



E-ISSN: 2278-4136
P-ISSN: 2349-8234
JPP 2018; SP3: 100-103

Nagappa Desai
Scientist (Horticulture),
Department of Horticulture,
Krishi Vigyan Kendra,
Konehalli, Tiptur Taluk,
Tumkuru District, UAS (B),
Karnataka

Mallikarjuna Gowda AP
Senior scientist and Head, Krishi
Vigyan Kendra, Hadonahalli,
Tubagere Hobli, Doddaballapur
Taluk, Bengaluru Rural District,
UAS (B), Karnataka

Praneeth YS
Ph.D. Scholar, Department of
Plantation, Spices, Medicinal and
Aromatic plants, College of
Horticulture, UHS Campus,
GKVK, Bengaluru, Karnataka

Pragath UB
M. Sc. (Horticulture) student,
Department of Plantation,
Spices, Medicinal and Aromatic
plants, College of Horticulture,
UHS Campus, GKVK,
Bengaluru, Karnataka, India

Correspondence
Nagappa Desai
Scientist (Horticulture),
Department of Horticulture,
Krishi Vigyan Kendra,
Konehalli, Tiptur Taluk,
Tumkuru District, UAS (B),
Karnataka, India

National conference on “Conservation, Cultivation and Utilization of medicinal and Aromatic plants” (College of Horticulture, Mudigere Karnataka, 2018)

Effect of integrated nutrient management on economics of herb production in lucerne

Nagappa Desai, Mallikarjuna Gowda AP, Praneeth YS and Pragath UB

Abstract

The experiment was conducted to study the effect of integrated nutrient management on economics of herb production in lucerne (*Medicago sativa* L.) at the farm field of Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Konehalli, Tiptur Taluk, Tumkuru District during *kharif* and *rabi* seasons with nine treatments and four replication. The results revealed that the maximum fresh herb yield per hectare at first (193.52 q & 178.70 q), second (207.41 q & 213.89 q), third (209.26 q & 217.13 q), fourth (210.65 q & 218.98 q), fifth (211.11 q & 216.20 q), sixth (210.18 q & 208.33 q) and seventh harvest (208.33 q & 200.00 q) were recorded respectively during *kharif* and *rabi* season and also maximum net return (Rs. 1,38,270 ha⁻¹ & Rs. 1,38,675 ha⁻¹) and B:C ratio (2.743 & 2.749) were obtained respectively during *kharif* and *rabi* season with the application 50 % RDF + 25 % N through vermicompost + *Rhizobium* + PSB + VAM.

Keywords: Lucerne, bio-fertilizers, harvest, herb, net return and nutrient

Introduction

Lucerne (*Medicago sativa* L.) is one of the oldest cultivated perennial fodder crop in the world and supplies green fodder continuously for 2-3 years. It belongs to the family Fabaceae and considered as ‘Queen of the fodder crops’. It is native of temperate regions of South-West Asia. In India, lucerne is third most important forage crop cultivated approximately in an area of one million hectare with annual production of 60 to 130 t/ha green forage and seed yield of 186 - 280 kg/ha. It is grown in Punjab, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu and Karnataka. Lucerne is relished by all kinds of livestock as it yields nutritious and palatable green fodder, which contains protein (13.3 - 26.6%), phosphorus (0.14 - 0.66 %), calcium (0.92 - 2.9 %), carotene (9.27 mg/ 100g), fibre (20 -30 %) and vitamin A and C (Khalak, 1989). It is important medicinal plant having stachydrine as alkaloid and used as laxative, digestive, diuretic and treating for dropsy, blood pressure, hair loss, acidity and arthritis. It is also used against high cholesterol, asthma, osteo-arthritis, diabetes, stomach problem and a bleeding disorder called thrombocytopenic purpura.

