

Reprint

ISSN 1991-3036 (Web Version)

International Journal of Sustainable Crop Production (IJSCP)

(Int. J. Sustain. Crop Prod.)

Volume: 7

Issue: 3

November 2012

Int. J. Sustain. Crop Prod. 7(3):28-30 (November 2012)

PROFICIENCY AND PROFITABILITY OF POTATO AS AFFECTED BY UREA SUPER GRANULE (USG) AS A SOURCE OF NITROGEN IN HIGH GANGES RIVER FLOOD PLAIN OF BANGLADESH

M.G. AZAM, J.A. MAHMUD, K.U. AHAMMAD, M.A. GULANDAZ AND M. ISLAM



GGF
Nature is Power

An International Scientific Research Publisher

Green Global Foundation®

Publication and Bibliography Division

100 Leeward Glenway

Apartment # 1601

M3c2z1, Toronto, Canada

E-mails: publication@ggfagro.com, editor@ggfagro.com

<http://ggfagro.com/ejournals/current issues>



IJSCP** issn 1991-3036, HQ:19-10 cantral place, saskatoon, saskatchewan, s7n 2s2, Canada

PROFICIENCY AND PROFITABILITY OF POTATO AS AFFECTED BY UREA SUPER GRANULE (USG) AS A SOURCE OF NITROGEN IN HIGH GANGES RIVER FLOOD PLAIN OF BANGLADESH

M.G. AZAM¹, J.A. MAHMUD², K.U. AHAMMAD², M.A. GULANDAZ³ AND M. ISLAM³

¹Scientific Officer, On-Farm Research Division, Regional Agricultural Research Station, Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute, Jessore; ²Senior Scientific Officer, On-Farm Research Division, Regional Agricultural Research Station, Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute, Jessore; ³Scientific Officer, Regional Agricultural Research Station, Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute, Jessore.

Corresponding author & address: Md.Golam Azam, Email: rubel_rbbd@yahoo.com

Accepted for publication on 10 October 2012

ABSTRACT

Azam MG, Mahmud JA, Ahammad KU, Gulandaz MA, Islam M (2012) Proficiency and profitability of potato as affected by Urea Super Granule (USG) as a source of nitrogen in high ganges river flood plain of Bangladesh. *Int. J. Sustain. Crop Prod.* 7(3), 28-30.

A field experiment was conducted at the multilocation testing (MLT) site, On Farm Research Division, BARI, Jhikargacha, Jessore under High Ganges River Floodplain (AEZ-11) during rabi seasons 2008-09 and 2009-10 to investigate the effect of urea super granule (USG) on the growth and yield of potato. The experiment was laid out in RCB design with six dispersed replications with the unit plot size 5m x 4m. Five treatments were the same in two rabi seasons. viz. T₁ = Recommended dose of nitrogen as prilled urea (PU), T₂ = Recommended dose of nitrogen as urea super granule (USG), T₃ = 10% less of recommended dose of nitrogen as USG, T₄ = 20% less of recommended dose of nitrogen as USG and T₅ = Farmers practice (average of 20 farmers N dose used as PU) Significant variation was observed in different treatments. The highest yield of potato 33.21 t/ha were obtained from the recommended N dose of USG followed by USG 10% less than recommended dose of N (31.51 t/ha) during 2008-09. In the year 2009-10 higher yield was obtained from the T₂ treatment (32.33 t/ha) followed by T₃ (30.87 t/ha). By reducing 10% N losts through USG application more or equal returns can be obtained over prilled urea application. Cost and return analysis revealed that the treatment T₂ was obtained higher gross returns as well as BCR (2.74) followed by T₃ treatment (2.64).

Key words: USG, yield, potato

INTRODUCTION

Potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.) is the 3rd largest food and vegetables crop in Bangladesh after rice and wheat. It is also a world leading vegetables crop that furnishes appreciable amount of vitamin B and vitamin C as well as minerals. As an industrial crop, potato is a raw material of various foods and confectionaries. Potato is a staple food in the developed countries and which account for 37% of the total potato production in the world (FAO and CIP, 1995). In Bangladesh, area under potato crops was 520 thousand ha with annual production of 7800000 ton and average yield 15 t/ha (Anon. 2008).

