



INTEGRATED NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT BY USING ENRICHED COMPOST, VERMI COMPOST AND BIOFERTILIZER ON GROWTH AND YIELD OF POTATO

*Roji Chutia & Bhagawati, P.C

Department of Agronomy, Assam Agricultural University, Jorhat-785013, India
Corresponding authors email: rojichutia10@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Innumerable experiments have been carried out to establish the yield response of potato to the rate of nitrogen (N) supply. Chemical fertilizers are the main source of nutrient to the potato crop. However, continuous cropping and dependence on chemical fertilizers has resulted in nutritional imbalance, depletion of soil organic matter, soil erosion, adverse effect on biodiversity as well as on human health. Considering their harmful effects of fertilizers, it is necessary to find out an alternative that besides improving the productivity and quality of potato should also be eco-friendly to the environment. Experiment was conducted during rabi seasons of 2014-15 and 2015-16 at Assam Agricultural University, India. This experiment consisting of eight treatments viz., 100% recommended dose (RD) of Nitrogen (T₁), 75% recommended dose of Nitrogen + 25% Nitrogen through enriched compost (EC) (T₂), 75% recommended dose of Nitrogen + 25% Nitrogen through vermi compost (VC) (T₃), 50% recommended dose of Nitrogen + 50% Nitrogen through enriched compost (T₄), 50% recommended dose of Nitrogen + 50% Nitrogen through vermi compost (T₅), 50% recommended dose of Nitrogen + 25% Nitrogen through enriched compost + 25% Nitrogen through vermi compost (T₆), 50% recommended dose of Nitrogen + 25% Nitrogen through enriched compost (T₇) and 50% recommended dose of Nitrogen + 25% Nitrogen through vermi compost (T₈) was laid out in randomized block design with three replications. The experimental findings revealed that T₆ (50% recommended dose of Nitrogen + 25% Nitrogen through enriched compost + 25% Nitrogen through vermi compost) recorded maximum values for most of the growth and yield attributing characters. Based on the results of two years experimentation, it can be concluded that the integrated use of inorganic and organic sources of nutrients proved superior to inorganic alone in respect of yield and other growth characters.

KEYWORDS: Bio fertilizer, Enriched compost, Potato and Vermi compost.

INTRODUCTION

To meet the food and nutritional demand of the fast growing population of the country like India it is becoming essential to make a futuristic plan. A shift in the food behaviour so as to include the high productivity crops like roots and tubers as food sources in place of the commonly used low yielding cereal staple food crops may be one of the important approach in this regard. Potato being highly productive and nutritive it easily stands out from this group of crops. Besides being a good source of carbohydrate and protein, potato provides vitamins viz., Vit-C and Vit-B, minerals and some essential amino acids like lysine. Potato as food is most nutritious in proportion to its calorie contents. This unique combination of qualities justifies it as a crop best suited for the masses of developing countries (Gaur, 1990). Potato popularly known as “The king of vegetables” has emerged as fourth most important food crop in India after rice, wheat and maize in terms of dry matter production per unit area per unit time. Application of organic manures in conjunction with fertilizers improves physical, chemical and biological properties of the soil besides improving fertilizer use efficiency and crop yield. A suitable combination of organic and inorganic sources of nutrients is necessary for a sustainable agriculture that will provide food with good

quality and maintain a sound environment. Potato demands high level of soil nutrients due to relatively poorly developed and shallow root system in relation to yield (Perrenoud, 1993). Compared with cereals crops, Potato produces much more dry matter in a shorter cycle (Singh and Trehan, 1998). Great opportunities exist to increase potato yield and quality by improving nutrient management. Potato, being a heavy feeder of nutrients, requires high amounts of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium. Chemical fertilizers are the main source of nutrient to the potato crop. However, continuous cropping and dependence on chemical fertilizers has resulted in nutritional imbalance, depletion of soil organic matter, soil erosion, low availability of water, contamination of food and water, adverse effect on biodiversity as well as on human health. Considering their harmful effects of fertilizers, it is necessary to find out an alternative that besides improving the productivity and quality of potato should also be eco-friendly to the environment. Supplying of nutrients through the organic source can be opted for avoiding the hazardous effects of fertilizers and maintaining sustainability. The experiments done in the country have clearly indicated that there is a need to integrate both organic and inorganic for sustainable crop production, maintenance of soil fertility and conservation

of natural resources. It is also argued that use of only organics in the form of organic farming or natural farming to the present Indian agriculture may not be justifiable as use of only organics has not helped in enhancement of crop yield to the required extent. Therefore, it is envisaged that for sustainability of agricultural production in the country, integrated nutrient management appears to be promising.