Integrated nutrient management is the use of organic manures and bio-fertilizers along with balanced use of inorganic fertilizers as the eco-friendly approaches, which can be incorporated to attain higher crop productivity and sustainability (Singh *et al.*, 2015) [12]. Considering the importance of crop and role of INM, the present investigation was carried out to assess the “Effect integrated nutrient management on economics of herb production in lucerne”

Materials and Method

The field experiment was conducted at the farm field of Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Konehalli, Tiptur Taluk, Tumkuru District situated under Central dry zone (Zone-4) of Karnataka State during *kharif* and *rabi* seasons from June 2016 to July 2017. The soil status of experiment plot was red sandy loam. There were nine treatments and four replication with Randomized complete block design. Lucerne seeds (variety T-9) were treated with bio-fertilizers *viz.*, *Rhizobium meliloti* and applied *Phosphorous solubilizing bacteris (PSB)* and *vascular arbuscular mycorrhiza (VAM)* along with organic manures. The seeds were sown during *kharif* and *rabi* season with 30 cm x 15 cm spacing.

Treatment details for both the season

T₁ : Rec.Dose of Fertilizer (25:50:25 kg NPK/ha + 10 t/ha FYM)

- T₂: 75% RDF + 25% N through FYM
 T₃: 75% RDF + 25% N through Vermicompost
 T₄: 75% RDF + 25% N through Poultry manure
 T₅: 50% RDF + 25% N through FYM + Rhizobium + PSB+VAM
 T₆: 50% RDF + 25% N through Vermicompost+ Rhizobium + PSB+VAM
 T₇: 50% RDF + 25% N through Poultry manure+ Rhizobium + PSB+VAM
 T₈: RDF + *Rhizobium* + PSB+VAM
 T₉: 10 t/ha FYM + 100% N through FYM

The first crop was harvested at 60 days after sowing to a height of 5 cm from ground level and ratoon crops were harvested at 30 days interval at flower initiation stage for herbage yield. The observations on fresh weight of plant were recorded after harvesting of five tagged plants in each plot. The average of five plants was recorded as fresh weight of plant at first and subsequent harvesting of ratoon crops. The fresh herbage yield per hectare was calculated by taking weight of leaves and stem after harvesting of plants in each of the respective plot at first and subsequent harvesting of ratoon crops.

Benefit cost ratio (B:C ratio)

The benefit cost ratio was worked out by using the formula;

$$\text{B:C ratio} = \frac{\text{Gross income (Rs. ha}^{-1}\text{)}}{\text{Total cost of cultivation (Rs. ha}^{-1}\text{)}}$$

Results and Discussion

I. Effect of integrated nutrient management on fresh weight of plant

The data on fresh weight of plant at first and subsequent harvesting of ratoon crops during *kharif* and *rabi* season as effected by INM are presented in Table 1 & 2. The maximum fresh weight of plant was recorded at first (147.90 g & 152.49 g), second (183.18 g & 191.75 g), third (179.90 g & 195.10 g), fourth (186.05 g & 197.47 g), fifth (191.08 g & 188.85 g), sixth (188.58 g & 183.85 g) and seventh harvest (176.95 g & 174.38 g) during *kharif* and *rabi* season respectively, when plants were supplied with 50 % RDF + 25 % N through vermicompost + *Rhizobium* + PSB + VAM, which was *on par* with the application of 50 % RDF + 25 % N through poultry manure + *Rhizobium* + PSB + VAM at all the harvests. The lowest fresh weight of plant was recorded with the application of 10 t/ha FYM + 100 % N through FYM in both the season at all the harvests.

The increased fresh weight of plant might be attributed to better availability of nutrients and creation of congenial condition in the vicinity of root zone by bio-fertilizers, with which the plants absorbed more of nutrients and enhanced the synthesis of carbohydrates and utilized for building up of new cell. This agrees with the findings (Rajamanickam *et al.*, 2011) [8] in mint, (Ajimoddin *et al.*, 2005) [1] in sweet basil, (Shirole *et al.*, 2005) [11] in brahmi, (Subodhini *et al.*, 2005)

[13] in centella, (Kumaravel *et al.*, 2003) in sweet worm wood and (Senthil Kumar *et al.*, 2003) [10] in marigold.

