International Journal of Chemical Studies

P-ISSN: 2349–8528 E-ISSN: 2321–4902 IJCS 2019; 7(6): 2543-2546 © 2019 IJCS Received: 25-09-2019 Accepted: 27-10-2019

Divya Sahare

Department of Agronomy, Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Krishak Nagar, Labhandi, N.H.-6, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India

GK Shrivastava

Department of Agronomy, Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Krishak Nagar, Labhandi, N.H.-6, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India

Sanjay K Dwivedi

Department of Agronomy, Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Krishak Nagar, Labhandi, N.H.-6, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India

Corresponding Author: Divya Sahare Department of Agronomy, Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Krishak Nagar, Labhandi, N.H.-6, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India

Growth and yield maximization of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum*) through basal and foliar application of major and micro nutrients

Divya Sahare, GK Shrivastava and Sanjay K Dwivedi

Abstract

A field experiment to study the effect of basal and foliar application of major and micro nutrients on chickpea was conducted during *rabi* 2013-14 and 2014-15 at the Instructional Cum Research Farm, Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur (C.G.). Results indicated that treatment T₉ (T₃+ Mo+ B+ DAP) registered significantly higher growth parameters viz. plant height (48.83, 49.20 and 49.02cm), number of primary branches plant⁻¹ (5.57, 6.07 and 5.82), number of secondary branches plant⁻¹ (28.67, 28.96 and 28.82) and dry matter accumulation (19.35, 19.42 and 19.38g); yield attributes like number of pods plant⁻¹ (53.86, 58.64 and 56.25), number of seeds pod⁻¹ (2.20, 2.31 and 2.26), seed weight (9.93, 10.26 and 10.09 g plant⁻¹) and seed yield (1546, 2088 and 1817 kg ha⁻¹) and stover yield (2058, 2421 and 2240 kg ha⁻¹) as compared to others treatments during 2013-14, 2014-15 and on mean basis, respectively. However, it was at par with treatments T₇ (T₃+ DAP), T₈ (T₃ + B+ DAP), T₁₅ (T₄+ B+ DAP) and T₁₆ (T₄+ Mo+ B+ DAP) during 2013-14, 2014-15 and on mean basis.

Keywords: Foliar application, DAP, boron, molybdenum, nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium

Introduction

Pulses are considered as an important part of food crop occupying a unique position in agriculture and also an important component of food grain crops because of their high nutritive value. India stands first in area and production of chickpea followed by Pakistan and Turkey. In India chickpea, is cultivated over an area of 8.96 m ha and with a production of 7.66 mt and an average productivity level of 1066 kg ha⁻¹ (Anonymous, 2012)^[2]. Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Maharashtra, Gujarat, Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka are the major chickpea producing states sharing over 95 per cent area. In Chhattisgarh, chickpea is grown in an area of 3.9 lakh ha with an annual production of 2.4 lakh t with an average productivity of 1100 kg ha⁻¹ (Anonymous, 2015)^[3]. Chickpea is mainly cultivated as a rainfed crop and water stress often affects both the productivity and the yield stability of the chickpea. Rainfed soils are generally degraded with poor native fertility (Valenciano et al., 2010) [21]. Nutrient imbalance is one of the major abiotic constraints limiting productivity of chickpea (Thiyagarajan et al., 2003) [19]. Balanced fertilization with major and micronutrients can enhance the chickpea production to a considerable extent. Micronutrients play an important role in increasing the yield of pulse and oilseed legumes through their effects on plant itself and on the nitrogen fixing symbiotic process. (Rahman et al, 2014)^[15]. It has been well established that most of the plant nutrients are absorbed through the leaves and absorption would be remarkably rapid and nearly complete. The present study was therefore, undertaken to know the effect of basal and foliar application of major and micro nutrient on growth and yield of chickpea.