Nitrogen requirement of potato is very high. It is an essential plant nutrient element and is the most limiting due to its high mobility and different types of losses like leaching, volatilization and mobilization (Zaman *et al.* 1993; Bhuiyan *et al.* 1990; De Dalta and Crasswell, 1982). Eusof *et al.* (1993) observed USG as an alternative source of nitrogen than prilled urea in terms of efficiency in wet land rice. Nitrogen requirement of potato and rate of urea is very high. Farmer's of Bangladesh grown potato in different regions through prilled urea with other fertilizers. The efficiency of the prilled urea is very low (Chowdhury and Khanif, 2001).

Several research results showed the USG is more efficient than that of prilled urea. When prilled urea applied in the soil by broadcast method causes loss up to 50%, while the point placement method of USG in 8-10 cm depth showed negligible loss (De Dalta and Crasswell, 1982). So, during last 2-3 years, farmers are applying USG in upland vegetables and fruit due to it's minimizes of N fertilizer can increased through deep placement in the form of USG (Sanvant *et al.* 1991). Some research report on different crops especially vegetables revealed that by using of USG substantial amount of urea fertilizer can be saved (Anon. 2003). Much kind of vegetables were grown in Jessore region such as cabbage, cauliflower, eggplant, summer tomato, winter season tomato and country bean etc. However, these are no recommendation of USG for upland crops. The efficiency of USG in this AEZ 11 is not yet to be ascertained. There fore, the experiment was deigned to evaluate the efficiency of USG on the yield of potato and to find out the optimum and economic cost analysis in potato production.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment was carried out in the medium high land of AEZ 11 (High Ganges River Flood pain) at multiplication testing (MLT) site, Jhikargacha, Jessore during the two consecutive years in rabi season of 2008-9 and 2009-2010. The soil was analyzed for different properties before the start the experiment from SRDI, Jenaidha (Table 1). The experiment was laid out in RCB design with six dispersed replications with the unit plot size 5m x 4m. Treatments were T₁ = Recommended dose of nitrogen as prilled urea, T₂ = Recommended dose of nitrogen as urea super granule (USG), T₃ = 10% less of recommended dose of nitrogen as USG, T₄ = 20% less of recommended dose of nitrogen as USG and T₅ = Farmers practice. The recommended dose of nitrogen was 190 kg/ha. Other fertilizers were used as per recommended dose @ 20-110-15-4-1 kg PKSZn and B/ha in the form of triple super phosphate, murate of potash, gypsum, zinc sulphate and boric acid, respectively (Table 2).

Half of murate of potash was applied at 15 days after planting (DAP) and remaining half at 30 DAT. USG was applied at 15 DAT as ring method, 9-10 cm apart from plant stalk and 7-8 cm depth covering with soil. Potato was planted in 2 December, 2008 and 25 November 2009 and harvested in 4 March 2009 and 10 March 2010 respectively. The collected data were analyzed statistically following the ANOVA technique with the help of MSTA-C software package and means were separated by DMRT at 5% level of significance. Cost and return of all inputs and outputs were noted down and economic analysis of different treatments was done for benefit cost ratio (BCR). Gross return was calculated from two years mean yield of potato.