II. Effect of integrated nutrient management on fresh herb yield per hectare

The maximum fresh herb yield per hectare was recorded at first (193.52 q & 178.70 q), second (207.41 q & 213.89 q), third (209.26 q & 217.13 q), fourth (210.65 q & 218.98 q), fifth (211.11 q & 216.20 q), sixth (210.18 q & 208.33 q), seventh harvest (208.33 q & 200.00 q) and cumulative (1450.46 q & 1453.23 q) during *kharif* and *rabi* season respectively with the application 50 % RDF + 25 % N through vermicompost + *Rhizobium* + PSB + VAM (Table 3 & 4). The application of 10 t/ha FYM + 100 % N through FYM recorded least fresh herb yield per hectare in both the season at all the harvests.

The maximum fresh herb yield may be due to the reason that vermicompost is known to produce favourable effect on physical, chemical and biological factors that determines the productivity and fertility status of soil and supplies nutrients in their available form, increases the microbial population and provides sufficient energy for them to remain active. It also provides the vital macro-nutrient such as N, P, K, Ca, Mg and micro-nutrients. Besides, *Rhizobium* has increased the availability of nitrogen and helped in the synthesis of tryptophan, which is a precursor for the biosynthesis of auxins and hastened the metabolic activities in the plant resulting in maximum plant height, branches and number of leaves, thus maximum herb yield was obtained. The similar reports were found (Vishal *et al.*, 2013 and Tiwari, 2012) [14, 15] in kalmegh, (Gupta *et al.*, 2011) [4] in black henbane, (Ali *et al.*, 2012) [2] in chicory and (Sanjutha *et al.*, 2008) [9] in kalmegh.

III. Effect of integrated nutrient management on economics of herb production

The maximum net return per hectare (Rs. 1,38,270 ha⁻¹ & Rs. 1,38,675 ha⁻¹) and maximum benefit per rupee invested as B:C ratio (2.743 & 2.749) was obtained during *kharif* and *rabi* season with the application of 50 % RDF + 25 % N through vermicompost + *Rhizobium* + PSB + VAM, which was followed by the application of 50 % RDF + 25 % N through poultry manure + *Rhizobium* + PSB + VAM (Table 5). The minimum net return (Rs. 1, 22, 118 ha⁻¹ during *kharif* and Rs. 1, 24, 608 ha⁻¹ during *rabi* season) and B:C ratio (2.59 during *kharif* and 2.62 during *rabi* season) were obtained with the application of 10 t/ha FYM + 100 % N through FYM.

The maximum net return and B:C ratio may be attributed to the enhanced herb yield due to optimum level of nutrients supplied with vermicompost and bio-fertilizers to meet the required demand of the crop. Similar results were reported (Kulmi and Tiwari, 2006) [6] in Ashwagandh. The minimum net return and B:C ratio were obtained with the application of 10 t/ha FYM + 100 % N through FYM during *Kharif* and *rabi* season. The lowest net return and B:C ratio may be due to lesser yield obtained due to insufficient supply of nutrients. Similar results were obtained (Aliezera *et al.*, 2012) [3] in sweet basil, (Tiwari, 2012) [14] in kalmegh.

Table 1: Effect of integrated nutrient management on fresh weight of plant in lucerne *kharif* season