Materials and methods

A field experiment was conducted at *rabi* season of 2013-14 and 2014-15 in Instructional Cum research farm, Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur (Chhattisgarh). The soil of experimental field was unbunded Clayey (Vertisols) deep black soil in texture locally known as *bharri "Kanhar"*. The soil was neutral in reaction, low in organic carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus and high in potash contents. The experiment was laid out in randomized block design and consisted of eighteen treatments *viz;* T₁ - Control, T₂ - 20:40:20 kg N: P₂O₅: K₂O ha^{-1,} T₃ - 20:40:20 kg N: P₂O₅: K₂O and S ha⁻¹, T₄ - 20:20:20 kg N P₂O₅, K₂O and S ha⁻¹,

 $T_5 - T_3 + Mo$ seed treatment@ 1g kg⁻¹ seed ($T_3 + Mo$), $T_6 - T_3$ + 0.2% Boron spray at flowering and 15 days after flowering (T₃ +B), T₇ - T₃ + 2% DAP spray twice 15 days interval at flowering (T₃+ DAP), T₈ - T₃ + 0.2% Boron spray at flowering and 15 days after flowering + 2% DAP spray twice 15 days interval at flowering ($T_3 + B + DAP$), $T_9 - T_3 + Mo$ seed treatment@ 1g kg-1 seed + 0.2% Boron Spray at flowering and 15 days after flowering + 2% DAP spray twice 15 days interval at flowering (T₃+Mo+B+DAP), T₁₀-T₃ + Mo seed treatment@ 1g kg-1 seed + 0.2% Boron spray at flowering and 15 days after flowering (T_3+Mo+B), T_{11} - T_3 + Mo seed treatment@ 1g kg⁻¹ seed + 2% DAP spray twice 15 days interval at flowering (T₃+Mo+DAP), T₁₂ - T₄ + Mo seed treatment @ 1g kg⁻¹ seed (T₄+Mo), T₁₃ - T₄ + 0.2% Boron spray at flowering and 15 days after flowering (T_4+B) , T_{14} - T_4 + 2% DAP spray twice 15 days interval at flowering (T₄+DAP), T₁₅ - T₄ + 0.2% Boron spray at flowering and 15 days after flowering + 2% DAP Spray twice 15 days interval at flowering (T_4 +B+DAP), T_{16} -T₄ + Mo seed treatment@ 1g kg⁻¹ seed + 0.2% Boron spray at flowering and 15 days after flowering + 2% DAP spray twice 15days interval at flowering (T₄+Mo+B+DAP), T₁₇ - T₄ + Mo seed treatment@ 1g kg⁻¹ seed + 0.2% Boron spray at flowering and 15 days after flowering (T_4 +Mo+B), and T_{18} - T_4 + Mo seed treatment@ 1g kg⁻¹ seed + 2% DAP Spray twice 15 days interval at flowering (T₄+Mo+DAP). Chickpea "JG-130" cultivar was taken as test crop. Seeds were treated first with fungicide i.e. with Bavistin @ 2.5g kg^{-1} of seeds, then with rhizobium @ 10g kg^{-1} of seed and PSB @ 10g kg-1 of seed. The seeds in which molybdenum seed treatment required, it treated separately with molybdenum @ 1g kg-1 seed after treating them with fungicide, rhizobium and PSB. Source of Molybdenum was ammonium molybdate and source of Boron was Borax (11%). The crop was harvested treatment wise at maturity and seed yield per hectare was computed.

Results and discussion Growth parameters

Growth parameters like plant height, number of primary branches, secondary branches and dry matter accumulation were significantly influenced by basal and foliar application of major and micro nutrients. The plant height (48.83, 49.20 and 49.02 cm), number of primary branches plant⁻¹ (5.57, 6.07 and 5.82), number of secondary branches plant⁻¹ (28.67, 28.96 and 28.82) and dry matter accumulation plant⁻¹ (19.35, 19.42) and 19.38 g) were significantly highest with treatment $T_9(T_3+$ Mo+ B+ DAP) as compared to others during 2013-14, 2014-15 and on mean basis, respectively. However, it was at par with treatments $T_7 (T_3 + DAP)$, $T_8 (T_3 + B + DAP)$, $T_{15} (T_4 + B$ + DAP) and T₁₆ (T₄+Mo+B+DAP) during 2013-14, 2014-15 and on mean basis (Table 1). The increase in the growth parameters of chickpea is due to the increase in vegetative growth of the crop. It might be due to application of Nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium and sulphur as it increases photosynthetic activity of plant and helps to develop a more extensive root system and thus enables the plant to extract more water and nutrient from soil depth, resulting in better development of plant growth. The results are in the conformity of findings Nawange et al. (2011)^[14] and Tomar et al. (2013)^[20] and Kokani et al. (2015)^[12]. Kassab (2005) ^[11] observed a significant effect of micronutrients in growth parameters including yield in mung bean plants by foliar application of zinc, manganese and iron under water stress. Such enhancement effect of foliar application might be attributed to the favorable influence of these nutrients on

