

Print ISSN : 0972-8813
e-ISSN : 2582-2780

[Vol. 22(1) January-April 2024]

Pantnagar Journal of Research

(Formerly International Journal of Basic and
Applied Agricultural Research ISSN : 2349-8765)



G.B. Pant University of Agriculture & Technology, Pantnagar



ADVISORYBOARD

Patron

Dr. Manmohan Singh Chauhan, Vice-Chancellor, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

Members

Dr. A.S. Nain, Ph.D., Director Research, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. Jitendra Kwatra, Ph.D., Director, Extension Education, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. S.K. Kashyap, Ph.D., Dean, College of Agriculture, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. S.P. Singh, Ph.D., Dean, College of Veterinary & Animal Sciences, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. K.P. Raverkar, Ph.D., Dean, College of Post Graduate Studies, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. Sandeep Arora, Ph.D., Dean, College of Basic Sciences & Humanities, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. Alaknanda Ashok, Ph.D., Dean, College of Technology, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. Alka Goel, Ph.D., Dean, College of Community Science, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. Avdesh Kumar, Ph.D., Dean, College of Fisheries, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. R.S. Jadoun, Ph.D., Dean, College of Agribusiness Management, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

EDITORIALBOARD

Members

Prof. A.K. Misra, Ph.D., Chairman, Agricultural Scientists Recruitment Board, Krishi Anusandhan Bhavan I, New Delhi, India
Dr. Anand Shukla, Director, Reefberry Foodex Pvt. Ltd., Veraval, Gujarat, India
Dr. Anil Kumar, Ph.D., Director, Education, Rani Lakshmi Bai Central Agricultural University, Jhansi, India
Dr. Ashok K. Mishra, Ph.D., Kemper and Ethel Marley Foundation Chair, W.P. Carey Business School, Arizona State University, U.S.A.
Dr. B.B. Singh, Ph.D., Visiting Professor and Senior Fellow, Dept. of Soil and Crop Sciences and Borlaug Institute for International Agriculture, Texas A&M University, U.S.A.
Prof. Binod Kumar Kanaujia, Ph.D., Professor, School of Computational and Integrative Sciences, Jawahar Lal Nehru University, New Delhi, India
Dr. D. Ratna Kumari, Ph.D., Associate Dean, College of Community / Home Science, PJTSAU, Hyderabad, India
Dr. Deepak Pant, Ph.D., Separation and Conversion Technology, Flemish Institute for Technological Research (VITO), Belgium
Dr. Desirazu N. Rao, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Biochemistry, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India
Dr. G.K. Garg, Ph.D., Dean (Retired), College of Basic Sciences & Humanities, G.B. Pant University of Agric. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. Humnath Bhandari, Ph.D., IIRRI Representative for Bangladesh, Agricultural Economist, Agrifood Policy Platform, Philippines
Dr. Indu S Sawant, Ph.D., Director, ICAR - National Research Centre for Grapes, Pune, India
Dr. Kuldeep Singh, Ph.D., Director, ICAR - National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources, New Delhi, India
Dr. M.P. Pandey, Ph.D., Ex. Vice Chancellor, BAU, Ranchi & IGKV, Raipur and Director General, IAT, Allahabad, India
Dr. Martin Mortimer, Ph.D., Professor, The Centre of Excellence for Sustainable Food Systems, University of Liverpool, United Kingdom
Dr. Muneshwar Singh, Ph.D., Project Coordinator AICRP- LTFE, ICAR - Indian Institute of Soil Science, Bhopal, India
Prof. Omkar, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Zoology, University of Lucknow, India
Dr. P.C. Srivastav, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Soil Science, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India
Dr. Prashant Srivastava, Ph.D., Cooperative Research Centre for Contamination Assessment and Remediation of the Environment, University of South Australia, Australia
Dr. Puneet Srivastava, Ph.D., Director, Water Resources Center, Butler-Cunningham Eminent Scholar, Professor, Biosystems Engineering, Auburn University, U.S.A.
Dr. R.C. Chaudhary, Ph.D., Chairman, Participatory Rural Development Foundation, Gorakhpur, India
Dr. R.K. Singh, Ph.D., Director & Vice Chancellor, ICAR-Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar, U.P., India
Prof. Ramesh Kanwar, Ph.D., Charles F. Curtiss Distinguished Professor of Water Resources Engineering, Iowa State University, U.S.A.
Dr. S.N. Maurya, Ph.D., Professor (Retired), Department of Gynecology & Obstetrics, G.B. Pant University of Agric. & Tech., Pantnagar, India
Dr. Sham S. Goyal, Ph.D., Professor (Retired), Faculty of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, University of California, Davis, U.S.A.
Prof. Umesh Varshney, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Microbiology and Cell Biology, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India
Prof. V.D. Sharma, Ph.D., Dean Academics, SAI Group of Institutions, Dehradun, India
Dr. V.K. Singh, Ph.D., Head, Division of Agronomy, ICAR-Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, India
Dr. Vijay P. Singh, Ph.D., Distinguished Professor, Caroline and William N. Lehrer Distinguished Chair in Water Engineering, Department of Biological Agricultural Engineering, Texas A&M University, U.S.A.
Dr. Vinay Mehrotra, Ph.D., President, Vinlax Canada Inc., Canada

