## INTEGRATED NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT FOR PRODUCTIVITY AND QUALITY OF FCV TOBACCO (*NICOTIANA TABACUM*) IN IRRIGATED ALFISOLS

# S.V. KRISHNA REDDY, S. KASTURI KRISHNA, P. HARISHU KUMAR AND C. CHANDRASEKHARA RAO

ICAR-Central Tobacco Research Institute, Rajahmundry-533 105, Andhra Pradesh, India

(Received on 9th March, 2014 and accepted on 28th May, 2014)

A field experiment was conducted during the crop seasons of 2002-05, to find out the response of fluecured Virginia tobacco (Nicotiana tabacum L.) to integrated use of organic manures, biofertilisers and inorganic fertilizers in irrigated Alfisols (northern light soils) at Jeelugumilli in Andhra Pradesh. Results pooled over the years showed that addition of dual cultures of Azotobacter and Azospirillum along with co-inoculation of VAM fungi and PSB to tobacco grown after sunnhemp in situ green manuring (GM) with 8.7 kg P/ha and application of 90-8.7-99.9 kg NPK/ha followed by 0.2% MgSO. spray + 0.2% ZnSO<sub>4</sub> spray ( $T_{10}$ ) increased yields of green leaf by 1.46 t/ha (8.50%), cured leaf by 0.15 t/ha (6.78%) and grade index by 0.23 (14.47%); grade index/cured leaf by 5% and cured leaf production efficiency by 0.92 kg/ha/day compared with those of the recommended practice of fertilizer application i.e. sunnhemp with 8.7 kg P(in situ GM) + 110-17.5-99.9 kg NPK/ha (T<sub>2</sub>). Higher content of nicotine, total nitrogen and lower content of reducing sugars in tobacco leaf lamina; higher net returns, B:C ratio, profitability and higher soil available N were recorded in the treatment  $T_{10}$  compared to other treatments. Co-inoculation of VAM fungi + PSB cultures to tobacco grown with sunnhemp in situ GM saved 8.7 kg P/ha. Dual inoculation of free nitrogen fixing Azotobacter and Azospirillum to tobacco grown after sunnhemp in situ GM showed a saving of 20 kg N/ ha. Foliar spray of 0.2%  $ZnSO_4(T_{10})$  increased yields of green leaf by 0.75 t/ha (4.19%), cured leaf by 0.09 t/ha (3.96) and grade index by 0.12 (7.06%), grade index/ cured leaf by 2.2% and cured leaf production efficiency by 0.55 kg/ha/day compared with those of the treatment without foliar spray of ZnSO, *i.e.*  $T_{9.}$  It was concluded that treatment ( $T_{10}$ ) saved 8.7 kg P and 20 kg N/ha and produced higher cured leaf yield, grade index, better chemical quality in lamina, accrued higher net returns and improved soil available N.

Key words: FCV tobacco, INM, NLS, Productivity

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Flue-cured Virginia (FCV) tobacco (Nicotiana tabacum L.) is an important excise and foreign exchange earning commercial crop of India grown mainly in the states of Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka. Semi-flavorful to flavorful FCV tobacco required for domestic as well as international markets is being cultivated in an area of around 26000 ha, producing nearly 55 million kg of tobacco leaf annually in Alfisols under irrigated conditions, popularly termed as Northern Light Soil (NLS) area, comprising East Godavari, West Godavari and Khammam districts of Andhra Pradesh (Tobacco Board, 2008). Long-term fertilizer effects show that a total dependence on inorganic fertilizer alone has a deleterious effect on soil health by damaging physical and chemical properties, besides leading to nutrient imbalances in soil which consequently reduced crop productivity. Application of organic matter to soil increases the water holding capacity of soil besides adding major and micronutrients and reducing the leaching losses of nitrogen. Organic manures such as farmyard manure, filter press cake, sunnhemp [Crotalaria juncea (L.) Rotar and Joy] in situ green manuring also improve the body, aroma, pliability and other quality parameters in tobacco. Biofertilizers like Azotobacter (Narasimha Rao et al., 1995) and Azospirillum (Harishu Kumar et al., 1991) are known to improve the nitrogen economy by assimilating free atmospheric nitrogen in FCV tobacco. Vesicular arbuscular mycorrhizal (VAM) fungi are known to improve the availability of P and Zn by absorption of P and Zn from soil by fungal hyphae, translocation and transfer to host and phosphate solubilising bacteria (PSB) are apparently known to increase the plant availability of native and applied phosphorus (Yadav et al., 2008). Although chemical fertilizers will continue

to be the main components for meeting the increased crop nutrition needs, agronomic practices involving integrated use of fertilizers, organic manures and biofertilizers is required to reduce the application of chemical fertilizers and cost of cultivation besides being an eco-friendly approach. This approach also helps in sustaining moderate to high productivity and profitability of the field crops and at the same time restores soil health by improving physical and chemical properties of soils. Keeping these points in view, the present experiment was conducted to assess the impact of conjunctive use of organic manures, biofertilisers and chemical fertilizers through soil and foliar application on the yield, quality, economics of FCV tobacco cv. Kanchan and soil health in terms of soil organic C, N, P and K content under irrigated Alfisols of Andhra Pradesh.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

The field experiment was conducted during *Rabi* 2002-03, 2003-04 and 2004-05 at the research farm of Central Tobacco Research Institute Research Station, Jeelugumilli, West Godavari district, Andhra Pradesh. The top soil (0-22.5 cm) was sandy loam and deeper layers (22.5-45 cm) were sandy clay, classified as Typic Haplustalfs with slightly acidic pH {(1:2.5) 6.30}, low electrical conductivity {(1:2.5) 0.22 dS/m}, chlorides (32 mg/kg), organic C (0.24%), available N (150 kg/ha), high available P (25 kg/ha) and medium available K (209 kg/ha).