metabolism and biological activity and its stimulating effect on photosynthetic pigments and enzymes activity which in turn encourage vegetative growth of plants (Michail *et al.*, 2004) ^[13]. Foliar mineral spray significantly affect biomass production of plants irrespective to their growth. The obtained results are in agreement with the findings of Asad *et al.* (2003) ^[4], Basole *et al.* (2003) ^[6], Kassab (2005) ^[11] and Thalooth *et al.* (2006) ^[18].

Yield attributes and yield

The yield attributes and yield of chickpea were significantly influenced by basal and foliar application of major and micro nutrients. The application of treatment $T_9(T_3 + M_0 + B + DAP)$ registered significantly higher number of pods plant⁻¹ (53.86, 58.64 and 56.25), number of seeds pod⁻¹ (2.20, 2.31 and 2.26), seed weight (9.93, 10.26 and 10.09 g plant⁻¹), seed yield (1546, 2088 and 1817 kg ha⁻¹) and stover yield (2058, 2421 and 2240 kg ha⁻¹) as compared to other treatments during 2013-14, 2014-15 and on mean basis, respectively (Table 2 and 3). However, it was at par to T_7 (T_3 + DAP) with seed yield of 1352, 1886 and 1619 kg ha⁻¹ and stover yield of 1885, 2154 and 2020 kg ha⁻¹; T_8 ($T_3 + B + DAP$) with seed yield of 1468, 1981 and 1725 kg ha⁻¹ and stover yield of 1946, 2348 and 2147 kg ha⁻¹; T_{15} (T_4 + B+ DAP) with seed yield of 1313, 1805 and 1559 kg ha⁻¹ and T_{16} (T₄+ Mo+ B+ DAP) with seed yield of 1391, 1943 and 1667 kg ha⁻¹ and stover yield of 1902, 2276 and 2089 kg ha⁻¹ during 2013-14, 2014-15 and on mean basis, respectively. As regards to 100 - seed weight and harvest index, it remained unaffected due to different treatments during both the years and on mean basis. It might be due to the combined application of nutrients through basal and foliar application. Nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium application influenced plant growth and yield attributes of chickpea, which were higher with higher dose of nutrients. Macronutrient nutrition is known to improve yield in chickpea (Devi and Singh, 2005)^[8]. Mineral nitrogen increase water use efficiency in chickpea (Bahavar et al., 2009)^[5] and therefore, apart from supplying nutrition it could benefit the crop indirectly also. Sulphur besides improving vegetative growth it activates certain photolytic enzymes and coenzymes (Bixby and Beaton, 1970)^[7]. Thus, these bioactivities of sulphur might have played important role in improving yield attributing characters and total yield of chickpea. Chickpea responded significantly due to application of boron and seed treatment with molybdenum in both the years. Increase in grain yield of chickpea with the application of various nutrients could be due to improvement in plant growth and yield attributes such as pods plant⁻¹, seeds pod⁻¹ and seed plant⁻¹. Foliar application of boron enhances flowering which in turn increases number of pods and its deficiency causes flower drop and subsequently, poor podding of chickpeas which results in poor yield of the crop results are in the findings of Srivastava et al. (1997)^[17] and (Ganie et al 2014)^[9]. Similarly in Mo-deficient chickpea, the flowers produced are less in number, smaller in size and many of them fail to open or to mature, consequently this leads to lower seed yield (Ahlawat et al., 2007)^[1]. Micronutrient application through seed treatments improves the stand establishment, advances phenological events, and increases yield and micronutrient grain contents in most cases. Also, it is an easy and cost effective method of micronutrient application (Farooq et al., 2012) [10]. Therefore in Modeficient chickpea, the flowers produced are less in number, smaller in size and many of them fail to open or to mature, consequently this leads to lower seed yield (Ahlawat et al.,

assimilate to reproductive parts resulting in higher yield (Sarkar and Malik, 2001)^[16].