| Treatment | Fresh weight of plant (g) | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------------|------------|-------------|------------|-----------|------------|-------------|
| | I Harvest | II Harvest | III Harvest | IV Harvest | V Harvest | VI Harvest | VII Harvest |
| T ₁ | 128.85 | 159.40 | 161.48 | 163.85 | 169.71 | 168.15 | 155.88 |
| T ₂ | 114.85 | 144.50 | 144.38 | 149.33 | 152.48 | 155.63 | 142.68 |
| T ₃ | 124.60 | 155.28 | 153.10 | 159.00 | 163.93 | 163.93 | 152.00 |
| T ₄ | 122.40 | 149.18 | 150.70 | 154.75 | 158.65 | 158.50 | 146.38 |
| T ₅ | 138.40 | 168.55 | 170.98 | 175.23 | 179.93 | 179.30 | 167.03 |
| T ₆ | 147.90 | 183.18 | 179.90 | 186.05 | 191.08 | 188.58 | 176.95 |
| T ₇ | 143.78 | 178.33 | 173.93 | 180.55 | 184.75 | 183.68 | 171.83 |
| T ₈ | 133.20 | 163.18 | 166.63 | 169.38 | 175.15 | 174.93 | 161.60 |
| T ₉ | 110.03 | 139.60 | 141.03 | 144.93 | 148.43 | 151.90 | 138.85 |
| F- test | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| S.Em± | 2.91 | 3.53 | 2.85 | 3.36 | 3.35 | 3.12 | 3.22 |
| CD at 5 % | 8.50 | 10.31 | 8.31 | 9.82 | 9.78 | 9.13 | 9.41 |

Table 2: Effect of integrated nutrient management on fresh weight of plant in lucerne during *rabi* season

| Treatment | Fresh weight of plant (g) | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------------|------------|-------------|------------|-----------|------------|-------------|
| | I Harvest | II Harvest | III Harvest | IV Harvest | V Harvest | VI Harvest | VII Harvest |
| T ₁ | 137.88 | 179.12 | 181.55 | 184.34 | 175.27 | 167.64 | 159.50 |
| T ₂ | 127.74 | 169.55 | 171.86 | 173.97 | 165.75 | 157.73 | 149.14 |
| T ₃ | 133.04 | 174.14 | 176.18 | 178.15 | 169.96 | 164.13 | 154.70 |
| T ₄ | 131.78 | 174.16 | 175.94 | 178.20 | 169.93 | 161.70 | 154.64 |
| T ₅ | 146.58 | 185.49 | 189.68 | 191.62 | 183.46 | 176.92 | 167.76 |
| T ₆ | 152.49 | 191.75 | 195.10 | 197.47 | 188.85 | 183.85 | 174.38 |
| T ₇ | 150.96 | 190.16 | 192.87 | 194.39 | 187.16 | 180.18 | 171.75 |
| T ₈ | 142.57 | 182.83 | 185.66 | 188.11 | 179.08 | 172.60 | 164.21 |
| T ₉ | 124.87 | 166.00 | 167.37 | 169.95 | 162.30 | 155.73 | 145.68 |
| F- test | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| S.Em± | 1.76 | 1.75 | 1.37 | 6.21 | 1.74 | 2.09 | 2.16 |
| CD at 5 % | 5.15 | 5.11 | 4.01 | 2.12 | 5.10 | 6.11 | 6.31 |

Table 3: Effect of integrated nutrient management on fresh herb yield per hectare in lucerne during *kharif* season

| Treatment | Fresh herb yield per hectare (q) | | | | | | | Cumulative |
|----------------|----------------------------------|------------|-------------|------------|-----------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | I Harvest | II Harvest | III Harvest | IV Harvest | V Harvest | VI Harvest | VII Harvest | |
| T ₁ | 184.26 | 196.76 | 198.61 | 199.54 | 200.93 | 200.46 | 197.68 | 1378.24 |
| T ₂ | 180.56 | 192.59 | 191.67 | 194.91 | 196.30 | 195.37 | 193.98 | 1345.38 |
| T ₃ | 184.26 | 196.30 | 199.07 | 199.54 | 200.00 | 200.46 | 197.22 | 1376.85 |
| T ₄ | 182.87 | 195.83 | 197.68 | 198.15 | 199.54 | 200.00 | 195.83 | 1369.90 |
| T ₅ | 189.35 | 203.24 | 203.24 | 206.48 | 207.87 | 207.41 | 204.17 | 1421.76 |
| T ₆ | 193.52 | 207.41 | 209.26 | 210.65 | 211.11 | 210.18 | 208.33 | 1450.46 |
| T ₇ | 190.74 | 204.63 | 203.24 | 207.41 | 208.33 | 208.33 | 206.02 | 1428.70 |
| T ₈ | 187.04 | 199.07 | 200.46 | 202.78 | 204.17 | 204.63 | 200.93 | 1399.08 |
| T ₉ | 178.70 | 187.96 | 189.35 | 192.59 | 193.52 | 193.06 | 190.28 | 1325.46 |
| F- test | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| S.Em± | 1.38 | 1.37 | 2.24 | 1.40 | 1.03 | 0.74 | 1.31 | 9.55 |
| CD at 5 % | 4.05 | 4.01 | 6.55 | 4.10 | 3.01 | 2.15 | 3.84 | 27.90 |