MATERIALS & METHODS

A field experiment titled “Effect of biofertilizer and integrated nutrient management on yield of potato and soil microbial activity” was conducted during rabi seasons of 2014-15 and 2015-16 at the Instructional-cum- Research

farm of Assam Agricultural University. The experiment was laid out in Randomized Block Design with three replications and eight different treatments. Twenty four treatments consisting combination of both organic and inorganic fertilizers were allocated randomly.

Application of biofertilizer: In approximately 2.0L of water in a bucket, gum from 5 numbers of commercially available gum tubes each containing 15ml were poured and mix thoroughly with water in the bucket. The solution is sprinkled over the tubers and biofertilizer was mixed thoroughly with the tubers. So that each tuber gets a coating of the biofertilizer. The treated tubers were kept in the shade over night for drying (Fig 1).



FIGURE 1- Tubers treated with Bio fertilizer before planting in main plot

Seed rate, Spacing and planting

- I. **Seed rate:** A seed rate of 22.5q/ha was used for planting potato
- II. **Spacing:** The recommended spacing for potato was 50cm×20cm
- III. **Planting:** Potato tubers were planted manually on 11th and 10th November during 2014-15 and 2015-16 respectively. The experiment was carried out under irrigated condition and three irrigations were applied at 20days (Stolon formation stage), 55days (tuber formation stage) and 75 days (tuber development stage) after emergence of sprouts.

Tuber yield (total and different grades)

The harvested tubers were sorted out into four different grades viz., <25g, 25-50g, 50-75g and >75g. The weight of each grade of tubers per plot was recorded in kilogram

and later converted into t/ha. Similarly the total tuber yield per plot was recorded in kilogram and later converted into t/ha.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

Data on grade wise tuber yield (t/ha) of potato as influenced by different INM practices are presented in Table 1.

The effect of different nutrient management practices on <25g grade tuber yield of potato was found to be highest in T₆ during both the years. The tuber yield was found highest (6.83 and 7.91 t/ha) under the tuber grade of 25-50g in T₆ during both the years. Highest tubers yields of 8.82 and 7.93 t/ha under 50-75g grade tuber were recorded at T₆ during both the years. Highest yields of >75g grade tuber were also recorded at T₆ during both the years.

TABLE 1. Grade wise tuber yield (t/ha) as influence by different INM practices

Treatments	Grade wise tuber yield (t/ha)							
	<25g		25-50g		50-75g		>75g	
	2014-15	2015-16	2014-15	2015-16	2014-15	2015-16	2014-15	2015-16
T ₁	2.63	3.16	3.71	6.57	7.69	4.71	5.86	2.19
T ₂	2.81	3.06	5.06	6.64	6.35	4.87	6.05	1.88
T ₃	3.44	3.21	5.44	6.48	6.27	5.20	5.97	1.74
T ₄	4.27	4.38	5.66	6.91	9.09	7.96	7.76	2.35
T ₅	3.55	3.99	5.71	5.39	7.43	5.60	5.44	1.53
T ₆	4.84	5.16	6.83	7.91	9.82	7.93	8.06	2.74
T ₇	3.35	3.19	5.83	5.43	7.66	5.65	5.98	2.28
T ₈	3.94	3.07	5.83	6.05	6.47	4.73	5.72	1.86
S.Em(±)	0.39	0.39	0.55	0.48	0.76	0.59	0.57	0.22
CD(p=0.05)	1.18	1.18	NS	1.45	2.30	1.79	1.73	0.67
CV %	18.96	18.49	17.26	12.89	17.31	17.56	15.53	18.77

INM-Integrated nutrient management, NS – Non-significant

Yield of <25g tuber (t/ha)

In 2014-15, highest tuber yield of 4.84t/ha was recorded at T₆ and was statistically significant over T₃ (3.44t/ha), T₁ (2.63t/ha) and T₂ (2.81t/ha). The yields recorded at T₄ (4.27t/ha), T₅ (3.55t/ha) and T₇ (3.94t/ha) were at par with T₆.

