK + B@1kg ha ⁻¹	34,162	143458	109296	3.19
T₉	75% NPK+ VC@ 2t ha ⁻¹	39312	156713	117400	2.98
T₁₀	75%NPK+FYM@ 6t ha ⁻¹	37312	161087	123774	3.31
T₁₁	75%NPK + VC@ 2t ha ⁻¹ + Azotobacter	39542	174555	135013	3.41
T₁₂	75% NPK + FYM@ 6t ha ⁻¹ + Azotobacter	37542	175479	137937	3.62

The lowest Gross return of 73906 Rs. ha⁻¹ was obtained in treatment T₁. Maximum net return of 140758 Rs ha⁻¹ was recorded by the application of 125% NPK T₅ followed by T₁₂, T₆ and T₁₁. However, the maximum Benefit cost ratio of 4.23 was obtained in T₆ & T₅ followed by T₄, T₁₁ and T₁₂. The higher net returns and BCR was mainly due to increase in seed yield. Similar results recorded by Nath *et al.* [16], Rohit *et al.* [17] and Satyanarayana *et al.* [18].







Conclusion:

It can be concluded that among the various nutrient management practices, the application of 75%NPK + VC @2t ha⁻¹+ Azotobacter (T₁₁) and 75% NPK + FYM @6t ha⁻¹ + Azotobacter (T₁₂) found to be beneficial for yield, yield attributes and profitability of mustard.

References

1. Anonymous. Agricultural Statistics at a glance. Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Department of Agriculture, Cooperation and Farmers Welfare, Government of India, 2019.
2. Chauhan JS, Choudhary PR, Pal S, Singh KH. Analysis of seed chain and its implication in rapeseed-mustard (*Brassica spp.*) production. *India Journal Oilseeds Research*, 2020; **37**(2): 71-84.
3. Hegde DM, Sudhakara Basu SN. Balanced fertilization for nutritional quality in oilseeds. *Fertilizer News*, 2004; **49**(4): 57-62, 65-66.
4. Bhat SA, Khan FA, Khan MI. Effect of nitrogen and phosphorus on growth, nutrient content, seed yield and quality of mustard. *Indian Journal of Plant Physiology*, 2006; **11**(3): 281-286.
5. Kumar B, Singh GR. Response of land configurations, IW/CPE ratios and integrated nutrient supply systems on growth function, yield and water use efficiency of French bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L. PDR-14), *International Journal of Agriculture, Environment & Biotechnology*, 2014; **7**(4), 825-831.

6. Sharma, J. Influence of Vermicompost and Different Nutrients on Performance of Indian Mustard [*Brassica juncea* (L.) Czern and Coss] in Typic Haplusteps. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Maharana Pratap Agricultural University and Technology, Udaipur, 2016.
7. Singh R, Sinsinwar BS. Effect of integrated nutrient management on growth, yield, oil content and nutrient uptake of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea*). *Indian Journal of Agricultural Science*, 2006; 76:322-24.
8. Patel GM, Patel BT, Nodia IN, Bhatt VK, Bhatt RK. Effect of sources and levels of sulphur on yield, quality and nutrient uptake of mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) varieties in loamy sand soil. *Journal of Soils and Crops*, 2009; **19**: 30-35.
9. Hussain MJ, Sarker MMR, Sarker MH, Ali M, Salim MMR. Effect of different levels of boron on the yield and yield attributes of mustard in surma- kushiara flood plain soil (AEZ 20). *Journal of Soil and Nature*, 2008; **2**: 06-09.
10. Tripathi MK, Chaturvedi S, Shukla DK, Mahapatra BS. Yield performance and quality in Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) as affected by integrated nutrient management. *Indian Journal of Agronomy*. 2011;55(2): 138-142.
11. Dubey SK, Tripathi SK; Singh, B. Effect of sulphur and zinc levels on growth, yield and quality of mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.). *Journal of Crop Science and Technology*, 2013; **2**(1): 2319-3395.
12. Singh R, Singh A.K, Kumar P. Performance of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) in response to Integrated Nutrient Management. *Journal of Agricultural Research*. 2014;1(1): 9-12.
13. Kumar S, Patel A, Nath T, Verma S. Prajapati A. Response of sulphur and zinc nutrition on growth, yield attributes and yields of rapeseed (*Brassica napus* L.) under upland soil of Vindhyan region. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*. 2018;135-140.
14. Dhruw SS, Swaroop N, Swamy, Upadhayay Y. Effects of Different Levels of NPK and Sulphur on Growth and Yield Attributes of Mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) Cv. Varuna. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*. 2017;6:1089-1098.
15. Shivendu KC, Sanjay KS, Anil P. Influence of integrated nutrient management on yield and quality of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) in calcareous soil of Bihar. *Annals of Plant and Soil Research*. 2019;21(1): 76-81.
16. Nath S, Patel BT, Meena O, Jat GP. Effect of phosphorus and sulphur on yield attributes, yield and economics of mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) Czern&Coss] in loamy sand. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, 2018; **7**(5): 498-500.
17. Rohit K, Akhila ND, Suhana PG, Anupam D, Sanjay S. Impact of Integrated nutrient management on nutrient uptake of mustard crop. *International Journal of Chemical Studies*, 2019; **7**(3) 1284-1287.

18. Satyanarayana U, Singh R, Singh AC, Singh E. Effect of nutrient combinations on Economics of mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.). *International Journal of Chemical Studies*, 2020; **9**(1):2436-2438.