Editor-in-Chief

Dr. Manoranjan Dutta, Head Crop Improvement Division (Retd.), National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources, New Delhi, India

Managing Editor

Dr. S.N. Tiwari, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Entomology, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

Assistant Managing Editor

Dr. Jyotsna Yadav, Ph.D., Research Editor, Directorate of Research, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

Technical Manager

Dr. S.D. Samantray, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

CONTENTS

Productivity, nutrient uptake and economics of sweet corn (<i>Zea mays</i> L. var. <i>saccharata</i>) under different planting geometry and NPK levels	1-7
AMIT BHATNAGAR, SAILESH DEB KARJEE, GURVINDER SINGH and DINESH KUMAR SINGH	
Integrated effect of natural farming concoctions and organic farming practices with various NPK doses on quality of bread wheat	8-13
PRERNA NEGI, MOINUDDIN CHISTI and HIMANSHU VERMA	
Characterization and fertility capability classification of some soils in the rain forest zone of Edo state, Nigeria	14-25
OKUNSEBOR, F.E., OGBEMUDIA, I. and OKOLIE, S. I.	
Characterization and classification of guava growing soils of North-East Haryana according to frame work of land evaluation (FAO, 1993)	26-35
DHARAM PAL, MANOJ SHARMA, R.S. GARHWAL and DINESH	
Interactive impact of heavy metals and mycorrhizal fungi on growth and yield of pepper (<i>Capsicum annuum</i> Linn.)	36-47
SHARMILA CHAUHAN, MOHINDER SINGH, SNEHA DOBHAL, DEEKSHA SEMWAL and PRAVEEN	
Response of chilli (<i>Capsicum annuum</i> var. <i>annuum</i> L.) to different nutrient management practices	48-58
SHEETAL, K.C. SHARMA, SHIVAM SHARMA, NEHA SHARMA, D.R. CHAUDHARY, SANDEEP MANUJA and AKHILESH SHARMA	
Trend detection in weather parameters using Mann-Kendall test for Tarai region of Uttarakhand	59-67
SHUBHIKA GOEL and R.K. SINGH	
Comparative study of antioxidant potential of fresh peel from different citrus species	68-74
TARU NEGI, ANIL KUMAR, ARCHANA GANGWAR, SATISH KUMAR SHARMA, ANURADHA DUTTA, NAVIN CHAND SHAHI, OM PRAKASH and ASHUTOSH DUBEY	
Suitability of Quinoa Grains (<i>Chenopodium Quinoa</i> Willd.) for development of Low Glycemic Index Biscuits	75-84
RUSHDA ANAM MALIK, SARITA SRIVASTAVA and MEENAL	
A study on dietary intake among school-going adolescent girls of Udaipur, Rajasthan during COVID-19	85-92
JYOTI SINGH and NIKITA WADHAWAN	
Nutritional and sensory evaluation of gluten free chapatti developed using underutilised food sources	93-98
AYUSHI JOSHI, ARCHANA KUSHWAHA, ANURADHA DUTTA, ANIL KUMAR and NAVIN CHANDRA SHAHI	
Nutrient-enriched wheat chapatti with fresh pea shells (<i>Pisum sativum</i> L.): A comprehensive quality assessment	99-109
AMITA BENIWAL, SAVITA, VEENU SANGWAN and DARSHAN PUNIA	