While in 2015-16, the highest tuber yield of 5.16 t/ha was recorded by T₆ and was statistically significant over T₁ (3.16t/ha), T₂ (3.06t/ha), T₃ (3.21t/ha), T₇ (3.19t/ha) and T₈ (3.07t/ha). The yields recorded at T₄ and T₅ were statistically at par with T₆.

Yield of 25-50g tuber (t/ha)

No significant differences in tuber yields were observed in the first year of experimentation. However, the yield was highest at T₆ (6.83t/ha).

While in 2015-16, the highest tuber yield of 7.91 t/ha was recorded at T₆ and was statistically significant over the yields recorded at T₅ (5.39t/ha), T₇ (5.43t/ha) and T₈ (6.05t/ha). The yields registered at T₁, T₂, T₃ and T₄ were at par with yield at T₆.

Yield of 50-75g tuber (t/ha)

In 2014-15, the highest tuber yield of 9.82t/ha was observed at T₆ and was statistically significant over T₂ (6.35t/ha), T₃ (6.27t/ha) and T₈ (6.47t/ha). The yields recorded at T₁ (7.69t/ha), T₄ (9.09t/ha), T₅ (7.43t/ha) and

T₇ (7.66t/ha) were at par with T₆. However, the lowest tuber yield was recorded at T₃.

While in 2015-16, the highest tuber yield of 7.96 t/ha was recorded at T₄ and was statistically significant over the yields recorded at T₁ (4.71t/ha), T₂ (4.87t/ha), T₃ (5.20t/ha), T₅ (5.60t/ha), T₇ (5.65t/ha) and T₈ (4.73t/ha). However, the yield recorded at T₆ (7.93t/ha) was at par with yield T₄. And the lowest yield was recorded at T₁.

Yield of >75g tuber (t/ha)

In 2014-15, significantly higher tuber yield of 8.06t/ha was observed at T₆ as compared to the yield values of 5.86t/ha, 6.05t/ha, 5.97t/ha, 5.44t/ha, 5.98t/ha and 5.72t/ha at T₁, T₂, T₃, T₅, T₇ and T₈. However, T₄ was statistically at par with yield T₆.

While in 2015-16, the highest tuber yield of 2.74 t/ha was recorded at T₆ and was statistically significant over the yields recorded at T₂ (1.88t/ha), T₃ (1.74t/ha), T₅ (1.53t/ha), and T₈ (1.86t/ha). However, the yields recorded at T₁ (7.93t/ha), T₄ (2.35t/ha) and T₇ (2.28t/ha) were at par with yield at T₆.

Total tuber yield (t/ha)

Data on total tuber yield (t/ha) of potato at harvest as influenced by different INM practices are presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2. Total tuber yield (t/ha) as influenced by different INM practices

Treatments	Total tuber Yield(t/ha)		
	2014-15	2015-16	Pooled
T ₁ :100% RD of N	22.26	16.62	19.46
T ₂ :75% RD of N + 25% N through Enriched compost	20.28	16.45	18.37
T ₃ : 75% RD of N + 25% N through Vermicompost	21.12	16.63	18.88
T ₄ : 50% RD of N +50% N through Enriched compost	26.89	21.60	24.25
T ₅ : 50% RD of N + 50% N through Vermicompost	22.51	16.52	19.52
T ₆ : 50% RD of N + 25% N through Enriched compost + 25% N through Vermicompost	29.55	23.73	26.63
T ₇ : 50% RD of N + 25% N through Enriched compost	22.81	16.55	19.68
T ₈ : 50% RD of N + 25% N through Vermicompost	21.96	15.71	18.84
S.Em (±)	1.42	0.99	0.87
CD (P=0.05)	4.32	3.01	2.52
CV%	10.52	9.56	10.27

INM- Integrated nutrient management, NS- Non- significant

The highest tuber yields of 29.55t/ha and 23.73t/ha were recorded at T₆ {50% RD of N + 25% N through Enriched compost + 25% N through Vermi compost} during both the years and were statistically significant over T₁, T₂, T₃, T₅, T₇ and T₈. This was followed by tuber yields of 26.89 and 21.60t/ha at T₄ during both the years and was at par with T₆. Pooled data also indicated that among the nutrient management treatments T₆ showed the highest tuber yield of 26.63t/ha which was at par with T₄ (24.25t/ha). In 2014-15, the lowest yield was observed at T₂ and during second year lowest tuber yield was recorded at T₈.

