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#### Abstract

An experiment was conducted to evaluate the economic viability of Asiatic lily cv. Tressor during rabi season of 2016-17 at College of Horticulture, Dr. Y.S.R. Horticultural University, Venkataramannagudem, West Godavari district, Andhra Pradesh. Among the different treatment combinations, combination of $\mathrm{S}_{3} \mathrm{~N}_{3}\left(30 \mathrm{~cm} \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}+200 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{ha}^{-1}\right)$ recorded maximum gross income and high net returns followed by $\mathrm{S}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{3}\left(25 \mathrm{~cm} \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}+200 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{ha}^{-1}\right)$ where as $\mathrm{S}_{1} \mathrm{~N}_{1}(15 \mathrm{~cm} \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}+100 \mathrm{~kg}$ $\mathrm{ha}^{-1}$ ) recorded low gross income and net returns from one hectare. High benefit cost ratio was recorded in the combination of $\mathrm{S}_{3} \mathrm{~N}_{3}\left(30 \mathrm{~cm} \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}+200 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{ha}^{-1}\right)$. The low benefit cost ratio was recorded in the combination of $\mathrm{S}_{1} \mathrm{~N}_{1}\left(15 \mathrm{~cm} \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}+100 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{ha}^{-1}\right)$.
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## Introduction

Lilium is one of the important bulbous flowers, belongs to liliaceae family and is commercially grown in India for cut flowers. Recently, this crop has become popular in many states of India. Lilies are wonderful ornamental plants with varied uses, grown in border, beds, pots and are excellent cut flowers of magnificent appearance $\&$ beautiful colors. In India, lilium is being commercially cultivated in different parts such as, The Nilgiris (Cooner, Kothagiri and Ooty) in an area of around 40 acres (1,60,000 sq.m), Kodaikanal, Shevroy Hills (Yercad), Kalvarayan Hills (Karumanthurai), Hosur, Himachal Pradesh i.e. under Shimla and Kullu condition, North Eastern States and Jammu and Kashmir etc.
The farmers are always interested in maximizing their profit and not merely production. Therefore, there is necessity to know the variation in the yield and economic returns in the available treatment combinations, relating with different environmental circumstances.

## Materials and Methods

The present investigation was conducted at College of Horticulture, Dr. Y.S.R Horticultural University, Venkataramannagudem during 2016-2017. Which is located at $16^{\circ} 63^{\prime} 120$ " N latitude and $81^{\circ} 27^{\prime} 568^{\prime \prime}$ E longitude and 34 m above MSL. It experiences hot humid summer and mild winters. The experimental soil was red sandy loam with good drainage and moderate water holding capacity with sand $70 \%$ of sand, silt $20 \%$ and clay $10 \%$. The soil pH is 6.32 and E.C. is $0.18 \mathrm{dS} \mathrm{m}^{-1}$. The experiment was conducted in a factorial randomized block design involving three levels of spacing i.e. $\mathrm{S}_{1}(15 \mathrm{~cm} \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}), \mathrm{S}_{2}(25 \mathrm{~cm} \times 15 \mathrm{~cm})$ and $\mathrm{S}_{3}(30 \mathrm{~cm} \mathrm{x}$ $15 \mathrm{~cm})$ and three levels of nitrogen viz. $\mathrm{N}_{1}\left(100 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{ha}^{-1}\right), \mathrm{N}_{2}\left(150 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{ha}^{-1}\right)$ and $\mathrm{N}_{3}\left(200 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{ha}^{-1}\right)$. Each of these factors were composed at three levels involving totally 9 treatment combinations.
Bulbs of Asiatic lily cv. Tressor with uniform size were used for the experiment. The net size of plot was 3.0 mx 0.6 m , accommodating 40,24 and 20 plants as per treatments. The field was brought to the fine tilth by ploughing and harrowing. Well decomposed farm yard manure at the rate of $100 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{ha}^{-1}$ was applied at the time of land preparation. The fertilizers viz., Urea, Single Super Phosphate and Muriate of Potash were taken as the sources of $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ and $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ respectively. Entire dose of phosphorus and potassium was given basally and half of the nitrogen at different graded levels are applied before planting and remaining dose of nitrogen applied as top dressing at 30 and 45 days after planting to the respective plots. Bulbs of Asiatic lily cv. Tressor were selected treatment wise and planted in the beds on $20^{\text {th }}$ October, 2016. The various observations on vegetative growth, floral, vase life and bulb parameters were
recorded on five plants randomly selected from net plot area and tagged. The data collected for all the characters studied were subjected to statistical analysis by adopting 'Analysis of Variance’ (ANOVA) technique for factorial randomized block design as suggested by Panse and Sukhatme (1967) ${ }^{[1]}$. The different treatment combination of Asiatic lily under study were judged on the basis of yield performance and to assess the effectiveness of each individual treatment, the relative economics of each treatment was worked out in terms of benefit cost ratio. The gross realization in terms of rupees per hectare was worked out on the basis of the yield of each treatment and the prevailing price of the produce in the market. The cost of cultivation of Asiatic lily was calculated considering the quantity inputs and input services utilized their and market prices. The total costs were deducted from the gross income to obtain net income.