Pearl Millet-Based Pasta and Noodles Incorporated with <i>Jamun</i> Seed Powder: Quality Analysis	110-121
SAVITA, AMITA BENIWAL, VEENU SANGWAN and ASHA KAWATRA	
Unlocking the biofortification potential of <i>Serratia marcescens</i> for enhanced zinc and iron content in wheat grains	122-131
BHARTI KUKRETI and AJAY VEER SINGH	
Antioxidant and anti-inflammatory properties of sun-dried leaves and fruits of wild <i>Pyracantha crenulata</i> (D. Don) M. Roem.	132-141
SUGANDHA PANT, PREETI CHATURVEDI, AAKANSHA VERMA, MANDEEP RAWAT, VAISHNAVI RAJWAR and KAVITA NEGI	
Studies on productive herd life, longevity, and selective value and their components in crossbred cattle	142-150
SHASHIKANT, C.V. SINGH and R.S. BARWAL	
Studies on replacement rate and its components in crossbred cattle	151-157
SHASHIKANT, C.V. SINGH, R.S. BARWAL and MANITA DANGI	
Principal component analysis in production and reproduction traits of Frieswal cattle under field progeny testing	158-163
OLYMPICA SARMA, R. S. BARWAL, C. V. SINGH, D. KUMAR, C. B. SINGH, A. K. GHOSH, B. N. SHAHI and S. K. SINGH	
Degenerative renal pathology in swine: A comprehensive histopathological investigation in Rajasthan, India	164-169
SHOBHA BURDAK, INDU VYAS, HEMANT DADHICH, MANISHA MATHUR, SHESH ASOPA, RENU	
Evaluation of histopathological changes on acute exposure of profenofos in Swiss albino mice	170-177
SONU DEVI, VINOD KUMAR, PREETI BAGRI and DEEPIKA LATHER	
Temporal and spatial performance of rapeseed and mustard oilseed in India: A study in the context of Technology Mission on Oilseeds¹	178-190
LEKHA KALRA and S. K. SRIVASTAVA	
Comparative economics of maize cultivation in major and minor maize producing districts of Karnataka – a study across farm size groups	191-203
GEETHA, R. S. and S. K. SRIVASTAVA	
A study on Usefulness of Participatory Newsletter for Potato growers in Udham Singh Nagar district of Uttarakhand	204–209
RAMESH NAUTIYAL and ARPITA SHARMA KANDPAL	
Training Needs of Hortipreneurs in Value Addition and fruit crop production in Kumaon Hills of Uttarakhand	210-215
KRITIKA PANT and ARPITA SHARMA KANDPAL	
Post-training Knowledge Assessment of the rural women about Mushroom Cultivation under TSP project, funded by ICAR	216-220
ARPITA SHARMA KANDPAL, S. K. MISHRA and OMVEER SINGH	
UAV Technology: Applications, economical reliance and feasibility in Indian Agriculture	221-229
A. AJAY and S. SAI MOHAN	

Productivity, nutrient uptake and economics of sweet corn (*Zea mays* L. var. *saccharata*) under different planting geometry and NPK levels

AMIT BHATNAGAR*, SAILESH DEB KARJEE, GURVINDER SINGH and DINESH KUMAR SINGH

Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar-263145(U.S. Nagar, Uttarakhand)

**Corresponding author's email id: bhatnagaramit75@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT: To study the response of sweet corn to varied fertilizer doses and planting geometry, a field experiment was conducted at G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, Uttarakhand during *kharif* 2018. Four planting geometries (60 × 25 cm, 60 × 30 cm, 75 × 25 cm and 75 × 30 cm) were assigned to main plots, while three doses of NPK (120+60+40, 150+75+50 and 180+90+60 kg N+P₂O₅+K₂O/ha) were allocated to sub plots with in a splitplot design. The results revealed that the narrowest planting geometry, *i.e.*, 60 × 25 cm, exhibited significantly higher husked cob yield (13325 kg/ha) and dehusked cob yield (10327 kg/ha) compared to the widest geometry of 75 × 30 cm, although it remained comparable with the other geometries. Planting geometry did not significantly affect the uptake of N, P and K. Notably, the 60 × 25 cm geometry resulted in significantly higher gross returns (Rs. 199875/ha), which were on par with the 60 × 30 cm geometry. Similarly, the net returns (Rs. 150176/ha) and BC ratio (3.02) were maximum under the 60 × 25 cm geometry, although differences were not significant. Regarding nutrient levels, the application of 180+90+60 kg N+P₂O₅+K₂O/ha resulted increase in husked cob yield (12687 kg/ha) and dehusked cob yield (10351 kg/ha), but the differences were not significant. However, crops fertilized with 180+90+60 kg N+P₂O₅+K₂O/ha exhibited significantly higher nutrient uptake. Gross returns, net returns and BC ratio did not significantly differ among different nutrient levels.

Key words: Fertilizer application, maize, NPK, spacing

Recently, specialty corns such as sweet corn, baby corn, pop corn and quality protein maize have emerged as alternative crop which are highly remunerative. Sweet corn (*Zea mays* L. var. *saccharata*) differs from normal corn essentially for gene(s) that increases the level of sugar and decrease the starch content in maize. Thus, the kernels of sweet corn are much sweeter than normal corn. Higher content of water soluble polysaccharide in the kernel adds texture and quality in addition to sweetness (Venkatesh *et al.*, 2003). It is one of the most popular vegetables in USA, Europe and other advanced countries. It is eaten as raw, boiled or steamed and also used for the preparation of soups, salad, sweets, jams, cream pastes and other delicious eatables recipes. It is important source of fibre, minerals and certain vitamins (Lertrat and Pulam, 2007). Sweet corn has industrial demand for canning and processing. It is a remunerative crop and is gaining popularity among the farmers because it fetches higher market price than normal maize. Generally, sweet corn is early in maturity and green cobs are harvested in 18-20 days after pollination at