The experiment consisted of 12 treatment combinations *viz.*, T<sub>1</sub>= FYM (10 t/ha) + 110-26.2-99.9 kg NPK/ha;  $T_2 = FPC (10 \text{ t/ha}) + 110-26.2$ -99.9 kg NPK/ha;  $T_3 =$  Sunnhemp with 8.7 kg P{*in* situ green manuring (GM)}+110-17.5-99.9 kg NPK/ ha;  $T_4$  = Sunnhemp with 8.7 kg P (in situ GM) + 110-8.7-99.9 kg NPK/ha + VAM fungi;  $T_5 = T_4 +$ PSB;  $T_6$  = Sunnhemp with 8.7 kg P (in situ GM) + 90-17.5-99.9 kg NPK/ha + Azotobacter;  $T_7 = T_6 +$ Azospirillum;  $T_8$  = Sunnhemp with 8.7 kg P (in situ GM) + 90-8.7-99.9 kg NPK/ha + VAM fungi + PSB + Azotobacter + Azospirillum;  $T_0 = T_8 + 0.2\% MgSO_4$ spray;  $T_{10} = T_9 + 0.2\%$  ZnSO<sub>4</sub> spray;  $T_{11} =$  FPC (10 t/ha)+90-17.5-99.9 kg NPK/ha + All biofertilisers + 0.2% MgSO<sub>4</sub> spray + 0.2% ZnSO<sub>4</sub> spray;  $T_{12}$  = FYM (10 t/ha) + 90-17.5-99.9 kg NPK/ha + All biofertilisers + 0.2% MgSO<sub>4</sub> spray + 0.2% ZnSO<sub>4</sub>

spray; replicated three times in a randomized block design on a permanent layout.

Sunnhemp seed @ 50 kg/ha was sown in the first week of June and in situ incorporation was done before flowering in first week of August. The incorporated dry matter of sunnhemp was about 4.0 t/ha with N content of 3.40% (on oven dry weight basis). Farmyard manure (FYM) and filter press cake (FPC) @ 10 t/ha were applied one month before expected date of tobacco planting and incorporated into the soil after spreading uniformly as per the treatment. N, P and K content of FYM was 0.48, 0.20 and 0.48 and those of FPC were 0.75, 0.30 and 0.60%, respectively. In treatments having biofertilizers viz., Azospirillum, Azotobacter and 'phosphate-solubilizing bacteria' (PSB) or phosphobacteria (Pseudomonas striata) slurry was prepared by mixing 250 g of respective culture and 5 liters of water. The roots of the tobacco seedlings were dipped in this slurry for 30 minutes and then transplanted. Vesicular arbuscular mycorhizal (VAM) fungi (Glomus fasciculatum) were mixed with sand in 1:10 proportion and the mixture was applied and mixed uniformly in the planting places in the plots having VAM fungi treatment. The biofertilisers were obtained from Agricultural Research Station, Amaravathi (ANGRAU), Guntur district, Andhra Pradesh. The gross plot size was 6 X 6 m (60 plants) and the net plot size was 4 X 4.8 m (32 plants). Sixty-day-old seedlings of tobacco cv Kanchan were planted with a spacing of 100 X 60 cm in the first week of October. Nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium were applied as per the treatments. Nitrogen was applied in three splits in 1:2:1 proportion at 10, 30 and 45 days after planting. First split of N and full dose of P in the form of diammonium phosphate and 50% K in the form of potassium sulphate were applied 10 days after planting as basal dose. Second split of N was given through calcium ammonium nitrate along with remaining 50% K in the form of potassium sulphate at 30 days after planting. Remaining 25% N was top dressed at 45 days after planting adopting dollop method. Foliar spray of 0.2% MgSO<sub>4</sub> and 0.2% ZnSO<sub>4</sub> was done twice with 600 liters of spray fluid at 35 and 45 days after planting as per treatment. The recommended package of practices was followed to grow tobacco crop except the inputs applied as treatments. The crop was topped at 24 leaves at bud stage. Decanol (n-deconal, a fatty alcohol based suckericide) 4% was applied @ 10-15 ml/plant immediately after topping for preventing the sucker growth.

Tobacco leaves were harvested at maturity and flue-cured. The data on green leaf and cured leaf were recorded and grade index was calculated. Economics was calculated based on the prevailing market prices of the inputs and produce *i.e.* tobacco cured leaf @ Rs 52,000/t. Profitability was calculated on net returns. The tobacco cured leaf samples from primings (P), lugs and cutters (X), leaf (L) and tips (T) positions were collected, processed and analyzed for reducing sugars, nicotine, chlorides, total N, P and K as per the standard procedures. Soil samples were collected from 0-22.5 cm depth at pre-sowing and postharvest and estimated pH, electrical conductivity (EC), organic C, available N, P and K contents following standard procedures.