Different Integrated Nutrient Management practices could not exert significant influence on per cent plant emergence during both the years. In general, the per cent plant emergence was quite satisfactory due to the use of good quality planting material and moisture level maintained during planting. Significant influence of INM on total tuber yields and the highest values of 29.55 and 23.73t/ha were

obtained at T₆ {50% recommended dose of Nitrogen + 25% Nitrogen through Enriched compost + 25% Nitrogen through Vermicompost} during both the years. This was followed by tuber yields of 26.89 and 21.60t/ha at T₄ which were at par with T₆. The increase in total tuber yield is the result of the cumulative increase in grade wise tuber yields. Integrated Nutrient Management significantly influenced the concentration of N, P and K and their total uptake by crop during both the years of experimentation. The uptake of N, P and K were recorded highest at T₆ during both the years and were statistically superior to rest of the treatments. Higher uptakes were due to significantly higher N, P, and K content in tuber, haulm and superior dry matter yield under integrated use of both organic and inorganic nutrients. Similar observations were made by Sharma (1989), Sharma (1992), Sud *et al.* (1992) and Sujatha and Krishnappa (1995).

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of two years experimentation, it can be concluded that the integrated use of inorganic and organic sources of nutrients proved superior to inorganic alone in respect of yield and other growth characters. The INM treatment equally improved the physico-chemical and biological properties of the soil. Among the different INM practices T₆ was found to be the best suitable combination of inorganic and organic sources of nutrients on growth, yield and economics of potato as well as to improve the biological properties of soils.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Authors are sincerely thankful to the Department of Agronomy and Department of Soil Science, Assam Agricultural University for providing necessary facilities to conduct the experiment.

REFERENCES

Gaur, P.C. (1990) *Commercial Adoption of True Potato Seed Technology*- Prospects and Problems. Central Potato Research Institute, Shimla, India.

Goyal, S., Mishra, M.M., Hooda, I.S., Singh, R., Beri, V., Chaudhary, M.R., Sidhu, P.S., Pashricha, N.S. and Balwa, M.S. (1992) Buildup of microbial biomass with continuous use of inorganic fertilizers and organic amendments. *Proc. Int. Symp. Nutr. Manage. Sustained Prod.* **2**: 149-151.

Islam, M.R., Nahar, B.S., Baten, M.A. (2008) Effects of organic farming on the growth parameters, yield and yield

components of potato. *J. Environ. Sci. & Natural Resources*, **1**(1): 13-18.

Perrenoud S (1993) Fertilizing for high yield potato. IPI Bulletin 8. 2nd Edition. Intl. Potash Inst., Basel, Switzerland.

Sharma, U.C. (1989). Potato yield and nutrient uptake as influenced by fertility levels at different locations of Meghalaya. *J. Indian Potato Assoc.* **16** (3&4): 91-95.

Sharma, U.C. (1992) Effect of levels of Nitrogen, Phosphorous, Potassium and their interaction on yield and nutrient uptake of potato on acid soils. *J. Indian Potato Assoc.* **19** (1-2): 77-80.

Singh J.P., Trehan, S.P. (1998) Balanced fertilization to increase the yield of potato. Paper presented at the IPI-PRII-PAU Workshop on Balanced Fertilization in Punjab Agriculture, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, India, 15-16 December 1997 pp 129-139.

Sud, K.C., Sharma, R.C. and Govindakrishnan, P.M. (1992) Influence of organic manures and nitrogen on nutrient status, translocation, yield and tuber quality in four potato based cropping systems. *J. Indian potato Assoc.* **9** (1-2): 5-12.

Sujatha, N.T. and Krishnappa, K.S. (1995) Effect of different fertility levels on dry matter production at different stages of growth and nutrient uptake of potato. *J. Indian Potato Assoc.* **22** (1-2): 83-85.