

Original Research Article

<https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2021.1009.070>

Revive Old Practices of Rainy Season Groundnut from Smart Agronomy of Summer Season Groundnut

R. A. Singh^{1*}, Rajesh Rai¹, I. P. Singh², Amar Singh¹ and M. K. Singh¹

¹C.S. Azad University of Agriculture and Technology, Kanpur, U.P., India

²K.V.K. Auraiya, U.P., India

*Corresponding author

ABSTRACT

An experiment field was laid out during summer season of 1998 and 1999 at Regional Research Station, Mainpuri, C.S. Azad University of Agriculture and Technology, Kanpur. The experimental soil was sandy loam with poor fertility status. The thirty three genotypes of groundnut were tested. The main objective was to find out the suitable genotypes for summer season groundnut. Among the tested genotypes D₄D₈-10, D₄D₈-14 and ICGV 93468 gave superior pod yield by 35.08 q/ha, 34.34 q/ha and 32.62 q/ha. The genotypes ICGV-96360 (25.94 q/ha), ICGV-95337 (24.90 q/ha), ICGV-95299 (23.14 q/ha), ICGV-95319 (22.10 q/ha), D.G. 40 (21.04 q/ha) and ICGV-95290 (20.34 q/ha) also gave considerable pod yield. The other tested genotypes were failed to give expected pod yield during summer season. The incidence of pest almost absent except pod borer. Pod borer damaged the pods up to 20% - 51.85% during summer season in lower pod yielder genotypes. The incidence of viral disease was not noted but fungal disease affected the crop by 1-2%.

Keywords

Dh-86, Fungal diseases, ICGV-93468, Pod borer, Viral diseases, White grub

Article Info

Accepted:

25 August 2021

Available Online:

10 September 2021

Introduction

The riverine belt of alluvial soil of Uttar Pradesh, India, having loamy sand, sandy loam, loam, sandy clay loam and light clay loam texture is most suitable for rainy season groundnut cultivation. In early 1980's groundnut was grown in U.P. on 0.30 million ha with production of 0.19 million tones.

Since then both area and production have shown a steady decline due to various reasons. In 1997-98, the groundnut area was reduced to 0.13 million ha with a total production of 0.10 million tones. Effort to arrest this decline in area and production did not succeed due to various biotic and economic reasons (Singh, 2004 and Singh, 2005). A strong need was felt to develop a suitable technology for groundnut

cultivation under moisture stress condition to revive groundnut in state. Since, the main function of National Agricultural Research Project, Mainpuri was to lead the groundnut research. The scientific team of project started the work of summer groundnut. International Crop Research Institute for Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT) Patancheru provided 33 groundnut genotypes for evaluation during summer season in 1998. Genotypes ICGV 93468 of ICRISAT (now AVTAR) and D₄D₈-6, D₄D₈-10 & D₄D₈-14 group of Dharwad (now Dh 86) gave very good performance during summer season and at initial stage these genotypes gave more than 30 q/ha pod yield after 85-90 days of planting. Due to high yield potential, low incidence of insect, pest and diseases, better survival under moisture stress condition, early maturity and thermo –tolerance, these aforementioned genotypes were considered safe for groundnut growers. On farm trials these genotypes yielded 35-40 q/ha, this was the first unprecedented success for dissemination and diffusion of groundnut during summer season in Uttar Pradesh. Thus, the area under summer season groundnut cultivation increased from scratch in 2001 to >40 lakh ha 2018 through farmers to farmers spread. Therefore, the performance of test genotypes during summer season is the subject matter of this manuscript.

Materials and Methods

The field study was under taken during summer season of 1998 and 1999 at Regional Research Station, Mainpuri, C.S. Azad University of Agriculture and Technology, Kanpur. The experimental soil was sandy loam, having pH 8.5, organic carbon 0.45%, total nitrogen 0.04%, available phosphorus 10 kg/ha and available potassium 278 kg/ha, thus the nutrients of experimental soil were analyzed low in organic carbon, total nitrogen, available phosphorus and high in available potassium. The pH was determined by

Electrometric glass electrode method (Piper, 1950), while organic carbon was determined by Colorimetric method (Datta *et al.*, 1962).