milk stage. Added advantage of sweet corn is that after the harvest of green cobs, the plant remains green and can be used as green stover, thus, making it a dual-purpose crop. Sweet corn in India is mainly grown during *kharif* season. Among many constraints of crop production, optimum plant stand and adequate nutrition are of prime importance. In case of sweet corn green cobs are economic produce therefore, to get a healthy cob there is need to minimize the competition among the plants as well as optimization of nutrient amount. Planting geometry governs leaf area per plant and also decides number of plants per unit area. Thus, planting geometry is crucial factor in producing yield per unit area. Cob yield of sweet corn is decided by number of cobs per unit area and cob size. An increase in plant population is directly related to number of cobs per unit area but inversely to individual cob size (Bhatt *et al.*, 2012). Seed cost of sweet corn is very high so optimum planting geometry is very important from economic point of view. Being huge biomass production maize requires more amount of nutrients than other cereal crops. Nutrients should be in

adequate amount in soil and deficit between plant need and soil supply should be met through proper nutrient management. The plant requirement for N, P and K is high and prime focus is always on their fertilization. Nitrogen is part of protein and chlorophyll and involved in many enzymatic reactions. It has been reported that nitrogen is one of the important growth-limiting factors (Khan *et al.*, 2018). Sweet corn yield was found to increase as the amount of nitrogen was increased. Phosphorus nutrition plays a key role in plant metabolism as it provides energy through ATP. It is an essential component of nucleic acids, phosphorylated sugars and lipids, which control all life processes (Grazia *et al.*, 2003). Potassium is required for enzymatic activities and helps in photosynthesis and sugar translocation from source to sink. Nutrient application depends on many factors including plant population. Best performance of crop and profit can be realized with optimum dose of nutrients according to plant population. Both low and high doses of nutrients not only affect crop performance adversely but also result in poor nutrient use efficiency (Singh *et al.*, 2012). Considering these facts, an experiment was planned with the objective to determine the optimum plant population and NPK dose for higher productivity and profitability of sweet corn.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The field experiment was conducted during *kharif* 2018 at G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, district Udham Singh Nagar, Uttarakhand. Pantnagar lies in the *Tarai* belt in the foot hills range of the Himalaya (29° N latitude, 79.5° E longitude and altitude of 243.83 m msl). During the experiment, the mean maximum temperature ranged from 29.7 to 39° C whereas the mean minimum temperature ranged from 24.1 to 26.9° C. The total rainfall received during this period was 1378.5 mm. The maximum rainfall of 665.5 mm was received in August which accounts for almost 48.3 per cent of the total rainfall. There were total 35 rainy days. Total pan evaporation during the crop growing period was 380.1 mm. The average weekly maximum and minimum pan evaporation values fluctuated from 7.3 mm in June to 2.7 mm in August.

The maximum relative humidity ranged from 80.1 to 95.1 per cent whereas the minimum relative humidity fluctuated from 67.7 to 84.0 per cent during the cropping period. The average weekly sun shine hours were minimum *i.e.* 1.0 hr in first week of August due to cloudier weather and the maximum *i.e.* 6.4 hours in June. During the experiment, the average weekly wind velocity was the minimum in August (1.1 km/hr) and the maximum in the end of June (7.5 km/hr). The soil of experiment plot was silty clay loam in texture, neutral in reaction (pH 7.2), medium in organic carbon (0.69%), low in available nitrogen (216.3 kg/ha), medium in available phosphorus (21.5 kg P/ha) and available potassium (222.3 kg K/ha). The experiment consisted of four planting geometry (60 × 25 cm, 60 × 30 cm, 75 × 25 cm and 75 × 30 cm) in main plots and three doses of NPK (120+ 60+ 40, 150+ 75+ 50 and 180+ 90+ 60 kg N+ P₂O₅+ K₂O/ha) in sub plots was laid out in split plot design with three replications. The field was prepared by three cross harrowing and leveling. NPK mixture (12-32-16), urea and muriate of potash were used for application of nutrients. One fifth of the nitrogen and full amount of phosphorous, potassium was applied as basal while the remaining amount of nitrogen was applied in 3 splits of 20, 30 and 30% at 4 leaf- stage, knee height stage and tasseling, respectively. Sweet corn variety 'Sugar-75' was sown in 5 cm deep furrows at the spacing as per the treatments. Weeds were controlled by pre-emergence application of atrazine @ 1.0 kg a.i./ha followed by one manual weeding at 25 days after sowing. Because of adequate rainfall at regular interval, crop was not irrigated. At milk stage, cobs from the net plot area were harvested and weighed, without removing husk. After recording the cobs weight with husk, the husk was removed and the weight of cobs without husk was recorded. The uptake of N, P and K was determined in grains, rachis and stover of sweet corn at harvest stage by multiplying respective nutrient contents (Jackson, 1973) with their dry matter yield. Cost of cultivation of different treatments was worked out separately. The cost involved in labour, inputs and different operations such as land preparation, planting, irrigation, weeding, pesticides used and harvesting was calculated as per local market rates. Sale price

of husked green cobs was Rs.15 per kg. The data obtained from various observations were statistically analyzed as per procedure of split plot design by using the standard techniques of Analysis of Variance (Gomez and Gomez, 1984). Wherever, 'F' test was found significant at 5% level of significance, critical difference (CD) was calculated to test the significance of differences between two treatment means.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Plant population