Table 1. Soil analysis values of different samples collected from Jhikargacha, Jessore

| Elements | pH | OM (%) | K meq/100g | Total N (%) | P | S | B | Zn |
|-----------------|-----|--------|------------|-------------|---------|--------|----------|--------|
| | | | | | µg/g | | | |
| Soil test value | 7.8 | 1.39 | 0.15 | 0.07 | 30.5 | 18.4 | 0.12 | 0.95 |
| Interpretation | - | - | Low | Very low | Optimum | Medium | Very low | Medium |

Table 2. Fertilizer doses of different treatments for the performance of potato during 2008-10

| Treatments | Nutrient (Kg/ha) | | | | | | CD (kg/ha) |
|----------------|------------------|----|-----|----|----|---|------------|
| | N | P | K | S | Zn | B | |
| T ₁ | 190 | 20 | 110 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| T ₂ | 190 | 20 | 110 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| T ₃ | 170 | 20 | 110 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| T ₄ | 152 | 20 | 110 | 15 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| T ₅ | 220 | 30 | 90 | 20 | 8 | 2 | 4 |

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The results showed that plant height, plant populations/m², tuber/hill, tuber weight/hill and tuber yield of potato were significantly affected by the treatments (Table 3). In both years, the highest plant height (67.20 cm and 71.21 cm) was recorded from T₂ but T₂ and T₃ were significantly identical in 2008-09 and significantly difference in 2009-10. The treatment T₂ produced maximum number of plant per m² (38.62) in 2008-09 and in 2009-10, similar trend was observed which was statistically similar with T₅ treatment in both the years. The highest tuber per hill was observed from T₂ treatment, which was statistically similar with T₃ & T₄ treatments in 2008-09. The highest Tuber per hill was recorded from T₃ treatment followed by T₂ treatment but there was no significance difference among the T₁, T₄ and T₅ treatments in 2009-10. Higher tuber weight/hill (335.01 and 325.25 gm) were found in treatment T₂, that were statistically identically with T₅ (325.25 and 314.34 gm) followed by T₃ (300.15 and 305.95 gm) for both the years, respectively.

In 2008-09, maximum tuber yield was observed from T₂ treatment (33.21 t/ha) which was statistically identical with T₃ (31.51 ha) and statistically dissimilar with T₄ (29.89 t/ha) and T₅ (29.56 t/ha) treatments. In 2009-10, significantly maximum tuber yield was found from T₂ (32.33 t/ha) treatment closely followed by T₅ (30.21 t/ha) and T₃ (30.49 t/ha) treatments. It can be assumed from the better performance of USG that N loss from this fertilizer was remarkably less than that of prilled urea. Similar results have been found by Patrick (1982) and Mishra *et al.* (1999). Haque (2005) found maximum yield of potato with point placement of USG. The treatments T₁ gave the lowest yield (26.56 t/ha and 27.52 t/ha) in both years. However, average yield of the two years revealed that maximum yield (32.77 t/ha) was found in T₂ followed by T₃, T₅ and T₄ treatments. T₂, T₃ and T₄ treatments gave 21.19, 14.64 and 7.69% higher yield over T₁ treatment which was PU of urea fertilizer.

Table 3. Effect of USG and PU on the yield contributing characters of potato during 2008-10

| Treatment | Plant height (cm) | | Plant population/m ² (no.) | | Tuber/hill (no.) | |
|----------------|-------------------|---------|---------------------------------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
| T ₁ | 57.93c | 70.03b | 34.52c | 35.45b | 10.04c | 10.30 |
| T ₂ | 67.20a | 71.21a | 38.62a | 37.91a | 12.03a | 12.07 |
| T ₃ | 65.06ab | 69.05b | 37.52b | 36.66ab | 11.53ab | 12.27 |
| T ₄ | 57.02c | 67.89bc | 35.25c | 35.55b | 11.20ab | 11.17 |
| T ₅ | 62.15b | 66.23c | 39.10a | 37.73a | 11.02b | 11.83 |

Cont'd table 3

| Treatment | Tuber weight/hill (g) | | Tuber yield (t/ha) | | Mean yield (t/ha) | % increased over |
|----------------|-----------------------|----------|--------------------|---------|-------------------|------------------|
| | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | | |
| T ₁ | 289.61b | 296.50bc | 26.56c | 27.52a | 27.04 | - |
| T ₂ | 335.01a | 325.25a | 33.21a | 32.33a | 32.77 | 21.19 |
| T ₃ | 300.15b | 305.95b | 31.51a | 30.87a | 31.00 | 14.64 |
| T ₄ | 295.50b | 287.15c | 29.89b | 28.35c | 29.12 | 7.69 |
| T ₅ | 315.25a | 304.34b | 29.56b | 30.45b | 30.21 | 11.72 |