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### **Yield characters**

Results of pooled data over the years (Table 1) showed that co-inoculation of VAM fungi + PSB cultures to tobacco grown after sunnhemp in situ GM with 8.7 kg P/ha and 110-8.7-99.9 kg NPK/ ha to tobacco  $(T_{s})$  improved yields of green leaf by 0.44 (2.56), cured leaf by 0.05 (2.26) and grade index by 0.03 t/ha (1.89%) compared with those of the tobacco grown after sunnhemp in situ GM with 8.7 kg P and 110-17.5-99.9 kg NPK/ha (Recommended practice T<sub>o</sub>). By co-inoculation of VAM fungi + PSB, 8.7 kg P/ha was saved. The differences in growth response with VAM fungi was attributed to absorption of P and Zn from soil by fungal hyphae, translocation and transfer to the host (Yadav et al., 2008). The beneficial effect of PSB may be due to increased availability of native and applied soil phosphorus to the plant. The use of phosphobacteria and VAM fungi is undoubtedly of value in increasing crop yields (Yadav et al., 2008).

Addition of dual culture of free nitrogen fixing *Azotobacter* and *Azospirillum* to tobacco grown after sunnhemp *in situ* GM with 8.7 kg P and 90-17.5-99.9 kg NPK/ha ( $T_7$ ) improved yields of green leaf by 0.24 t/ha (1.40%), cured leaf by 0.02 t/ha

(0.90%) and grade index by 0.03 (1.89%) compared to recommended practice ( $T_3$ ), thus showing a saving of 20 kg N/ha. The better response of FCV tobacco for *Azospirillum* dip was mainly due to increased leaf growth which may be attributed to increased N availability through N fixation and secretion of plant growth promoting substances by *Azospirillum* culture compared with no *Azospirillum* treatments (Narasimha Rao *et al.*,1995).

Combined addition of dual cultures of Azotobacter and Azospirillum along with coinoculation of VAM fungi and PSB to tobacco grown after sunnhemp *in situ* GM with 8.7 kg P and 90-8.7-99.9 kg NPK/ha ( $T_g$ ) increased yields compared to the recommended practice ( $T_3$ ) and showing a total saving of 20 kg N and 8.7 kg P/ha.

Combined addition of dual cultures of Azotobacter and Azospirillum along with coinoculation of VAM fungi and PSB to tobacco grown after sunnhemp in situ GM with 8.7 kg P/ha and 90-8.7-99.9 kg NPK followed by 0.2% MgSO, spray + 0.2% ZnSO<sub>4</sub> spray ( $T_{10}$ ) increased yields of green leaf by 1.46 t/ha (8.50%), cured leaf by 0.15 t/ha (6.78%), grade index by 0.23 (14.47%), grade index/cured leaf by 5% and cured leaf production efficiency by 0.92 kg/ha/day compared with those of the recommended practice (T<sub>a</sub>). ZnSO<sub>4</sub> spray of 0.2% (T<sub>10</sub>) increased yields of green leaf by 0.75 (4.19), cured leaf by 0.09 (3.96), grade index by 0.12 t/ha (7.06%); grade index/cured leaf by 2.2%and cured leaf production efficiency by 0.55 kg/ ha/day compared with those of the treatment  $T_{o}$ . The increase in green and cured leaf yield is not statistically significant. However, grade index increased significantly due to Zn spray. Zinc application contributed to increased yield probably owing to its influence on protein and auxin synthesis and N fixation (Anuradha et al., 2005). Application of FYM and FPC @10 t/ha in lieu of sunnhemp in situ GM were not giving comparable tobacco yields and thus sunnhemp in situ GM is definitely better than application of organic manures.

#### **Chemical quality characters**

Reducing sugars, nicotine, chlorides, total nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium in leaf lamina are important chemical quality parameters

| E         |  |
|-----------|--|
| e e       |  |
| ī         |  |
| ŏ         |  |
| ď         |  |
| $\sim$    |  |
| T.        |  |
| 5         |  |
| 8         |  |
| ē         |  |
| <b></b> 0 |  |
| 03        |  |
| ອ         |  |
| B         |  |
| ÷         |  |
| Ē         |  |
| e         |  |
| E.        |  |
| Ħ         |  |
| ā         |  |
| Ē         |  |
| ĕ         |  |
| ÷.        |  |
| 13        |  |
| <i>b</i>  |  |
| Ĕ         |  |
| <b>H</b>  |  |
| -         |  |
| P.        |  |
|           |  |
| b<br>B    |  |
| ŭ         |  |
| g         |  |
| ne        |  |
|           |  |
| lni si    |  |
| •=        |  |
| ŝ         |  |
| s as      |  |
| ŝ         |  |
| Ĕ         |  |
| Z         |  |
| uttrib    |  |
| 1         |  |
| Ē         |  |
| d ai      |  |
| ld        |  |
| ē         |  |
| Ŀ         |  |
| 0         |  |
| õ         |  |
| S         |  |
| þ         |  |
| 0         |  |
| E         |  |
| <u></u>   |  |
| -         |  |
| ble       |  |
| <u>e</u>  |  |