Significantly highest plant population (60754/ha) was recorded under the narrowest geometry of 60×25 cm. The widest planting geometry of 75×30 cm resulted insignificantly lowest plant population (40533/ha) which was lower by 33.3 per cent over the narrowest geometry. Differences in treatments were due to differences in planting geometry. Due to mortality the plant population per unit area in each treatment was not exactly as per its geometry. However, the difference between maize plant population with 60×30 cm and 75×25 cm was non-significant. The difference in plant population was due to variation in spacing as per treatments. Plant population remained at par among all nutrient levels.

Yield attributes

Number of cobs per hectare followed the trend of plant population where it decreased significantly with increase in planting geometry. The narrowest planting geometry (60×25 cm) recorded significantly highest number of cobs per hectare (60354) while the widest geometry (75×30 cm) produced significantly lowest number of cobs per hectare (40167). The magnitude of reduction in number of cobs per hectare was to the tune of 33.4 per cent under 75×30 cm planting geometry over 60×25 cm planting geometry. Number of cobs per plant remained almost same (0.99) in all planting geometries. It indicated no influence of planting geometry on number of cobs per plant.

Different nutrient dose failed to bring significant variations in number of cobs/ha. However, the

maximum numbers of cobs/ha (49840) were observed under application of $180+90+60$ kg N+ $P_2O_5+K_2O$ /ha. Number of cobs per hectare is decided by plant population/ha and number of cobs/plant. Therefore, significantly more plant population at narrower geometry was the main reason for higher number of cobs per hectare under these treatments. Non-significant difference in plant population among different nutrient levels may be attributed to at par difference in number of cobs per hectare.

Cob length was increased due to increase in planting geometry. The widest planting geometry of 75×30 cm produced significantly more cob length (16.7 cm) than 60×25 cm but remained at par with 60×30 cm and 75×25 cm. Moreover, crop grown with 60×25 cm had significantly smaller cob length (15.1 cm). The results showed that cob length increased significantly by 6.5 per cent due to increase in nutrient levels from $120+60+40$ to $180+90+60$ kg N+ $P_2O_5+K_2O$ /ha. Crop fertilized with $180+90+60$ kg N+ $P_2O_5+K_2O$ /ha produced significantly more cob length (16.4 cm) than that of $120+60+40$ kg N+ $P_2O_5+K_2O$ /ha but did not differ statistically with $150+75+50$ kg N+ $P_2O_5+K_2O$ /ha. Plants grown under wider plant spacing fully exploited the natural resources efficiently, besides responding to externally applied inputs which resulted into better crop growth and in turn cob length. These results are in close agreement with the findings of Bhatt (2012). Better availability of nutrients under high nutrient levels improved the crop growth which might help in reproductive growth in terms of longer cobs. Kurne *et al.* (2017) also reported significant increase in cob length due to higher nutrient dose. Cob girth did not vary significantly due to different planting geometries and nutrient levels.

Yield

Husked cob yield

Results indicated significant differences in husked cob yield due to different planting geometries. A progressive reduction in husked cob yield was recorded with increase in planting geometry. Planting geometry 60×25 cm spacing produced significantly higher husked cob yield (13325 kg/ha) than 75×30 cm but remained at par with 60×30

cm and 75 × 25 cm. Planting geometry of 75 × 30 cm reduced cob yield by 16.6 per cent as compared to 60 cm × 25 cm. Increase in nutrient dose from 120+60+40 to 180+90+60 kg N: P₂O₅: K₂O/ha increased husked cob yield but difference was not significant. Crop fertilized with 180+90+60 kg N+P₂O₅+K₂O/ha resulted into numerically the maximum husked cob yield (12687 kg/ha). The cob yield per unit area is determined by the number of cobs per unit area and the weight of each individual cob. With the 60 × 25 cm planting geometry, there were more plants per hectare, resulting in a higher number of cobs per hectare and consequently, a greater cob yield. Conversely, the wider planting geometry yielded higher individual cob weights; however, due to fewer cobs per hectare under this

arrangement, the overall cob yield was lower. These results corroborate the findings of Kar *et al.* (2006) and Kurne *et al.* (2017). Non-significant differences in number of cobs per hectare and individual cob weight among different nutrient doses led to statistical at par cob yield in these treatments.