Table 1: Growth parameters of chickpea at harvest as influenced by basal and foliar application of major and micro nutrients

| | Plant height (cm) | | | Primary branches | | | Secondary branches | | | Dry matter accumulation (g plant ¹) | | | |
|----------------------------------------|-------------------|---------|-------|------------------|------------------------|------|--------------------|------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------|-------|--|
| Treatment | | | | (N | o. plant ⁻¹ |) | (N | o. plant ⁻ⁱ | ¹) | Dry matter accumulation (g plant) | | | |
| | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | Mean | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | Mean | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | Mean | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | Mean | |
| T ₁ - Control | 38.33 | 37.53 | 37.93 | 4.21 | 4.27 | 4.24 | 19.13 | 20.97 | 20.05 | 13.93 | 14.27 | 14.10 | |
| T ₂ -20:40:20 | 39.37 | 40.87 | 40.12 | 4.29 | 4.40 | 4.35 | 19.77 | 21.61 | 20.69 | 15.06 | 16.10 | 15.58 | |
| T ₃ - 20:40:20:20 | 44.03 | 44.19 | 44.11 | 4.68 | 5.23 | 4.96 | 20.83 | 24.02 | 22.43 | 16.02 | 17.23 | 16.62 | |
| T ₄ - 20:20:20:20 | 40.40 | 41.37 | 40.88 | 4.31 | 4.63 | 4.47 | 20.00 | 22.16 | 21.08 | 15.18 | 16.21 | 15.70 | |
| T5- T3 + Mo | 43.07 | 42.30 | 42.68 | 4.50 | 5.10 | 4.80 | 20.31 | 22.85 | 21.58 | 15.58 | 16.81 | 16.19 | |
| $T_{6}-T_{3}+B$ | 44.83 | 45.33 | 45.08 | 4.81 | 5.30 | 5.05 | 22.43 | 25.80 | 24.12 | 16.86 | 17.88 | 17.37 | |
| T ₇ - T ₃ + DAP | 46.67 | 47.67 | 47.17 | 5.00 | 5.57 | 5.29 | 26.73 | 27.95 | 27.34 | 18.19 | 18.43 | 18.31 | |
| $T_8 - T_3 + B + DAP$ | 48.03 | 48.90 | 48.47 | 5.40 | 5.67 | 5.54 | 27.83 | 28.64 | 28.24 | 18.92 | 19.05 | 18.98 | |
| T_{9} - T_{3} + Mo + B + DAP | 48.83 | 49.20 | 49.02 | 5.57 | 6.07 | 5.82 | 28.67 | 28.96 | 28.62 | 19.35 | 19.42 | 19.38 | |
| T_{10} - T_3 + Mo + B | 46.00 | 47.00 | 46.50 | 4.82 | 5.33 | 5.08 | 23.97 | 25.93 | 24.95 | 17.11 | 18.08 | 17.59 | |
| T_{11} - T_3 + Mo + DAP | 46.17 | 46.27 | 46.22 | 4.85 | 5.43 | 5.14 | 24.80 | 26.61 | 25.71 | 17.45 | 18.13 | 17.79 | |
| T_{12} - T_4 + Mo | 40.90 | 42.14 | 41.52 | 4.38 | 4.77 | 4.57 | 20.13 | 22.31 | 21.22 | 15.21 | 16.31 | 15.76 | |
| $T_{13}-T_4+B$ | 42.03 | 43.20 | 42.62 | 4.39 | 5.03 | 4.71 | 20.20 | 22.50 | 21.35 | 15.34 | 16.79 | 16.06 | |
| T_{14} - T_4 + DAP | 44.03 | 45.13 | 44.58 | 4.73 | 5.13 | 4.93 | 21.07 | 26.09 | 23.58 | 16.24 | 17.71 | 16.98 | |
| T_{15} - T_4 + B + DAP | 46.67 | 47.07 | 46.87 | 4.89 | 5.53 | 5.21 | 25.67 | 27.53 | 26.60 | 17.96 | 18.26 | 18.03 | |
| $T_{16}\text{-} T_4 + Mo + B + DAP$ | 46.83 | 47.77 | 47.30 | 5.24 | 5.60 | 5.42 | 26.73 | 27.96 | 27.35 | 18.49 | 18.53 | 18.51 | |
| $T_{17} - T_4 + Mo + B$ | 43.10 | 43.43 | 43.27 | 4.65 | 5.13 | 4.89 | 20.30 | 22.99 | 21.65 | 15.70 | 17.08 | 16.39 | |
| T_{18} - T_4 + Mo + DAP | 43.93 | 44.13 | 44.03 | 4.66 | 5.17 | 4.91 | 20.37 | 23.49 | 21.93 | 15.78 | 17.21 | 16.50 | |
| SEm± | 2.01 | 2.35 | 1.46 | 0.27 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 1.44 | 1.30 | 1.29 | 0.95 | 0.85 | 0.87 | |
| CD (P=0.05) | 5.78 | 6.77 | 4.21 | 0.78 | 0.73 | 0.75 | 4.15 | 3.73 | 3.70 | 2.74 | 2.44 | 2.50 | |