| Tr.No.         | Treatments   | Tobacco yield (t/ha) | eld (t/ha)            |                | Green leaf/ cured | Grade index / cured | Cured leaf                  |
|----------------|--|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
|                |  | Green leaf           | Green leaf Cured leaf | Grade<br>index | - Ical            | <b>JEAI</b> (70)    | productivity<br>(kg/ha/day) |
| Ţ              | FYM (10 t/ha) + 110-26.2-99.9 kg NPK /ha   | 14.19                | 1.88                  | 1.34           | 7.50              | 71.2                | 11.53                       |
| $T_2$          | FPC (10 t/ha) + 110-26.2-99.9 kg NPK /ha   | 14.26                | 1.93                  | 1.37           | 7.36              | 71.3                | 11.84                       |
| Л3 -           | Sunnhemp with 8.7 kg P (in situ GM) + 110-17.5-99.9 kg NPK /ha                                       | 17.18                | 2.21                  | 1.59           | 7.73              | 72.1                | 13.56                       |
| $T_4$          | Sunnhemp with 8.7 kg P + 110-8.7-99.9 kg NPK /ha+ VAM  | 17.35                | 2.24                  | 1.60           | 7.77              | 71.7                | 13.74                       |
| $T_5$          | $T_4 + PSB$  | 17.62                | 2.26                  | 1.62           | 7.76              | 71.9                | 13.87                       |
| $T_6$          | Sunnhemp with 8.7 kg P + 90-17.5-99.9 kg NPK /ha + Azotobacter                                       | 17.05                | 2.19                  | 1.59           | 7.79              | 72.3                | 13.44                       |
| $T_7$          | $T_6 + Azospirillum$   | 17.42                | 2.23                  | 1.62           | 7.84              | 72.6                | 13.68                       |
| $\mathrm{T}_8$ | Sunnhemp with 8.7 kg P + 90-8.7-99.9 kg NPK /ha + VAM + PSB +<br>Azotobacter + Azospirillum          | 17.72                | 2.25                  | 1.64           | 7.85              | 72.6                | 13.80                       |
| $T_9$          | $T_8 + 0.2\%$ MgSO <sub>4</sub> sprav  | 17.89                | 2.27                  | 1.70           | 7.87              | 74.9                | 13.93                       |
| $T_{10}$       | $T_9 + 0.2\% ZnSO_4 sprav$   | 18.64                | 2.36                  | 1.82           | 7.47              | 77.1                | 14.48                       |
| $T_{11}$       | FPC (10 t/ha)+ 90-17.5-99.9 kg NPK /ha + All biofertilisers + 0.2%                                   | 16.21                | 2.16                  | 1.60           | 7.47              | 76.3                | 13.25                       |
|                | MgSO4 spray + 0.2% ZnSO4 spray   |                      |                       |                |                   |                     |                             |
| $T_{12}$       | FYM (10 t/ha)+ 90-17.5-99.9 kg NPK /ha + All biofertilisers + 0.2%<br>MgSQ4 sprav + 0.2% ZnSO4 sprav | 15.69                | 2.12                  | 1.60           | 7.48              | 76.4                | 13.01                       |
|                | SBIIIT   | 0.35                 | 0.04                  | 0.04           | 0.04              | 0.36                | 0.23                        |
|                | CD (P=0.05)  | 0.97                 | 0.11                  | 0.10           | 0.12              | 1.00                | 0.64                        |
|                | Seasons  |                      |                       |                |                   |                     |                             |
|                | 2002-03  | 13.26                | 1.77                  | 1.30           | 7.47              | 73.5                | 10.86                       |
|                | 2003-04  | 16.76                | 2.24                  | 1.61           | 7.50              | 72.8                | 13.74                       |
|                | 2004-05  | 20.29                | 2.51                  | 1.86           | 8.07              | 74.0                | 15.40                       |
|                | SEm±   | 0.25                 | 0.04                  | 0.03           | 0.03              | 0.26                | 0.20                        |
|                | CD (P=0.05)  | 0 85                 | 0 14                  | 010            | 011               | 0.00                | 000                         |

| led)           |
|----------------|
| (pool)         |
| management     |
| nutrient       |
| ntegrated      |
| l by iı        |
| influenced     |
| a as           |
| leaf lamin     |
| tobacco        |
| FCV            |
| composition of |
| : Chemical     |
| Table 2        |