Dehusked cob yield

Dehusked cob yield followed the trend of husked cob yield where it was statistically higher (10327 kg/ha) in the widest planting geometry of 60 × 25 cm than the narrowest planting geometry of 75 × 30 cm but remained at par with 60 × 30 cm and 75 × 25 cm. Significantly lowest dehusked cob yield (8758 kg/ha) was recorded with 75 × 30 cm spacing. Crop sown at 60 × 25 cm spacing had 17.9 per cent more

Table 1: Influence of planting geometry and nutrient levels on yield attributes and yield of sweet corn

Treatment	Plant population/ha	No. of cobs/ha	Cob length (cm)	Cob girth (cm)	Husked cob yield (kg/ha)	Dehusked cob yield (kg/ha)
Planting geometry						
60 × 25 cm	60754	60354	15.1	14.6	13325	10327
60 × 30 cm	50251	49809	15.8	15.1	12285	9681
75 × 25 cm	48688	48273	15.9	15.3	12096	9580
75 × 30 cm	40533	40167	16.7	15.5	11114	8758
SEm ±	1809	1918	0.3	0.6	410	290
CD at 5 %	6381	6768	0.9	NS	1447	1024
Nutrient levels (kg N+P ₂ O ₅ +K ₂ O/ha)						
120+60+40	50117	49186	15.4	14.7	11711	8911
150+75+50	49974	49718	15.9	15.1	12217	9533
180+90+60	50080	49840	16.4	15.6	12687	10351
SEm ±	751	835	0.2	0.3	258	437
CD at 5 %	NS	NS	0.7	NS	NS	NS

Table 2: Effect of different planting geometry and nutrient levels on N, P and K uptake by sweet corn

Treatment	N uptake (kg/ha)				P uptake (kg/ha)				K uptake (kg/ha)			
	Grain	Rachis	Stover	Total	Grain	Rachis	Stover	Total	Grain	Rachis	Stover	Total
Planting geometry												
60 × 25 cm	26.9	4.3	48.8	80.0	9.7	2.2	20.1	32.0	15.9	3.9	91.2	111.0
60 × 30 cm	24.7	3.9	45.6	74.2	9.0	2.1	19.5	30.7	14.4	3.6	84.6	102.6
75 × 25 cm	24.9	3.9	45.6	74.5	8.9	2.1	19.6	30.7	14.4	3.6	85.5	103.5
75 × 30 cm	22.5	3.5	41.1	67.3	8.6	1.9	17.8	28.3	12.8	3.3	75.1	91.3
SEm ±	0.8	0.3	2.8	3.3	0.3	0.2	1.0	1.2	0.6	0.3	6.1	6.2
CD at 5 %	2.8	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	2.0	NS	NS	NS
Nutrient levels (kg N+P ₂ O ₅ +K ₂ O/ha)												
120+60+40	22.2	3.6	38.9	64.6	8.1	1.8	16.4	26.4	13.2	3.1	76.2	92.5
150+75+50	24.9	4.0	45.7	74.6	9.2	2.1	19.6	30.9	14.4	3.6	84.2	102.2
180+90+60	27.3	4.2	51.3	82.8	9.9	2.3	21.8	33.9	15.6	4.0	91.9	111.5
SEm ±	0.8	0.1	0.9	1.2	0.4	0.1	0.9	1.0	0.5	0.2	1.6	1.6
CD at 5 %	2.5	0.4	2.8	3.7	1.1	0.3	2.6	3.1	1.5	0.6	4.9	5.0

Table 3: Economics of sweet corn cultivation as influenced by different planting geometry and nutrient levels

Treatment	Cost of cultivation (Rs./ha)	GrossReturn (Rs./ha)	Net return (Rs./ha)	B: C
Planting geometry				
60 cm × 25 cm	49713	199888	150176	3.02
60 cm × 30 cm	45963	184275	138312	3.01
75 cm × 25 cm	45212	181450	136237	3.01
75 cm × 30 cm	42462	166713	124251	2.93
SEm ±	-	6156	6156	0.13
CD at 5 %	-	21717	NS	NS
Nutrient levels (kg N+P ₂ O ₅ +K ₂ O/ha)				
120+60+40	44294	175666	131372	2.97
150+75+50	45850	183267	137418	3.00
180+90+60	47369	190311	142942	3.01
SEm ±	-	3872	3872	0.09
CD at 5 %	-	NS	NS	NS

dehusked cob yield than that of 75 × 30 cm. Raising the nutrient level from 120+60+40 to 180+90+60 kg N+P₂O₅+K₂O/ha caused increase in dehusked cob yield but differences were not significant. However, crop nourished with 180+90+60 kg N+P₂O₅+K₂O/ha acquired numerically maximum cob yield (10351 kg/ha) while that fertilized with 120+60+40 kg N+P₂O₅+K₂O/ha produced minimum cob yield (8911 kg/ha). Since, dehusked cobs are obtained after removing husk from the green cobs hence, difference in both the yields is only for husk weight. Planting geometry 60 × 25 cm had more plant population and husked cob yield which resulted more cob yield. Different nutrient levels have statistically same husked cob yield. Therefore, variations in dehusked cob yields were non-significant among nutrient levels.