Table 2: Yield attributes of chickpea as influenced by basal and foliar application of major and micro nutrients

| Treatment | No. of Pods plant ⁻¹ | | | No. of Seeds No. pod ⁻¹ | | | Seed weight (g plant ⁻¹) | | | 100 -seed weight (g) | | |
|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------|-------|------------------------------------|---------|------|--------------------------------------|---------|-------|----------------------|---------|-------|
| Ireatment | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | Mean | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | Mean | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | Mean | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | Mean |
| T ₁ - Control | 28.75 | 32.04 | 30.40 | 1.07 | 1.17 | 1.12 | 4.15 | 5.11 | 4.63 | 11.95 | 12.07 | 12.01 |
| T ₂ -20:40:20 | 30.04 | 32.07 | 31.06 | 1.26 | 1.26 | 1.26 | 5.18 | 5.32 | 5.25 | 13.08 | 13.13 | 13.10 |
| T ₃ - 20:40:20:20 | 38.05 | 39.15 | 38.60 | 1.77 | 1.94 | 1.85 | 6.33 | 7.47 | 6.90 | 13.64 | 14.05 | 13.84 |
| T ₄ - 20:20:20:20 | 30.91 | 34.34 | 32.62 | 1.35 | 1.40 | 1.38 | 5.19 | 5.40 | 5.30 | 13.18 | 13.16 | 13.17 |
| $T_{5}-T_{3}+M_{0}$ | 33.22 | 35.49 | 34.35 | 1.67 | 1.63 | 1.65 | 5.72 | 6.41 | 6.06 | 13.37 | 13.48 | 13.43 |
| $T_{6}-T_{3}+B$ | 41.21 | 42.59 | 41.90 | 1.79 | 2.01 | 1.90 | 8.05 | 8.39 | 8.22 | 13.79 | 14.13 | 13.96 |
| T_{7} - T_{3} + DAP | 50.50 | 51.63 | 51.06 | 1.95 | 2.24 | 2.10 | 8.35 | 9.75 | 9.05 | 14.31 | 14.30 | 14.31 |
| T_{8} - T_{3} + B + DAP | 52.84 | 55.13 | 53.98 | 2.12 | 2.26 | 2.19 | 8.87 | 9.97 | 9.42 | 14.42 | 14.93 | 14.68 |
| T_{9} - T_{3} + Mo + B + DAP | 53.86 | 58.64 | 56.25 | 2.20 | 2.31 | 2.26 | 9.93 | 10.26 | 10.09 | 14.45 | 15.07 | 14.76 |
| $T_{10} - T_3 + Mo + B$ | 43.46 | 45.12 | 44.29 | 1.83 | 2.01 | 1.92 | 8.21 | 9.12 | 8.66 | 13.88 | 14.19 | 14.04 |
| T_{11} - T_3 + Mo + DAP | 47.39 | 49.08 | 48.23 | 1.85 | 2.02 | 1.93 | 8.24 | 9.20 | 8.72 | 13.93 | 14.24 | 14.08 |
| $T_{12} - T_4 + Mo$ | 31.71 | 34.86 | 33.28 | 1.39 | 1.48 | 1.43 | 5.25 | 5.51 | 5.38 | 13.29 | 13.47 | 13.38 |
| $T_{13}-T_4+B$ | 32.16 | 34.87 | 33.51 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 5.26 | 5.53 | 5.39 | 13.30 | 13.14 | 13.22 |
| T_{14} - T_4 + DAP | 40.04 | 41.51 | 40.78 | 1.78 | 2.01 | 1.89 | 7.69 | 8.10 | 7.90 | 13.59 | 14.06 | 13.83 |
| $T_{15}-T_4+B+DAP$ | 48.67 | 50.25 | 49.46 | 1.90 | 2.23 | 2.06 | 8.26 | 9.68 | 8.97 | 14.11 | 14.24 | 14.18 |
| $T_{16}-T_4 + Mo + B + DAP$ | 52.25 | 54.90 | 53.58 | 1.95 | 2.26 | 2.10 | 8.46 | 9.79 | 9.13 | 14.36 | 14.52 | 14.44 |
| $T_{17} - T_4 + M_0 + B$ | 33.57 | 35.99 | 34.78 | 1.73 | 1.74 | 1.73 | 6.00 | 6.48 | 6.24 | 13.43 | 13.62 | 13.52 |
| T_{18} - T_4 + Mo + DAP | 34.84 | 36.79 | 35.81 | 1.74 | 1.77 | 1.76 | 6.75 | 7.06 | 6.91 | 13.42 | 13.80 | 13.61 |
| SEm± | 1.98 | 2.62 | 2.40 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.06 | 0.51 | 0.48 | 0.43 | 0.60 | 0.70 | 0.52 |
| CD (P=0.05) | 5.69 | 7.54 | 6.90 | 0.26 | 0.26 | 0.17 | 1.47 | 1.39 | 1.24 | NS | NS | NS |