| Treatments   | R        | Reducing sugars (%) | sugars (% | (%        |      | Nicoti  | Nicotine (%) |           |         | Chlorides (%) | es (%)   |   | A                    | Nitrogen (%) | 1 (%)  |                      | Ph     | Phosphorus (%) | (%) SI |                          |         | Potassium (%) | (%) <b>ш</b> | ĺ    |
|--|----------|---------------------|-----------|-----------|------|---------|--------------|-----------|---------|---------------|----------|---|----------------------|--------------|--|----------------------|--------|----------------|--------|--------------------------|---------|---------------|--------------|------|
| 11001110   | Ч        | X                   | г         | Т         | Р    | X       | г            | Т         | Р       | X             | r        | T   | Ъ                    | X            | L  | Т                    | L<br>L | X              | L T    |                          | PX      | 1             |              | Ē    |
| $T_1$  | 14.05    | 20.27               | 16.17     | 13.68     | 1.39 | 1.71    | 2.59         | 2.90      | 0.33    | 0.41          | 0.51     | 0.57  | 1.51                 | 1.85         | 2.70   | 2.97                 | 0.26   | 0.32 (         | 0.26 ( | 0.22                     | 1.71 1  | 1.92 2.       | 2.46 2.3(    | 3(   |
| $T_2$  | 13.65    | 20.07               | 15.95     | 13.45     | 1.41 | 1.73    | 2.67         | 2.95      | 0.32    | 0.34          | 0.45     | 0.51  | 1.53                 | 1.87         | 2.77   | 3.04                 | 0.25   | 0.31 (         | 0.25 0 | 0.22                     | 1.67 1  | 1.85 2.       | 2.39 2.25    | 25   |
| $T_3$  | 12.66    | 19.18               | 15.03     | 12.53     | 1.55 | 1.86    | 2.80         | 3.11      | 0.30    | 0.40          | 0.52     | 0.59  | 1.68                 | 2.00         | 2.91   | 3.21                 | 0.25   | 0.32 (         | 0.26 0 | 0.23                     | 1.68 1  | 1.88 2.       | 2.46 2.26    | 26   |
| $\mathrm{T}_4$   | 12.05    | 18.51               | 14.50     | 11.93     | 1.61 | 1.91    | 2.86         | 3.17      | 0.36    | 0.36          | 0.45     | 0.51  | 1.74                 | 2.04         | 2.97   | 3.27                 | 0.27   | 0.34 (         | 0.28 0 | 0.24                     | 1.61 1  | 1.84 2.       | 2.40 2.20    | 2(   |
| $T_5$  | 11.49    | 17.68               | 13.73     | 11.13     | 1.65 | 1.96    | 2.97         | 3.27      | 0.35    | 0.42          | 0.47     | 0.53  | 1.78                 | 2.08         | 3.07   | 3.37                 | 0.27   | 0.34 (         | 0.29 0 | 0.25                     | 1.60 1  | 1.79 2.       | 2.30 2.1     | 11   |
| $T_6$  | 12.87    | 19.65               | 15.29     | 12.84     | 1.51 | 1.81    | 2.79         | 3.09      | 0.35    | 0.42          | 0.46     | 0.51  | 1.64                 | 1.96         | 2.92   | 3.18                 | 0.26   | 0.33 (         | 0.28 0 | 0.24                     | 1.69 1  | 1.90 2.       | 2.48 2.3(    | 3(   |
| $T_7$  | 12.41    | 18.81               | 14.72     | 12.13     | 1.58 | 1.89    | 2.84         | 3.15      | 0.38    | 0.38          | 0.47     | 0.54  | 1.71                 | 2.01         | 2.95   | 3.24                 | 0.26   | 0.32 (         | 0.27 0 | 0.23                     | 1.64 1  | 1.85 2.       | 2.44 2.5     | 2.25 |
| $T_8$  | 11.80    | 18.17               | 14.12     | 11.76     | 1.63 | 1.94    | 2.89         | 3.22      | 0.38    | 0.39          | 0.48     | 0.54  | 1.76                 | 2.06         | 3.00   | 3.32                 | 0.28   | 0.35 (         | 0.30 0 | 0.26                     | 1.61 1  | 1.81 2.       | 2.34 2.      | 2.14 |
| $T_9$  | 11.24    | 17.47               | 13.42     | 11.16     | 1.67 | 1.98    | 3.03         | 3.34      | 0.39    | 0.34          | 0.48     | 0.55  | 1.80                 | 2.10         | 3.13   | 3.43                 | 0.28   | 0.35 (         | 0.31 0 | 0.27                     | 1.59 1  | 1.78 2.       | 2.29 2.10    | 10   |
| $T_{10}$   | 10.97    | 16.58               | 12.79     | 10.44     | 1.69 | 2.00    | 3.13         | 3.44      | 0.36    | 0.36          | 0.46     | 0.52  | 1.83                 | 2.13         | 3.23   | 3.53                 | 0.29   | 0.37 (         | 0.32 0 | 0.28                     | 1.58 1  | 1.77 2.       | 2.27 2.(     | 2.05 |
| $T_{11}$   | 13.08    | 19.76               | 15.63     | 13.13     | 1.47 | 1.80    | 2.77         | 3.07      | 0.36    | 0.34          | 0.45     | 0.49  | 1.61                 | 1.94         | 2.90   | 3.15                 | 0.24   | 0.30 (         | 0.25 0 | 0.21                     | 1.61 1  | 1.81 2.       | .47 2.3      | 2.35 |
| $T_{12}$   | 13.27    | 19.94               | 15.81     | 13.25     | 1.46 | 1.77    | 2.75         | 3.04      | 0.38    | 0.41          | 0.46     | 0.52  | 1.59                 | 1.92         | 2.88   | 3.13                 | 0.23   | 0.30 (         | 0.25 0 | 0.21                     | 1.64 1  | 1.83 2.       | 2.48 2.3     | 2.35 |
| SEm±   | 0.16     | 0.15                | 0.17      | 0.12      | 003  | 0.02    | 0.04         | 0.05      | 0.01    | 0.01          | 0.01     | 0.01  | 0.03                 | 0.04         | 0.05   | 0.03                 | 0.01   | 0.01 (         | 0.01 0 | 0.01 (                   | 0.02 0  | 0.02 0.       | 0.03 0.0     | 0.02 |
| CD (P=0.05)  | 0.44     | 0.43                | 0.47      | 0.33      | 007  | 0.07    | 0.11         | 0.13      | 0.04    | 0.04          | 0.03     | 0.03  | 0.08                 | 0.10         | 0.13   | 0.09                 | 0.02   | 0.02 (         | 0.02 0 | 0.02 (                   | 0.06 0  | 0.06 0.       | 0.07 0.06    | 0£   |
| Seasons  |          |                     |           |           |      |         |              |           |         |               |          |   |                      |              |  |                      |        |                |        |                          |         |               |              |      |
| 2002-03  | 13.05    | 19.42               | 15.87     | 12.93     | 1.41 | 1.71    | 2.64         | 2.98      | 0.31    | 0.34          | 0.43     | 0.47  | 1.52                 | 1.84         | 2.75   | 3.07                 | 0.23   | 0.30 (         | 0.26 0 | 0.23                     | 1.58 1  | 1.77 2.       | 2.34 2.      | 2.17 |
| 2003-04  | 12.74    | 18.99               | 14.95     | 12.41     | 1.55 | 1.86    | 2.84         | 3.18      | 0.36    | 0.38          | 0.47     | 0.55  | 1.70                 | 2.00         | 2.97   | 3.27                 | 0.26   | 0.34 (         | 0.28 0 | 0.24                     | 1.65 1  | 1.85 2.       | 2.40 2.5     | 2.22 |
| 2004-05  | 11.59    | 18.12               | 13.47     | 11.52     | 1.70 | 2.02    | 3.04         | 3.28      | 0.41    | 0.43          | 0.52     | 0.58  | 1.83                 | 2.15         | 3.14   | 3.37                 | 0.28   | 0.35 (         | 0.30 0 | 0.26                     | 1.69 1  | 1.90 2.       | 2.45 2.5     | 2.26 |
| SEm±   | 0.11     | 0.11                | 0.10      | 0.05      | 0.01 | 0.01    | 0.01         | 0.03      | 0.01    | 0.01          | 0.01     | 0.02  | 0.01                 | 0.03         | 0.01   | 0.01                 | 0.01   | 0.01           | 0.01 0 | 0.01                     | 0.01 0  | 0.01 0.       | 0.02 0.01    | 0    |
| CD (P=0.05)  | 0.37     | 0.38                | 0.33      | 0.19      | 0.04 | 0.05    | 0.04         | 0.09      | 0.02    | 0.03          | 0.02     | 0.05  | 0.05                 | 0.12         | 0.05   | 0.04                 | 0.02   | 0.02           | 0.02 0 | 0.02                     | 0.04 0  | 0.03 0.       | 0.06 0.      | 0.04 |
| Acceptable limits                                      |          | 8.0                 | 8.0 -24.0 |           |      | 0.      | 0.7 - 3.5    |           |         | ~             | <1.5     |   |                      | 1.0          | 1.0 - 3.0  |                      |        | 0.20 -0.40     | .40    |                          |         | 1.5           | 1.5 - 3.0    |      |
| P = Primings (first and second harvest from bottom), X | and seco | nd harve            | st from b | ottom), X | 11   | and cut | tters (thi   | ird and f | ourth h | arvest),      | L = Leaf | Lugs and cutters (third and fourth harvest), $L = Leaf$ (fifth to 10 <sup>th</sup> harvest) | 10 <sup>th</sup> hai |              | and $T=Tips$ (11 <sup>th</sup> and 12 <sup>th</sup> harvest) | ïps (11 <sup>t</sup> | 12 and | th harve       |        | @ two leaves per harvest | res per | harvest.      |              |      |

