Yield and economic response of Rabi maize (Zea mays L.) to different mulching and nutrient management
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ABSTRACT

An experiment was conducted during Rabi season of 2019-20 with the objective of evaluating the effect of mulching and nutrient management practices on growth, yield and economics of maize (Zea mays L.) at Balindi Research Complex, Bidhan Chandra Krishi Viswavidyalaya, Nadia, West Bengal, India on clay loam soil. The experiment was laid out in Randomized Block Design with nine treatment (T) combinations such as T1- Live mulch (Trifolium alexandrium)+50% recommended dose of fertilizer (RDF) [120:60:40 kg /ha N, P2O5 and K2O], T2- Live Mulch+75% RDF, T3- Live Mulch+100% RDF, T4- Straw Mulch (rice straw)+ 50 % RDF, T5- Straw Mulch+75% RDF, T6- Straw Mulch+100% RDF, T7- No Mulch+50% RDF ,T8- No Mulch+75% RDF and T9- No Mulch+100 % RDF, replicated thrice. Experimental results revealed that different mulching and nutrient levels exerted significant influence on growth, yield, net return and benefit-cost ratio (B:C). Application of straw mulch+100% RDF (T6) resulted in the highest plant height (164.57 cm), grain yield (5.28 tonnes/ha), stover yield (7.65 tonnes/ha) and B: C (2.16), however, treatment T7 recorded the lowest grain and stover yield. So, the integrated application of straw mulch along with 100% RDF could be recommended for better yield and higher profit of Rabi maize. Integration of organic mulch might be useful for long-term soil health benefits for the nutrient exhaustive maize crop.

Introduction

Maize is an important cereal crop ranking third after wheat and rice in area and production globally (Olaniyin, 2015). It is also familiar as the “Miracle Crop” or “Queen of Cereals” due to its high productivity potential among the cereal crops. In India, maize is grown on area of 9.47 M ha with production of 28.72 Mt and productivity of 3.03 tonnes/ha (Anonymous, 2017). The predominant Rabi maize growing states are Andhra Pradesh (45.5%), Bihar (20.1%), Tamil Nadu (9.3%), Karnataka (8.5%), Maharashtra (7.7%) and West Bengal (5.3%) (Anonymous, 2012). Rice being the major staple food of India which mainly comes from the winter paddy grown in Kharif season. So, it would be a great opportunity to promote maize cultivation in other seasons such as Rabi. Rabi season maize yielded invariably higher (>5 tonnes/ha) than Kharif season maize (2-2.5tonnes/ha) due to long duration of growth period and least infestation of pests and diseases. In recent years, significant changes have occurred in maize production and utilization due to increasing commercial orientation of this crop and rising demand for diversified end users, especially for feed and industrial uses. A sizable number of districts (110 districts), have potential for growing winter maize in the Rabi maize growing states. But, low temperature during early growth period, imbalanced use of fertilizers, low input use efficiency and high cost of cultivation are the prime
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Material and Methods
The field experiment was conducted at Balindi Research Complex, Bidhan Chandra Krishi Viswavidyalaya, Nadia, West Bengal during Rabi season of 2019-20 (96° N latitude, 88° 53′ E longitude, 9.75 m MSL). It lies in the New Alluvial Zone of West Bengal and the region is characterized by tropical and semi-humid climate with annual rainfall about 1350 mm. Experimental field had fairly levelled medium-upland topography with good drainage system and clay loam soil having slightly alkaline pH (7.2) with medium fertility status. The experiment was laid out in Randomized Block Design with 3 replications, comprising of 9 treatment combinations; T1- Live mulch (Trifolium alexandrium) +50% recommended dose of fertilizer (RDF), T2- Live Mulch+75% RDF, T3- Live Mulch+100% RDF, T4- Straw Mulch+ 50 % RDF, T5- Straw Mulch+75% RDF, T6-Straw Mulch+100% RDF, T7- No Mulch+50% RDF, T8- No Mulch+75% RDF and T9- No Mulch+100 % RDF. The recommended dose of fertilizer (RDF) is 120:60:40 kg/ha N, P₂O₅ and K₂O. Maize cultivar ‘VMH-45’ was sown on 2nd fortnight of November, 2019 with a spacing of 60cm × 20cm in 6m × 4m plots with a seed rate of 20 kg/ha by dibbling. For Fertilizer management a recommended dose of 120: 60: 40 kg/ha N: P₂O₅: K₂O for Rabi maize was applied as per treatments in the form of Urea, Diammonium Phosphate and Muriate of Potash respectively. 1/3rd nitrogen of the full dose of P₂O₅ and K₂O were applied as basal by broadcasting and rest 2/3rd dose of nitrogen was top dressed by band application at knee high and tasseling stage of the maize crop in equal doses. In plots with live mulch treatments, berseem was sown in the inter row spaces of maize. Straw mulch was applied at 7 DAS in the inter-row spaces in the respective plots.