Total nitrogen was analyzed by Kjeldahl's method as discussed by Piper (1950). The available phosphorus and potassium were determined by Olsen's method (Olsen *et al.*, 1954) and Flame photometric method (Singh, 1971), respectively. Thirty three genotypes of groundnut provided by ICRISAT, Patancheru, Telangana (Listed in Table -1) were tested. The groundnut genotypes were planted in 19th March and harvested on 15 June after 97 days of seeding during both experimental season of summer. The crop was fertilized with 20 kg N+30kg P₂O₅+45 kg K₂O+200 kg gypsum/ha. The irrigations were given at 20, 35, between 50-55 and 70-75 days of seeding. The crop was harvested on the residue moisture of irrigation given at 70-75 days after seeding as suggested by Singh (2004), Singh (2005), Singh (2006) and Singh (2007). The smart agronomical practices were followed as suggested by Singh (2004). The experiment was under taken in RBD with three replications. The experimental data of pooled years were statistically analyzed as suggested by Gomez and Gomez (1984).

Results and Discussion

The pooled data of two years were analyzed and reported in Table -1 and discussed here under appropriate heads.

Pod yield

Among the different genotype, tested during summer season D₄D₈-10, D₄D₈-14 and ICGV 93468 gave higher pod yield by 35.08 q/ha, 34.34 q/ha and 32.62 q/ha, respectively. Genotypes, ICGV-96360, ICGV-95337, ICGV-95299, ICGV-95319, D.G. 40, and ICGV-95290 also gave better yield during summer season plantation.

Table.1 Statement showing pod yield, pest incidence and disease incidence under different genotypes during summer season (*Pooled data of two years*).

Sl. No.	Genotype	Yield (q/ha)	Pest incidence (%)				Disease incidence (%)	
			Anarsia eppiphias	Jasid	Pod borer	White grub	Viral	Fungal
1.	ICGV-96337	1.76	2.00	0.00	21.42	0.00	0.00	1-2
2.	ICGV-96412	1.76	2.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	1-2
3.	ICGV-96395	2.10	1.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	1-2
4.	ICGV-96433	4.20	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1-2
5.	ICGV-96443	7.00	2.00	1.00	5.25	0.00	0.00	1-2
6.	ICGV-96342	7.70	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1-2
7.	ICGV-96332	11.92	1.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1-2
8.	ICGV-96399	2.44	3.00	0.00	11.11	0.00	0.00	1-2
9.	ICGV-96365	7.00	1.00	2.00	8.33	0.00	0.00	1-2
10.	ICGV-96329	7.70	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1-2
11.	ICGV-95290	20.34	1.00	1.00	2.43	0.00	0.00	1-2
12.	ICGV-95271	16.48	2.00	0.00	7.69	0.00	0.00	1-2
13.	ICGV-94357	9.46	3.00	2.00	7.69	0.00	0.00	1-2
14.	ICGV-94299	16.48	2.00	2.00	3.57	0.00	0.00	1-2
15.	ICGV-95299	23.14	6.00	1.00	6.66	0.00	0.00	1-2
16.	ICGV-95296	16.12	4.00	3.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	1-2
17.	ICGV-95319	22.10	2.00	0.00	15.38	0.00	0.00	1-2
18.	ICGV-95311	17.54	4.00	1.00	32.14	0.00	0.00	1-2
19.	ICGV-94313	14.38	5.00	1.00	3.33	0.00	0.00	1-2
20.	D.G.-40	21.04	2.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1-2
21.	D ₄ -D ₈ -14	34.34	1.00	0.00	11.59	0.00	0.00	1-2
22.	D ₄ -D ₈ -6	12.62	1.00	0.00	14.54	0.00	0.00	1-2
23.	ICGV-96357	16.12	7.00	2.00	51.85	0.00	0.00	1-2
24.	ICGV-96356	18.24	3.00	0.00	22.50	0.00	0.00	1-2
25.	D ₄ -D ₈ -10	35.08	1.00	0.00	3.44	0.00	0.00	1-2
26.	ICGV-96360	25.94	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1-2
27.	ICGV-96349	19.64	2.00	3.00	31.63	0.00	0.00	1-2
28.	ICGV-96359	16.82	1.00	1.00	2.63	0.00	0.00	1-2
29.	ICGV-95337	24.90	2.00	2.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	1-2
30.	ICGV-93468	32.62	1.00	0.00	4.34	0.00	0.00	1-2
31.	ICGV-96453	8.06	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1-2
32.	ICGV-93460	16.12	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1-2
33.	ICGV-86158	4.90	2.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1-2
	C.D. 5%	4.58	-	-	-	-	-	-