influenced by different components of INM (Table 2). Relatively higher contents of nicotine, total nitrogen and lower contents of reducing sugars in tobacco leaf lamina were recorded in all the plant positions in the treatment  $T_{10}$  compared to other treatments. This trend could be attributed to higher nitrogen availability and foliar spray of MgSO, and ZnSO, in this treatment. Lower contents of total N, nicotine and higher content of reducing sugars in tobacco leaf lamina were recorded in all the plant positions in the treatments  $T_1$ ,  $T_2$ ,  $T_{11}$  and  $T_{12}$  that received FYM and FPC @ 10 t/ha (in addition to other INM components) compared to other treatments that have sunnhemp in situ GM with 8.7 kg P/ha ( $T_3$ - $T_{10}$ ). This might be due to lower N supply from FYM and FPC as compared to sunnhemp in situ GM which is evident from lower soil organic C and residual N in these treatments.

There was a gradual increase of nicotine, total N and decrease in sugars with increase in soil available N in all plant positions. It is the interplay of the N and carbohydrate metabolism as influenced by management that predetermines the quality and chemical composition of cured leaf of tobacco. Nitrogen is a component of the nicotine molecule and is important in its synthesis in tobacco. The concentration of nitrogen in leaves is positively correlated with nicotine and negatively correlated with starch and sugar concentrations (Flower, 1999). Thus in the present study, an increase in the soil available N and organic C increased the concentration of total nitrogen and nicotine and decreased the sugar and sugar: nicotine ratio in tobacco cured leaf. Similar observations were also reported by Kasturi-Krishna et al., (2009) and Krishna-Reddy et al. (2008). Although chloride concentration in lamina varied among the treatments, it was well within the normal limits of good quality leaf. Usually leaf chlorides >1.5% is not preferred as the leaf absorbs more moisture, becomes pale and slick and adversely affects leaf burning quality.

The variations in yield parameters and lamina quality characteristics were significant between the seasons. Higher green leaf, cured leaf, grade index and cured-leaf productivity and higher levels of lamina total N, nicotine and lower sugars in all plant positions were recorded during the third season compared with those of the first and second

seasons. This was mainly due to the carry over (residual) and cumulative effect of organic manures applied in the first and second season crop and more than the carry over effect, the benefit in improving soil health made it to produce higher tobacco leaf yields, and increased lamina total N and nicotine in third season compared with first and second season (Kasturi-Krishna et al., 2009 and Krishna-Reddy et al., 2009). The study also revealed that the lamina total N, nicotine and potassium contents increased gradually from P to T positions and reducing sugars and P concentrations increased from P to X position and there after decreased gradually up to T position in all the treatments (Table 2). Distribution of nicotine, reducing sugars, total N, P and K in different plant positions followed the normal trend in all the treatments (Gopalachari, 1984). All the chemical quality parameters were within the acceptable limits in all the plant positions.