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

The economic performance of potato production (Table 4) the highest gross return (Tk 294930/ha) was obtained from T₂ treatment followed by T₃ (Tk 79000/ha) and T₅ (Tk 271890/ha). Highest total cost was obtained from the treatments T₅ (Tk 111525/ha) and lowest (Tk 99493/ha) from T₄ treatment. The highest benefit cost ratio (BCR) was obtained from T₂ (2.74) followed by T₃ (2.64) and T₄ (2.63) treatments.

Table 4. Cost and return analysis of the effect on potato production. Cost of analysis (Average of 2 years)

| Treatment | Gross return | Total cost | G.M | BCR |
|----------------|--------------|------------|--------|------|
| T ₁ | 243360 | 106636 | 136724 | 2.28 |
| T ₂ | 294930 | 107646 | 187284 | 2.74 |
| T ₃ | 279000 | 105588 | 173412 | 2.64 |
| T ₄ | 262080 | 99493 | 162587 | 2.63 |
| T ₅ | 271890 | 111525 | 160365 | 2.42 |

Market price (Tk./kg): Potato-9.00, Urea-6.50, USG-7.00, TSP-30.0, MP-30.0, Gypsum-5.0, Zinc sulphate-120.0 and Boric acid-110.0

CONCLUSION

On the basis of two years results, it can be concluded that yield and income might be increased through using USG, on an average 10% use N application as USG which can be saved on compared among the treatments. So, the increased price of N fertilizer and the nation can save 10% fertilizer in potato production.

REFERENCES

- Anonymous (2003) Adoption of urea super granule (USG) in vegetables crops: A profitable technology'. Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute and SFFP, Department of Agricultural Extension. Pp.1-10.
- Anonymous (2008) Annual Research Report 2007-08. TCRC, BARI, Gazipur.
- Bhuiyan NI, Saleque MA, Panaullah CM (1990) Nitrogen fertilizer management for higher efficiency in wetland rice. *Bangladesh J. Soil Sci.* 21, 29-39.
- Choudhury ATMA, Khanif YM (2001) Evaluation of effects of nitrogen and magnesium fertilization on rice yield and fertilizers nitrogen efficiency using 15 N tracer technique. *J. Plant Nutr.* 24, 855-871.
- De Datta SK, Crasswell FT (1982) Nitrogen fertilizer management in wetland rice soils. In Int'l Rice Res. Inst. Rice Research Strategies for the Future. Los Banos, Philippines. Pp. 283-316.
- Eusuf I-I. M, Quayurri MA, Razzaq A, Alarri MS, Jabber MA, Quayurn A (1993) Economic analysis of urea super granules application in irrigated rice. *Bangladesh Rice J.* 4, 23-27.
- FAO, CIP (1995) Potatoes in the 1990s: Situation and prospects of the world potato economy. FAO, Rome. Italy. 39pp.
- Haque SA (2005) Efficiency of Urea Super Granule Point Placement on Potato. *Bull. Inst. Trop. Agr., Kyushu Univ.* 28, 21-24.
- Mishra BK, Mishra S, Dash AK, Jena D (1999) Effect of time for Urea Super granule (USG) placement on low land rice. *Ann. Agril. Res.* 20, 443-247.
- Patrick WHJr (1982) Nitrogen transformation in submerged soils. In nitrogen in agricultural soil. *Adv. Agron.* 22, 446-462.
- Savant NK, Dhane SS, Talashikar SC (1991) Fertilizer News. International Fertilizer Development Centre, Muscle Shoals Alabama and ISA. 36(3), 19-25.
- Zaman SK, Razzaque MA, Karim SMR, Ahrned AU (1993) Evaluation of prilled urea and urea super granule as nitrogen sources for upland aus rice. *Bangladesh Rice J.* 4, 412-446.