## $\frac{\text { Gross returns (Rs. ha }{ }^{-1} \text { ) }}{\text { Total costs (Rs ha }{ }^{-1} \text { ) }}$

## Results and Discussion

The results obtained from the investigation are presented in
table 1 and 2. To workout gross returns, input-output ratio, net returns over various costs, it is necessary to workout cost of cultivation of Asiatic lily cv. Tressor under shade net condition (table 1). Among the different treatment combinations of Asiatic lily, combination of $\mathrm{S}_{3} \mathrm{~N}_{3}(30 \mathrm{~cm} \times 15$ $\mathrm{cm}+200 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{ha}{ }^{-1}$ ) recorded highest gross returns (Rs $1,48,82,045)$. The treatment combination of $\mathrm{S}_{1} \mathrm{~N}_{1}(15 \mathrm{~cm} x 15$ $\mathrm{cm}+100 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{ha}^{-1}$ ) recorded the lowest gross returns (Rs $78,32,000$ ) where as among the treatment combinations, $\mathrm{S}_{3} \mathrm{~N}_{3}$ ( $30 \mathrm{~cm} \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}+200 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{ha}^{-1}$ ) recorded highest net returns (Rs $1,21,86,583$ ) and $\mathrm{S}_{1} \mathrm{~N}_{1}\left(15 \mathrm{~cm} \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}+100 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{ha}^{-1}\right.$ ) recorded lowest net returns (Rs 27,98,337). The economic analysis resulted in higher B : C ratio for treatment combination of $\mathrm{S}_{3} \mathrm{~N}_{3}$ (5.52) followed by $\mathrm{S}_{3} \mathrm{~N}_{2}$ (4.66). The lower B: C ratio was obtained with $\mathrm{S}_{1} \mathrm{~N}_{1}$ (1.55). Similar findings reported by Patel et al. (2006) ${ }^{[2]}$ in tuberose.
The differences observed in the total cost of cultivation of Asiatic lily cv. Tressor under shade net condition per hectare for various combinations of spacing and nitrogen levels are presented in table 1.
Economic analysis of different treatment combinations of Asiatic lily cv. Tressor under shade net condition is presented in Table 2.

Table 1: Cost of cultivation of Asiatic lily cv. Tressor under shade net conditions among different treatment combinations (Figures indicate Rupees per ha)

| Particulars | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 15 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm} \\ +100 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} \\ \mathrm{ha}^{-1} \\ \left(\mathrm{~T}_{1}\right) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm} \\ +150 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} \\ \mathrm{ha}^{-1}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{2}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \times 15 \\ \mathrm{~cm}+200 \\ \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{ha} \\ \mathbf{1}_{\left(\mathrm{T}_{3}\right)} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 25 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm} \\ +100 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} \\ \mathrm{ha}^{-1}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{4}\right) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 25 \times 15 \\ \mathbf{c m}+150 \\ \mathbf{k g ~ N ~ h a} \\ \mathbf{1}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{5}\right) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm} \\ +200 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} \\ \mathrm{ha}^{-1} \\ \left(\mathrm{~T}_{6}\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline 30 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm} \\ +100 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} \\ \mathrm{ha}^{-1} \\ \left(\mathrm{~T}_{7}\right) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 30 \times 15 \\ \mathrm{~cm}+150 \\ \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{ha} \\ 1 \\ 1\left(\mathrm{~T}_{8}\right) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{3 0 \times 1 5 \mathrm { cm }} \\ +200 \mathrm{~kg} \\ \mathbf{N ~ h a}^{-1} \\ \left(\mathrm{~T}_{9}\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. Variable Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | A. LABOUR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Ploughing | 4000 | 4000 | 4000 | 4000 | 4000 | 4000 | 4000 | 4000 | 4000 |
| 2) Sterilization of soil | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 | 2000 |
| 3) Land and bed preparation | 60,000 | 60,000 | 60,000 | 60,000 | 60,000 | 60,000 | 60,000 | 60,000 | 60,000 |
| 4) Application of fertilizers | 7500 | 7500 | 7500 | 7500 | 7500 | 7500 | 7500 | 7500 | 7500 |
| 5) Planting | 6000 | 6000 | 6000 | 4500 | 4500 | 4500 | 4200 | 4200 | 4200 |
| 6) Staking | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 9000 | 9000 | 9000 | 8250 | 8250 | 8250 |
| 7) Irrigation (need based) | 8000 | 8000 | 8000 | 8000 | 8000 | 8000 | 8000 | 8000 | 8000 |
| 8) Weeding | 9000 | 9000 | 9000 | 9000 | 9000 | 9000 | 9000 | 9000 | 9000 |
| 9) Application of plant protection chemicals | 5000 | 5000 | 5000 | 5000 | 5000 | 5000 | 5000 | 5000 | 5000 |
| 10) Harvesting | 2500 | 2750 | 3000 | 3500 | 3750 | 4000 | 4000 | 4250 | 4500 |
| 11) Transportation and marketing | 2000 | 2250 | 2500 | 3000 | 3250 | 3500 | 3500 | 3750 | 4000 |
| 12) Miscellaneous | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 | 3000 |
| Sub Total | 1,24,000 | 1,24,500 | 1,25,000 | 1,18,500 | 1,19,000 | 1,19,500 | 1,18,450 | 1,18,950 | 1,19,450 |