#### **Economics**

The highest net return, B: C ratio and profitability were obtained with  $T_{10}$  foliar sprays of Zn and Mg along with other INM components have improved the cured leaf yields leading to increase in gross returns and hence accrued higher net returns in these treatments. In general, higher net returns were obtained with sunnhemp *in situ* GM due to the higher tobacco cured leaf yields in these treatments as compared to application of FYM and FPC @ 10 t/ha.

#### **Residual soil fertility**

Residual soil fertility indicated significant variation in the available N status of soil, but there was no change in pH, EC, organic C, available P and K (Table 3). Available N ranged from 152.3 to 162.9 kg/ha under different treatments. The treatment  $T_{10}$  being on a par with the treatments having sunnhemp *in situ* GM i.e. $T_3$ - $T_9$  showed significantly higher soil available N as compared to other treatments having application of FYM and FPC @10 t/ha ( $T_1$ , $T_2$ , $T_{11}$  and  $T_{12}$ ). Lower values of soil available N was recorded in the treatments that received FYM and FPC in lieu of sunnhemp *in situ* GM. The higher soil available N in sunnhemp *in situ* GM-tobacco system might be the result of enhanced microbial activity due to accretion of

| crop                   |        |
|------------------------|--------|
| hree                   |        |
| fter t]                |        |
| enta                   |        |
| nagem                  |        |
| nt mø                  |        |
| nutrier                |        |
| rated                  |        |
| integi                 |        |
| l by i                 |        |
| uenced                 |        |
| s infl                 |        |
| ity as                 |        |
| fertil                 |        |
| soil                   |        |
| residual               |        |
| and                    |        |
| 8: Economics and resid | 000000 |
| e<br>Se                |        |
| able                   |        |

| Ë                         | Treatments  | Econ             | Economics (x10 <sup>3</sup> Rs/ha) | Rs/ha)         | C<br>B       | Profitability  |                   |                   | Soil ch           | Soil chemical parameters | eters                                   |                      |
|---------------------------|---|------------------|------------------------------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|---|----------------------|
| No.                       |   | Gross<br>returns | Cost of<br>cultivation             | Net<br>returns | ratio        | (Rs/ha/day)    | Hq                | EC<br>(dS/m)      | Organic<br>C (%)  | Available<br>N (kg/ha)   | Available P Available<br>(kg/ha) (kg/ha | Available<br>(kg/ha) |
| $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{l}}$ | FYM (10 t/ha) + 110-26.2-99.9 kg NPK /ha  | 97.76            | 67.44                              | 30.32          | 1.45         | 186.0          | 6.40              | 0.23              | 0.24              | 152.3                    | 26.1                                    | 215                  |
| $\mathrm{T}_2$            | FPC (10 t/ha)+ 110-26.2-99.9 kg NPK /ha   | 100.36           | 68.44                              | 31.92          | 1.47         | 195.8          | 6.37              | 0.24              | 0.25              | 153.2                    | 26.5                                    | 216                  |
| <b>د</b> ن                | Sumnhemp with 8.7 kg P (in situ GM) + 110-<br>17.5-99.9 kg NPK /ha  | 114.92           | 72.04                              | 42.88          | 1.60         | 263.1          | 6.20              | 0.23              | 0.26              | 158.7                    | 28.0                                    | 217                  |
| $T_4$                     | Sunnhemp with 8.7 kg P + 110-8.7-99.9 kg<br>NPK /ha+ VAM  | 116.48           | 72.34                              | 44.14          | 1.61         | 270.8          | 6.20              | 0.24              | 0.26              | 158.0                    | 29.0                                    | 214                  |
| $T_5$                     | $T_4 + PSB$   | 117.52           | 72.79                              | 44.73          | 1.61         | 274.4          | 6.23              | 0.23              | 0.27              | 159.6                    | 29.9                                    | 213                  |
| $T_6$                     | Sunnhemp with 8.7 kg P + 90-17.5-99.9 kg<br>NPK /ha + Azotobacter   | 113.08           | 70.73                              | 42.35          | 1.60         | 259.8          | 6.23              | 0.23              | 0.25              | 157.5                    | 28.4                                    | 214                  |
| 2                         | $T_6$ + Azospirillum  | 115.96           | 71.58                              | 44.38          | 1.62         | 272.3          | 6.20              | 0.21              | 0.26              | 160.2                    | 28.6                                    | 215                  |
| $T_8$                     | Sumhemp with 8.7 kg P + 90-8.7-99.9 kg NPK<br>/ha + VAM + PSB + Azotobacter + Azospirtlium  | 117.00           | 71.73                              | 45.27          | 1.63         | 277.7          | 6.20              | 0.22              | 0.27              | 159.2                    | 27.9                                    | 212                  |
| $T_9$                     | $T_8$ + 0.2% Mg SO <sub>4</sub> spray   | 118.04           | 72.53                              | 45.51          | 1.63         | 279.2          | 6.20              | 0.23              | 0.28              | 159.0                    | 27.2                                    | 211                  |
| ${ m T_{10}}{ m T_{11}}$  | T <sub>9</sub> + 0.2% Zn SO <sub>4</sub> spray<br>FPC (10 t/ha)+ 90-17.5-99.9 kg NPK /ha + All<br>biofertilizers + 0.2% Mg SO <sub>4</sub> spray + 0.2% Zn<br>SO <sub>4</sub> spray | 122.72<br>112.32 | 74.73<br>72.33                     | 47.99<br>39.99 | 1.64<br>1.55 | 294.4<br>245.3 | 6.23<br>6.33      | 0.24<br>0.24      | 0.28<br>0.25      | 162.9<br>153.2           | 27.0<br>26.7                            | 210<br>217           |
| $T_{12}$                  | FYM (10 t/ha)+ 90-17.5-99.9 kg NPK /ha + All<br>biofertilizers + 0.2% Mg SO4 spray + 0.2% Zn<br>SO4 spray   | 110.24           | 71.53                              | 38.71          | 1.54         | 237.5          | 6.40              | 0.24              | 0.24              | 152.3                    | 26.4                                    | 216                  |
|                           | SEmt  |                  |                                    |                |              |                | 0.07              | 0.02              | 0.01              | 1.71                     | 0.81                                    | 2.68                 |
|                           | CD (P=0.05)<br>Grand Mean   |                  |                                    |                |              |                | <b>NS</b><br>6.27 | <b>NS</b><br>0.23 | <b>NS</b><br>0.26 | <b>5.00</b><br>157.2     | <b>NS</b><br>27.64                      | <b>NS</b><br>214.17  |
| nitia.                    | Initial soil test value   |                  |                                    |                |              |                | 6.30              | 0.22              | 0.24              | 150.0                    | 25                                      | 209                  |