The growth attributes viz., plant height (cm), leaf area index (LAI), dry matter/plant and crop growth rate (CGR) were recorded at different growth stages from five randomly tagged plants in each plot. Yield attributes viz., cob length (cm), cob girth of cob (cm) recorded at harvest. Yield of grain and straw (kg/ha) were recorded after harvest from net plot. Shelling (%) and Harvest Index (HI) (%) were computed as

\[ Shelling \% = \frac{Grain \ yield \ (q/ha)}{Whole \ cob \ weight \ (q/ha)} \times 100 \]

\[ HI = \frac{Economic \ yield \ (kg/ha)}{Biological \ yield \ (kg/ha)} \times 100 \]

Data recorded from various observations were statistically analyzed by adopting appropriate method of “Analysis of Variance”. The significance of the treatment effect was judged by ‘F’ test (Variance ratio) and difference of the treatments...
mean was tested using critical difference (C. D.) at 5% level of probability (Sahu, 2013).

Results and Discussion
Mulching and nutrient management significantly affected plant heights, LAI at 90 DAS and CGR at 60-90 DAS (Table-1). Long stature plants (164.57 cm) were produced at 90 DAS from T6 (Straw Mulch+100% RDF) treatment, which was statistically at par with T3 (Live Mulch + 100% RDF) treated plots with average plant height (160.32 cm). The increase in plant height with 100% RDF doses might be attributed to increased length of the internodes due to more cell division and cell elongation which in turn resulted in higher plant height. Highest LAI (3.70 at 90 DAS) was obtained in T6 treatment, where straw mulch along with 100% RDF was applied, which was statistically similar to T3 and T9 treatment. Better soil moisture conserved under mulches with higher moisture reserve noticed under straw mulch which helped in better utilization of fertilizers and moisture which resulted in higher leaf area index in maize due to larger leaf size and broader expansion of leaf blades. This corroborates the findings of Ravindranath et al. (1974) and Ahmed (1989). At 90 DAS highest dry matter accumulation was found in the plants of T6 treatment (Table-1) whereas lowest dry matter accumulation (63.32 g/plant) was recorded in T7 treatment. The possible reason may be that straw mulches created favourable soil temperature and soil moisture conditions which encouraged higher nutrient use efficiency, that in turn, increased the dry matter accumulation in plants, reported by Khan and Pervej (2010) and Jena et al. (2013). Among all the date of observations taken, maximum CGR (15.53 g/m²/day) was recorded at 60-90 DAS at elevated 100% RDF level along with straw mulching (T6 treatment) which was statistically similar to T3 and T9 treatment. The reason for superior CGR in T6 treatment may be due to synergistic effect of mulching and 100% recommended dose of fertilizer that resulted in increased availability and absorption of nutrients through production of growth promoting substances and greater accumulation of dry matter another possible reason of the improvement in the crop growth of maize under mulching could also be due to moisture conservation for long time and the suppression of weeds, thus competition for available resources was greatly reduced. These results are in accordance with the findings of Pramanik (1999) and Sawant (1992). Different level of fertilizer and mulching did not significantly influence the length of cob and cob girth (Table-1), however maximum cob length (15.30 cm) was recorded in T3 (Live Mulch+100% RDF) treatment. Highest cob girth (13.86 cm) was obtained from T6 treatment (Straw Mulch+100% RDF). The mean data revealed that cob length and girth increase with increased fertilizer levels along with mulching. This might be due to moisture conservation and reduction of weed infestation which influenced higher utilization of resources during cob formation stage. These finding are in agreement with Lal (1995) and Avval and Khan (2000).