| Particulars | $\mathbf{1 5 \times x 1 5}$ <br> $\mathbf{c m}+100$ <br> kg N ha <br> $\left(\mathrm{T}_{1}\right)$$\|$ | $\begin{gathered} 15 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm} \\ +150 \mathrm{~kg} \\ \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{ha}^{-1}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{2}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|} \hline 15 \times 15 \\ \mathrm{~cm}+200 \\ \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{ha} \\ \left(\mathrm{~T}_{3}\right) \end{array} \mathbf{t}^{-1}+$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 25 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm} \\ +100 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} \\ \mathrm{ha}^{-1}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{4}\right) \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm} \\ +150 \mathrm{~kg} \\ \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{ha}^{-1}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{5}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 25 \times 15 \\ \mathrm{~cm}+200 \\ \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{ha}^{-1} \\ \left(\mathrm{~T}_{6}\right) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} 30 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm} \\ +100 \mathrm{~kg} \\ \mathbf{N ~ h a -}{ }^{-1}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{7}\right) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} \mathbf{3 0 \times 1 5} \\ \mathrm{cm}+150 \\ \mathrm{~kg} \mathbf{N ~ h a} \\ (\mathrm{~T} 8) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm} \\ +200 \mathrm{~kg} \\ \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{ha}^{-1}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{9}\right) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B. INPUTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Cost of bulbs | 44,44,440 | 44,44,440 | 44,44,440 | 26,66,660 | 26,66,660 | 26,66,660 | 22,22,220 | 22,22,220 | 22,22,220 |
| 2) Staking | 3,33,333 | 3,33,333 | 3,33,333 | 2,44,444 | 2,44,444 | 2,44,444 | 2,22,222 | 2,22,222 | 2,22,222 |
| 3) Manure or compost | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| 4) Fertilizers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Urea @ ₹. 5.96 per kg | 1192 | 1788 | 2384 | 1192 | 1788 | 2384 | 1192 | 1788 | 2384 |
| b) Single super phosphate @ ₹. 6.96 per kg | 12,180 | 12,180 | 12,180 | 12,180 | 12,180 | 12,180 | 12,180 | 12,180 | 12,180 |
| c) Murate of potash @ ₹. 11.16 per kg | 3683 | 3683 | 3683 | 3683 | 3683 | 3683 | 3683 | 3683 | 3683 |
| d) Neem cake @ ₹. 13.36 per kg | 13,361 | 13,361 | 13,361 | 13,361 | 13,361 | 13,361 | 13,361 | 13,361 | 13,361 |
| e) Coco peat @ ₹. 35.76 per kg | 71,514 | 71,154 | 71,154 | 71,154 | 71,154 | 71,154 | 71,154 | 71,154 | 71,154 |
| 5) Plant protection chemicals | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 | 1000 |
| 6) Irrigation charges | 4000 | 4000 | 4000 | 4000 | 4000 | 4000 | 4000 | 4000 | 4000 |
| Sub total | 48,94,703 | 48,94,703 | 48,94,703 | 30,27,674 | 30,27,674 | 30,27,674 | 25,61,012 | 25,61,012 | 25,61,012 |
| Fixed Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Interest on fixed capital | 9000 | 9000 | 9000 | 9000 | 9000 | 9000 | 9000 | 9000 | 9000 |
| 2) Depreciation | 6000 | 6000 | 6000 | 6000 | 6000 | 6000 | 6000 | 6000 | 6000 |
| Sub Total | 15000 | 15000 | 15000 | 15000 | 15000 | 15000 | 15000 | 15000 | 15000 |
| Total cost ( $\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}$ ) | 50,33,703 | 50,34,203 | 50,34,703 | 31,61,174 | 31,61,674 | 31,62,174 | 26,94,462 | 26,94,962 | 26,95,462 |