Nutrient uptake

Significantly higher N uptake by grain (26.9 kg/ha) was noted in planting geometry 60 × 25 cm than 75 × 30 cm but remained at par with rest of the geometries. Numerically the highest N uptake by rachis (4.3 kg/ha) and stover (48.8 kg/ha) and total N uptake (80.0 kg/ha) were also recorded with 60 × 25 cm spacing. Increase in nutrient level also brought significant increase in nitrogen uptake. Nutrient level 180+90+60 kg N+P₂O₅+K₂O/ha exhibited significantly more uptake in grain (27.3 kg/ha) and rachis (4.2 kg/ha) than 120+60+40 kg N+P₂O₅+K₂O/ha but did not differ statistically with 150+75+50 kg N+P₂O₅+K₂O/ha. This treatment also recorded significantly maximum N uptake by stover (51.3 kg/ha) and total N uptake (82.8 kg/ha). P uptake by grain,

rachis and stover and total N uptake were not affected statistically due to different planting geometries. Numerically the highest P uptake by grain (9.7 kg/ha), rachis (2.2 kg/ha) and stover (20.1 kg/ha) and total P uptake (32.0 kg/ha) were recorded with 60 × 25 cm spacing. Among nutrient levels, 180+90+60 kg N+P₂O₅+K₂O/ha being at par with 150+75+50 kg N+P₂O₅+K₂O/ha exhibited significantly more P uptake in grain (9.9 kg/ha), rachis (2.3 kg/ha) and stover (21.8 kg/ha) and total P uptake (33.9 kg/ha) than 120+60+40 kg N+P₂O₅+K₂O/ha. K uptake due to different planting geometries was significantly higher only in grain where 60 × 25 cm being at par with 60 × 30 cm and 75 × 25 cm had significantly more value (15.9 kg/ha) than 75 × 30 cm. Potassium uptake by rachis and stover and total K uptake did not show significant variations. It was noticed that crop sown at 60 × 25 cm planting geometry recorded numerically the highest K uptake by rachis (3.9 kg/ha) and stover (91.2 kg/ha) and total K uptake (111.0 kg/ha). Different nutrient levels exhibited significant variation in K uptake by different plant parts viz. grain, rachis, stover and total uptake. Crop nourished with 180+90+60 kg N+P₂O₅+K₂O/ha being at par with 150+75+50 kg N+P₂O₅+K₂O/ha exhibited significantly higher K uptake by grain and rachis (15.6 and 4.0 kg/ha, respectively) than 120+60+40 kg N+P₂O₅+K₂O/ha. Application of 180+90+60 kg N+P₂O₅+K₂O/ha also recorded significantly highest K uptake by stover (91.9 kg/ha) and total K uptake (111.5 kg/ha). There was 18.2, 29.0, 20.6 and 20.5 per cent increase in K uptake by grain, rachis and stover and total K uptake, respectively by application of 180+90+60 kg N+P₂O₅+K₂O/ha over 120+60+40

kg N+P₂O₅+K₂O/ha.

Nutrient uptake by crop is product of nutrient content and dry matter yield. Though, plant grown under narrower plant geometry had lower nutrient content but produced more dry matter per unit area which resulted into higher nutrient uptake by crop. Bhatt (2012) and Bharud *et al.* (2014) also found higher uptake of nutrients with narrow spacing. Similarly, higher nutrient uptake at high nutrient dose was because of high nutrient content and dry matter yield under this treatment. These results corroborate the findings of Massey and Gaur (2013) who reported more nutrient uptake by maize with increase in NPK levels.

Economic analysis

Crop sown on wider spacing had the minimum cost of cultivation (Rs. 42462/ha) while the maximum cost was in the narrowest spacing (Rs. 49713/ha). In wider geometry less amounts of seeds were used compared to narrower spacing (8.7, 7.2, 6.9 and 5.8 kg/ha in 60 × 25 cm, 60 × 30 cm, 75 × 25 cm and 75 × 30 cm, respectively). This difference in seed amount caused variation in cost incurred on seed (Rs. 2500/kg) in each treatment and thus differences in cost of cultivation. Among nutrient levels, cost of cultivation varied due to difference in dose of nutrient and was the highest (Rs. 47369/ha) in 180+90+60 kg N+P₂O₅+K₂O/ha which was more by Rs. 3075 and Rs. 1519 than 120+60+40 and 150+75+50 kg N+P₂O₅+K₂O/ha, respectively. Gross return at 60 × 25 cm was found significantly superior (Rs. 199888/ha) to 75 × 30 cm spacing but remained at par with 60 × 30 cm and 75 × 25 cm. On an average, crop sown at 60 × 25 cm gave 19.9 per cent higher gross return as compared to 75 × 30 cm. Different nutrient doses had non-significant differences in gross return however, 180+90+60 kg N+P₂O₅+K₂O/ha realized numerically the highest gross returns (Rs. 190311/ha). The difference in gross return under different planting geometries and nutrient levels were because of variation in husked cob yield under respective treatments. Different planting geometries were failed to show significant effect on net return. Numerically the highest net returns (Rs. 150176/ha) was observed at 60 × 25 cm