Table 4: Effect of integrated nutrient management on fresh herb yield per hectare in lucerne during *rabi* season

| Treatment | Fresh herb yield per hectare (q) | | | | | | | Cumulative |
|----------------|----------------------------------|------------|-------------|------------|-----------|------------|-------------|------------|
| | I Harvest | II Harvest | III Harvest | IV Harvest | V Harvest | VI Harvest | VII Harvest | |
| T ₁ | 172.22 | 206.48 | 208.33 | 210.65 | 209.26 | 202.31 | 193.05 | 1402.30 |
| T ₂ | 166.2 | 201.85 | 201.85 | 204.63 | 202.31 | 196.30 | 188.89 | 1362.03 |
| T ₃ | 169.91 | 204.17 | 206.02 | 208.33 | 206.48 | 200.46 | 191.67 | 1387.04 |
| T ₄ | 168.52 | 203.24 | 204.17 | 206.48 | 205.09 | 199.07 | 191.20 | 1377.77 |
| T ₅ | 175.46 | 211.11 | 213.42 | 216.67 | 213.89 | 205.55 | 197.22 | 1433.32 |
| T ₆ | 178.70 | 213.89 | 217.13 | 218.98 | 216.20 | 208.33 | 200.00 | 1453.23 |
| T ₇ | 177.78 | 212.50 | 215.28 | 218.52 | 215.28 | 207.41 | 199.07 | 1445.84 |
| T ₈ | 174.07 | 208.79 | 211.11 | 213.89 | 211.57 | 203.70 | 194.91 | 1399.52 |
| T ₉ | 162.04 | 199.07 | 199.54 | 201.39 | 200.46 | 193.52 | 186.11 | 1342.13 |
| F- test | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | * |
| S.Em± | 1.06 | 0.86 | 1.32 | 0.72 | 0.79 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 6.50 |
| CD at 5 % | 3.10 | 2.50 | 3.85 | 2.11 | 2.05 | 2.73 | 2.76 | 19.10 |

Table 5: Influence of integrated nutrient management on economics of herb production in lucerne

| Treatment | Economics of herb during <i>kharif</i> season (Rs. ha ⁻¹) | | | | Economics of herb during <i>rabi</i> season (Rs. ha ⁻¹) | | | |
|----------------|---|---------------------|------------|-----------|---|---------------------|------------|-----------|
| | Gross return | Cost of cultivation | Net return | B:C ratio | Gross return | Cost of cultivation | Net return | B:C ratio |
| T ₁ | 206730 | 77649 | 129081 | 2.660 | 210345 | 77649 | 132696 | 2.710 |
| T ₂ | 201810 | 77513 | 124297 | 2.600 | 204300 | 77513 | 126787 | 2.640 |
| T ₃ | 206520 | 78810 | 127710 | 2.620 | 208050 | 78810 | 129240 | 2.640 |
| T ₄ | 205485 | 77437 | 128048 | 2.650 | 206670 | 77437 | 129233 | 2.670 |
| T ₅ | 213270 | 78008 | 135262 | 2.730 | 214995 | 78308 | 136987 | 2.740 |
| T ₆ | 217575 | 79305 | 138270 | 2.743 | 217980 | 79305 | 138675 | 2.749 |
| T ₇ | 214305 | 78432 | 135873 | 2.732 | 216870 | 78932 | 137938 | 2.747 |
| T ₈ | 209865 | 78937 | 130928 | 2.680 | 209925 | 78937 | 130988 | 2.660 |
| T ₉ | 198825 | 76707 | 122118 | 2.590 | 201315 | 76707 | 124608 | 2.620 |