The highest grain (5.28 tonnes/ha) and stover yield (7.65 tonnes/ha) were obtained from T6 treatment (Table-2). Significant increase in the grain yield of maize under these treatments was due to significant increase in yield components like number of grains per cob, cob length, cob girth and hundred grain weights (seed index). This might be due to moisture conservation and reduction of weed infestation which helped in utilization of the resources from the soil in a better way. These finding are in agreement with Bhatt et al. (2004). The mean data also revealed that 100% RDF and straw mulching significantly improve stover yield due to the combined effect of fertilizer and along with favourable and adequate moisture available to the crop around the root zone due to presence of mulch. Combined application of N, P₂O₅ and K₂O is beneficial in significantly increasing the dry matter yield of maize as observed by Prasad (1981), Ravindranath et al. (1974), Singh and Singh (1984) and Karki et al. (2005). Harvest index (%) and shelling % of maize significantly varied among the treatments. Treatment T6 exhibited the maximum harvest index (37.49 %), which was statistically at par, with T3 treatment. Higher values of harvest index indicated greater partitioning of photosynthates and other essential elements towards reproductive development and economic yield. The findings were supported by Khan and Pervej (2010). The treatment T6 recorded maximum shelling percentage (85.09 %) which was statistically similar with treatments T3 and T9, which is in close conformity with the findings of Singh and Singh (1984). Results revealed that net
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Table 1: Effect of different mulching and nutrient management on plant height, LAI, dry matter accumulation (DMA), CGR, cob length and girth in Rabi maize.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatments</th>
<th>Plant height at 90 DAS (cm)</th>
<th>LAI at 90 DAS</th>
<th>DMA at 90 DAS (g/plant)</th>
<th>CGR at 60-90 DAS (g/m²/day)</th>
<th>Length of cob (cm)</th>
<th>Girth of cob (cm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T₁ (Live Mulch+ 50 % RDF)</td>
<td>132.83</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>64.92</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>12.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T₂ (Live Mulch+ 75% RDF)</td>
<td>143.20</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>80.62</td>
<td>15.07</td>
<td>13.49</td>
<td>13.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T₃ (Live Mulch+ 100% RDF)</td>
<td>160.32</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>92.22</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>15.30</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T₄ (Straw Mulch+50 % RDF)</td>
<td>138.43</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>69.23</td>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>13.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T₅ (Straw Mulch+75% RDF)</td>
<td>147.70</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>80.37</td>
<td>15.11</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>13.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T₆ (Straw Mulch+100% RDF)</td>
<td>164.57</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>95.21</td>
<td>15.53</td>
<td>15.23</td>
<td>13.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T₇ (No Mulch+ 50 % RDF)</td>
<td>126.77</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>63.32</td>
<td>12.61</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>12.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T₈ (No Mulch+75% RDF)</td>
<td>141.37</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>77.77</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>12.93</td>
<td>13.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T₉ (No Mulch+100% RDF)</td>
<td>152.17</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>89.15</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>13.77</td>
<td>13.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEm (±)                     | 1.51                        | 0.28          | 0.52                    | 0.58                        | 0.94               | 0.46              |

CD(ρ=0.05)                  | 4.33                        | 0.84          | 1.57                    | 1.76                        | NS                 | NS                |

Table 2: Effect of different mulching and nutrient management on grain yield, stover yield, harvest index, shelling percentage and economics of Rabi maize.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatments</th>
<th>Grain yield (tonnes/ha)</th>
<th>Stover yield (tonnes/ha)</th>
<th>Harvest Index (%)</th>
<th>Shelling (%)</th>
<th>Net Return (Rs/ha)</th>
<th>B:C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T₁ (Live Mulch+ 50 % RDF)</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>28.33</td>
<td>81.53</td>
<td>29439.40*</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T₂ (Live Mulch+ 75% RDF)</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>36.21</td>
<td>83.47</td>
<td>50609.70*</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T₃ (Live Mulch+ 100% RDF)</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>37.29</td>
<td>84.77</td>
<td>55907.89*</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T₄ (Straw Mulch+50 % RDF)</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>32.54</td>
<td>82.99</td>
<td>18385.40</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T₅ (Straw Mulch+75% RDF)</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>36.66</td>
<td>84.01</td>
<td>33749.42</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T₆ (Straw Mulch+100% RDF)</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>37.49</td>
<td>85.09</td>
<td>43869.44</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T₇ (No Mulch+ 50 % RDF)</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>27.40</td>
<td>79.42</td>
<td>6997.92</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T₈ (No Mulch+75% RDF)</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>34.19</td>
<td>83.10</td>
<td>24104.94</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T₉ (No Mulch+100% RDF)</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>36.24</td>
<td>84.07</td>
<td>35989.96</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEm (±)                     | 0.05                    | 0.03                     | 0.31              | 0.48         | 993.04           | 0.001             |

CD(ρ=0.05)                  | 0.14                    | 0.09                     | 0.94              | 1.44         | 3,002.78         | 0.002             |

*Includes return obtained from selling berseem foliage

return and B: C ratio was also influenced by Mulching and nutrient management significantly (Table2). Maximum net return (55907.89/- /ha) was obtained in T₃ treatment (Live Mulch+100% RDF) due to additional returns obtained from selling the berseem cuttings as an opportunity cost. But the B: C ratio for T₁ treatment (Live Mulch+100% RDF) was (2.13) which is lower than T₆ (Straw Mulch+100% RDF) treatment (2.16), the lower B:C obtained from T₃ treatment is due to higher cost of cultivation which included a high cost of labour for the purpose of cutting the berseem foliage and selling of cuttings at regular interval as well as additional cost of the berseem seeds for the intercropping. The results were confirmed by Bhatnagar et al. (1994).

Conclusion
Considering the findings as summarized above, it can be concluded that the integrated application of straw mulch along with 100% RDF can be recommended for better grain yield and higher profit of Rabi maize. The integration of organic mulching such as straw mulch may bring long-term benefits to soil health for cultivating the nutrient exhaustive maize crop.

Acknowledgement
We sincerely acknowledge NAHEP-CAAST, ICAR for financial support and field staff for providing facility for conducting this research. The support provided by Directorate of Research, BCKV, Nadia, West Bengal, India for this study is also acknowledged.
Conflict of interest
The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References


**Publisher's Note:** ASEA remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and figures.