The order of performance of these genotype was ICGV-96360 (25.94 q/ha) > ICGV-95337 (24.90 q/ha) > ICGV-95299 (23.14 q/ha) > ICGV-95319 (22.10 q/ha) > D.G. 40 (21.04 q/ha) and >ICGV-95290 (20.34 q/ha). The other tested genotypes were failed in production of expected pod yield, during summer season. The results display that the better yield in aforementioned genotypes was due to suitability of climatic condition, resistant against to the thermal environment and harsh condition. Under this situation these varieties had maintained better source – sink relationship. It means amount of dry matter or photosynthetic produced by source organs translocated towards sink organ (economic part) and, produced higher yield. These results are commensurable to the findings of Panchbor and Shete (2010), Singh *et al.*, (2015), Singh *et al.*, (2016) and Singh *et al.*, (2019).

Pest incidence

The data recorded on Anarsia eppiphias, Jasad, Pod borer and White grub display that among these insect, pod borer damage the pod up to 51.85% in some tested genotype during summer season. The genotypes ICGV -96337 (21.42%), ICGV-96412 (25.00%), ICGV-96433 (20.00%), ICGV-95319 (20.00)%, ICGV-95311 (32.14%), ICGV-96357 (51.85)%, ICGV-96356 (22.50%) and ICGV-96359 (31.63%) were displayed damaged of pods by pod borer. The incidence of white grub was found nil during summer season.

Disease incidence

The incidence of viral disease was not seen but incidence of fungal disease was noted 1-2%.

The farm families residing in the riverine tract of Uttar Pradesh, where, groundnut cultivation is in vigour may be advocated for cultivation

of D₄D₈-10 and D₄D₈-14 (both varieties released by name Dh-86) and ICGV 93468 (AVTAR) for obtaining maximum pod yield during summer season.

References

- Datta, N. P., Khera, M. S. and Saini, T. R. 1962. Rapid colorimetric procedure for determination of organic carbon in soil. *Journal of Indian Society of Soil Sciences*, 10:67-74.
- Gomez, K. A. and Gomez, A. A. 1984. Statistical procedures for agricultural research. Johnviley and Sons, New York.
- Olsen, S. R, Cole, C. V., Wabonable, K. S. and Dean, L. A. 1954. Estimation of available phosphorus in soils by extraction with sodium bicarbonate. U.S.D.A. Circ. 919 (Washington) : 19.
- Panchpor, N. S. and Shete, P. G. 2010. Source Sink relationship in soybean genotype in summer season. *International Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 6(1):67-68.
- Piper, C. S. 1950. Soil and Plant Analysis, Univ. Adelaide, Australia.
- Singh, R. A. 2005. Revival of groundnut production. *NRCG News Letter IV* (2-3): 1.
- Singh, R. A. 2006. Performances of groundnut cultivar ICGV 93468 during summer season in Uttar Pradesh, India. *International Arachis News Letter*. 26: 19-20.
- Singh, R. A. 2007. Effect of variable doses of potassium, sulphur, and calcium on pod yield of short duration of summer groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *International Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 3(1):196-198.
- Singh, R. A., Singh, A., Singh, I. P. and Rai, R. 2015. Groundnut – wheat cropping system under different moisture management practices in hillocks

- watershed of Bundelkhand. *Journal of Research in Environment and Life Sciences*, 8(2): 337-340.
- Singh, R. A., Singh, J. Pal, S. B. and Singh, R. K. 2016. Integrated nutrient management in companion cropping of field pea (*Pisum sativum*) and Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea*) in riverine eco-system of U.P. *Research in Environment and Life Science*, 9(10):1171-1174.
- Singh, R. A., Verma, M. C., Singh, P. V., Jaiswal, V. B., Rai, R. and Yadav, A. 2019. Studies on suitability of groundnut genotypes in summer and rainy seasons for riverine tract of Uttar Pradesh. *International Journal of Current Research*, 11 (2):1000-1002.
- Singh, T. A. 1971. A laboratory manual for soil fertility and fertilizer. *U.P. Agril. Univ. Pantnagar* (Nainital) : 71-74.

How to cite this article:

Singh, R. A., Rajesh Rai, I. P. Singh, Amar Singh, and Singh, M. K. 2021. Revive Old Practices of Rainy Season Groundnut from Smart Agronomy of Summer Season Groundnut. *Int.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci*. 10(09): 613-617. doi: <https://doi.org/10.20546/ijemas.2021.1009.070>