Conclusion

The study on the effect of integrated nutrient management on economics of herb production in lucerne revealed that, the application of 50 % RDF + 25 % N through vermicompost + *Rhizobium* + PSB + VAM has recorded maximum herb yield and also maximum profit during *kharif* and *rabi* season. Therefore, 50 % RDF + 25 % N through vermicompost + *Rhizobium* + PSB + VAM may be recommended for commercial cultivation of lucerne under central dry zone of Karnataka.

References

- Ajimoddin I, Vasundara M, Radhakrishna D, Biradar SL, Rao GGE. Integrated nutrient management studies in Sweet basil (*Ocimum basilicum* L.). Indian Perfumer. 2005; 49(1):95-101.
- Ali Z, Alka Narula, Malik Abdin, Prem Shankar. Organic and inorganic fertilizers influence biomass production and esculin content in *Cichorium intybus* L. J Phyto. 2012; 7(5):1-6.
- Aliezera S, Arbabi J, Mohammad R. Effect of organic and inorganic manures on yield, essential oil content and some morphological characteristics of sweet basil (*Ocimum basilicum*). Adv. Env. Bio. 2012; 14(6):458-502.
- Gupta AK, Pandey CS, Vineeta, Kumar J. Effect of integrated nutrient management on herbage yield of black henbane (*Hyoscyamus niger* L.). J Med. and Arom. Pl. Sci. 2011; 2(1):10-14.
- Khalak A. Seed yield of Lucerne (*Medicago sativa* L.) varieties at different times of sowing and levels of fertilizer. M. Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, Univ. of Agri. Sci. GKVK, Bengaluru, 1989.
- Kulmi GS, Tiwari PN. Integrated nutrient management in Ashwagandh (*Withania somnifera* Dunal). Res. Crops. 2006; 7(3):895-899.
- Kumaravel R. Productivity and quality of *Artemisia annua* L. under organic cultivation. M. Sc. (Hort.) Thesis, Univ. Agri. Sci., GKVK, Bengaluru, 2003.
- Rajamanickam V, Venkatesan S, Arumugam Shakila. Effect of organic manures, consortium of biofertilizers and inorganic fertilizers on growth and yield of Mint (*Mentha arvensis* L.), Plant Archives. 2011; 11(2):745-747.
- Sanjutha S, Subramanian S, Indu Rani C and Maheswari J. Integrated nutrient management in *Andrographis paniculata*. Res. J Agri. and Bio. Sci. 2008; 4(2):141-145.
- Senthil Kumar B, Vasundhara M, Farooqi AA. Studies on dry matter production, nutrient uptake and quality in *Tagetes minuta* L. Indian Perfumer. 2003; 47(4):375-381.
- Shirole MS, Jadhav AS, Mahatale PV, Shinde RH. Effect of organic manures and spacings on growth and yield of bramhi. Annal. Plant Physi. 2005; 19(2):264-265.
- Singh R, Munnu Singh, Akshata S, Prakasa Rao EVS, Puttanna K. Assessment of organic and inorganic fertilizers for growth, yield and essential oil quality of industrially important plant Patchouli (*Pogostemon cablin*) (Blanco) Benth., Journal of Essential Oil Bearing Plants. 2015; 18(1):1-10.
- Subodhini C, Tuse BP, Madhuri S, Mahatale YU. Effect of organic manure and spacing on growth and yield of *Centella asiatica*. Annal. Plnt. Physi. 2005; 19(2):243-244.
- Tiwari KN. Nutrient management for sustainable agriculture in kalmegh. J Indian Soc. Soil Sci. 2012; 50(4):374-397.
- Vishal G, Duhan BS. Kalmegh (*Andrographis paniculata*) crop as influenced by the application of farmyard manure (FYM) and inorganic phosphorous in typic torripsamments of Hisar. J Med. Plant. Res. 2013; 7(46):3337-3342.