Table 2: Benefit-cost ratio for cultivation of Asiatic lily cv. Tressor under shade net conditions affected by spacing, nitrogen levels and their interactions

| Treatment combinations | Flower yield (lakh number $h^{-1}$ ) | $\underset{\substack{\text { Bulb } \\ \text { yield }\left(k g \\ \mathbf{h a}^{-1}\right)}}{ }$ | Marketable surplus of Lilium flowers (lakh number $\mathrm{ha}^{-1}$ ) | Marketable surplus of Lilum bulbs (kg $h a^{-1}$ ) | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Gross returns } \\ \text { (returns from } \\ \text { flower + bulb) } \\ (\text { Lakh Rs ha } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Cost of cultivation (Lakh Rs ha ${ }^{-1}$ ) | Net <br> returns <br> (Lakh Rs <br> ha' $\left.^{-1}\right)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B:C } \\ & \text { ratio } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left.\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 15 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}+100 \mathrm{~kg} \\ \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{ha} \\ \hline 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \mathrm{~T}_{1}\right) \mathrm{C}$ | 2.25 | 4944 | 2.12 | 4647 | 78.32 | 50.33 | 27.98 | 1.55 |
| $\begin{gathered} 15 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}+150 \mathrm{~kg} \\ \mathrm{Nha}^{-1}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{2}\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2.50 | 6778 | 2.35 | 6371 | 98.96 | 50.34 | 49.13 | 1.96 |
| $\begin{gathered} 15 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}+200 \mathrm{~kg} \\ \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{ha} \\ \hline-1\left(\mathrm{~T}_{3}\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2.83 | 8667 | 2.66 | 8147 | 121.41 | 50.35 | 71.06 | 2.41 |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 25 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}+100 \mathrm{~kg} \\ \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{ha} \\ \left.\hline-\mathrm{T}_{4}\right) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 2.77 | 5333 | 2.61 | 5013 | 89.29 | 31.61 | 57.68 | 2.82 |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 25 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}+150 \mathrm{~kg} \\ \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{ha}^{-1}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{5}\right) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 3.25 | 7389 | 3.06 | 6946 | 115.41 | 31.62 | 83.78 | 3.65 |
| $\begin{gathered} 25 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}+200 \mathrm{~kg} \\ \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{ha} \\ \hline \mathrm{a}^{-1}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{6}\right) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 3.66 | 9278 | 3.44 | 8721 | 138.91 | 31.62 | 107.27 | 4.39 |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 30 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}+100 \mathrm{~kg} \\ \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{ha}^{-1}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{7}\right) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 3.12 | 6111 | 2.94 | 5744 | 101.56 | 26.94 | 74.62 | 3.76 |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 30 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}+150 \mathrm{~kg} \\ \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{ha}^{-1}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{8}\right) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 3.50 | 8111 | 3.29 | 7624 | 125.59 | 26.95 | 100.73 | 4.66 |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 30 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}+200 \mathrm{~kg} \\ \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{ha}^{-1}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{9}\right) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 3.92 | 9944 | 3.69 | 9347 | 148.82 | 26.95 | 121.86 | 5.52 |

Note: Labour wages @ Rs 200/- per day for men and Rs 150/- for women Market price of cut lilium flowering shoot/spike = Rs $15.0 /-$ Market price of lilium bulb $=$ Rs 1000/- per kg Gross returns $=$ Returns from Spikes + Returns from bulbs

## Conclusion

As the objective of any farmer is to realize maximum profits from the crop cultivated, the study indicated that farmers can choose their profitable treatment combination of spacing and nitrogen viz., $\mathrm{S}_{3} \mathrm{~N}_{3}$ as they had recorded highest gross returns, net returns and benefit - cost ratio among all treatment combination the studied.
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