fresh organic matter with higher N content as a consequence of sunnhemp incorporation into the soil (Krishna Reddy *et al.*, 2007). Perceptible improvement in soil fertility in terms of organic C, available N, P and K was noticed as compared to initial soil test values, though the differences were not significant statistically.

It was concluded that combined inoculation of dual cultures of *Azotobacter* and *Azospirillum* along with co-inoculation of VAM fungi and PSB to tobacco grown after sunnhemp *in situ* GM with 8.7 kg P and 90-8.7-120 kg NPK/ha followed by 0.2% MgSO<sub>4</sub> spray + 0.2% ZnSO<sub>4</sub> spray (T<sub>10</sub>) produced higher cured leaf yield, grade index, better chemical quality in lamina, accrued higher net returns and improved soil available N.

#### REFERENCES

- Anuradha, M., K. Nageswara Rao, K. Deo Singh and V. Krishnamurthy. 2005. *Tobacco plant nutrition. Mineral nutrients: Deficiency, toxicity symptoms and corrective measures*. Central Tobacco Research Institute, (ICAR), Rajahmundry, A. P. India. Pp. 20-21.
- Flower, K.C. 1999. Field practices. In: Tobacco -Production, Chemistry and Technology (Davis, D.L. and Nielsen, M.T. Eds.).
  Blackwell Science Ltd. University Press, Cambridge, Great Britain. Pp. 77-82.
- Gopalachari, N.C. 1984. *Tobacco*: Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi. pp. 96.
- Harishu Kumar, P., R. Sinha, K.S.N. Murty, R.B. Narayana Rao and N. Prabhakara Rao. 1991.
  Evaluation of different sources of NO<sub>3</sub>-N as top dressing over basal application of DAP, ammonium sulphate and *Azotobacter* in tobacco nurseries. **Tob. Res.** 17 (2): 93-6.
- Jones, D.L., A. Hogde and Y. Kuzyakov. 2004. Plant mycorrhizal regulation of rhizodeposition. **New Phytologist** 163: 459-80.

Kasturi Krishna, S., S.V. Krishna Reddy, K. Deo

Singh, P. Harishu Kumar and V. Krishnamurty. 2009. Effect of organic and inorganic sources of nitrogen on productivity, quality and economics of FCV (*Nicotiana tabacum*) in irrigated Alfisols. **Indian J. Agron.** 54 (3): 24-32.

- Krishna Reddy, S.V., S. Kasturi Krishna, K. Deo Singh, P. Harishu Kumar and V.
  Krishnamurty. 2009. Integrated nutrient management in FCV tobacco (*Nicotiana tabacum*) in irrigated Alfisols. Indian J.
  Agron. 54 (1): 74-9.
- Krishna Reddy, S.V., S. Kasturi Krishna and J.A.V. Prasad Rao. 2008. Productivity, quality and economics of irrigated FCV tobacco (*Nicotiana tabacum*) in relation to spacing, dose and time of nitrogen application. **Indian J. Agron**. 53 (1): 70-5.
- Krishna Reddy, S.V., S. Kasturi Krishna, J.A.V. Prasad Rao, P. Harishu Kumar and V. Krishnamurty. 2007. Effect of application of biofertilisers to soybean (*Glycine max*) and nitrogen to tobacco (*Nicotiana tabacum*) in soybean – tobacco cropping system. **Indian** J. Agron. 52 (4): 294-9.
- Narasimha Rao, C.V., D. Ramachandram, K.S.N. Murty, D.V. Subhashini and R. Athinarayanan. 1995. Influence of boifertliser (*Azotobacter chroococum*) on yield and chemical quality of FCV tobacco in NLS. In: **Souvenir 1995 tobacco symposium**" (Murthy, P.S.N. and P.R.S. Reddy, Eds.). Indian Society of Tobacco Science, Central Tobacco Research Institute, Rajahmundry, Andhra Pradesh. pp. 42.
- Tobacco Board. 2008. *Annual Report*, Tobacco Board, Govt. of India. Ministry of Commerce & Industry. Guntur. Andhra Pradesh. Pp.143 -54.
- Yadav, R.L., D.V. Yadav and S.K. Duttamajumder. 2008. Rhizospheric environment and crop productivity: A review. **Indian J. Agron**. 53 (1): 1-17.