while minimum (Rs. 124251/ha) was in 75 cm × 30 cm. An increase in net return was observed with increase in nutrient levels but differences were non-significant. Numerically, the maximum net return (Rs. 142942/ha) was obtained under 180+90+60 kg N+P₂O₅+K₂O/ha. Differential cost of cultivation and gross return caused variation in net return under different treatments. Benefit to cost ratio (B:C) was non-significant however, crop sown at 60 × 25 cm was numerically superior (3.02) and among different nutrient doses 180+90+60 kg N+P₂O₅+K₂O/ha had maximum value (3.01). Benefit to cost ratio is decided by net return and cost of cultivation. More monetary return under high plant population was also reported by Verma and Tomar (2014). Better economics of sweet corn in terms of gross return, net return and B:C in high nutrient levels was also reported by and Kurne *et al.* (2017).

CONCLUSION

The study revealed that planting geometry affected the crop growth and cob yield of sweet corn in *kharif* season. Based on findings it can be inferred that planting geometry should be kept 60 × 25cm. High dose of NPK is not productive and economical. Nutrient dose 120+ 60+ 40 kg N+ P₂O₅+K₂O/ha is sufficient.

REFERENCES

- Bharud, S. R., Bharud, R. W. and Mokate, A. S. (2014). Yield and quality of sweet corn (*Zea mays* L. var. *saccharata*) as influenced by planting geometry and fertilizer levels. *International Journal of Plant Sciences*, 9(1): 240-243.
- Bhatt, P. S. (2012). Response of sweet corn hybrid to varying plant densities and nitrogen levels. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, 7(46): 6158-6166.
- Bhatt, P. S., Yakadri, M. and Sivalakshmi, Y. (2012). Influence of varying plant densities and nitrogen levels on yield attributes and yield of sweet corn. *International Journal of Bio-Resource and Stress Management*, 3(3): 169-172.

- Gomez, K.A. and Gomez, A.A. (1984). Statistical procedures for agricultural research. 2nd edition. John Wiley and sons, New York.
- Grazia, J. D., Tittonella, P. A., Germinara, D. and Chiesa, A. (2003). Phosphorus and nitrogen fertilization in sweet corn (*Zea mays L. saccharata*). *Spanish Journal of Agricultural Research*, 1(2): 103-107.
- Jackson, M.L. (1973). Soil chemical analysis. Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 498.
- Kar, P. P., Barik, K. C., Mahaptra, P. K., Garnayak, L. M., Rath, B. S., Bastia, D. K. and Khanda, C. M. (2006). Effect of planting geometry and nitrogen on yield, economics and nitrogen uptake of sweet corn (*Zea mays*). *Indian Journal of Agronomy*, 51(1): 43-45.
- Khan, A. A., Hussain, A., Ganai, M. A., Sofi, N. R. and Hussain, S. (2018). Yield, nutrient uptake and quality of sweet corn as influenced by transplanting dates and nitrogen levels. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, 7(2): 3567-3571.
- Kurane, A. K., Jaday, Y. R. and Mohite, A. B. (2017). Effect of fertilizer levels and plant densities on growth, productivity and economics of sweet corn in summer season. *Contemporary Research in India*, 7(3): 24-27.
- Lertrat, K. and Pulam, T. (2007). Breeding for increased sweetness in sweet corn. *International Journal of Plant Breeding*, 1(1): 27-30.
- Massey, J. X. and Gaur, B. L. (2013). Effect of plant population and fertility levels on yield attributes, yield and nutrient uptake of sweet corn (*Zea mays L.*) cultivars. *Advance Research Journal of Crop Improvement*, 4(1): 34-37.
- Singh, U., Saad, A., Ram, T., Lekh, C., Mir, S. A. and Aga, F. A. (2012). Productivity, economics and nitrogen use efficiency of sweet corn (*Zea mays saccharata*) as influenced by planting geometry and nitrogen fertilization. *Indian Journal of Agronomy*, 57(1): 43-48.
- Venkatesh, S., Sanjay, R. and Shekhar, J. C. (2003). Sweet corn. *Specially corn Technical Series I*, Directorate of Maize Research, New Delhi, India, Pp.1-3.
- Verma, A. and Tomar, G. S. (2014). Effect of planting geometry and nitrogen levels on growth, green cob yield and economics of sweet corn (*Zea mays saccharata* Sturt.). *International Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 10(2): 766-769.

Received: January 05, 2024

Accepted: April 03, 2024