 Table 3: Seed and stover yield (kg ha⁻¹) and harvest index (%) at harvest of Chickpea at influenced by basal and foliar application of major and micro nutrients

| Turation | S | eed yield (| kgha ⁻¹) | Stove | r yield (kg | gha ⁻¹) | Harvest index (| | |
|----------------------------------------|---------|-------------|----------------------|---------|-------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------|-------|
| Ireatment | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | Mean | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | Mean | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | Mean |
| T ₁ - Control | 780 | 901 | 840 | 1193 | 1136 | 1164 | 39.80 | 44.24 | 42.02 |
| T ₂ -20:40:20 | 1171 | 1498 | 1335 | 1371 | 1647 | 1509 | 46.23 | 47.57 | 46.90 |
| T ₃ - 20:40:20:20 | 1221 | 1699 | 1460 | 1555 | 1866 | 1710 | 44.11 | 47.85 | 45.98 |
| T ₄ - 20:20:20:20 | 1145 | 1593 | 1369 | 1378 | 1745 | 1562 | 45.44 | 47.59 | 46.51 |
| $T_{5}-T_{3}+Mo$ | 1203 | 1658 | 1430 | 1456 | 1814 | 1635 | 45.12 | 47.70 | 46.41 |
| T6- T3 + B | 1265 | 1737 | 1501 | 1698 | 1950 | 1824 | 42.85 | 47.77 | 45.31 |
| $T_7 - T_3 + DAP$ | 1352 | 1886 | 1619 | 1885 | 2154 | 2020 | 41.45 | 46.68 | 44.06 |
| T_{8} - T_{3} + B + DAP | 1468 | 1981 | 1725 | 1946 | 2348 | 2147 | 42.94 | 45.61 | 44.28 |
| T_{9} - T_{3} + Mo + B + DAP | 1546 | 2088 | 1817 | 2058 | 2421 | 2240 | 43.26 | 46.26 | 44.76 |
| $T_{10} - T_3 + M_0 + B$ | 1292 | 1753 | 1523 | 1725 | 2045 | 1885 | 43.07 | 46.12 | 44.60 |
| $T_{11} - T_3 + M_0 + DAP$ | 1284 | 1764 | 1524 | 1718 | 2064 | 1891 | 42.85 | 46.08 | 44.46 |

| $T_{12} - T_4 + Mo$ | 1167 | 1629 | 1398 | 1401 | 1771 | 1586 | 45.57 | 47.74 | 46.66 |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|-------|
| $T_{13}-T_4+B$ | 1181 | 1635 | 1408 | 1428 | 1790 | 1609 | 45.29 | 47.81 | 46.55 |
| T_{14} - T_4 + DAP | 1262 | 1700 | 1481 | 1562 | 1927 | 1745 | 44.69 | 46.75 | 45.72 |
| T_{15} - T_4 + B + DAP | 1313 | 1805 | 1559 | 1746 | 2071 | 1909 | 42.97 | 46.50 | 44.74 |
| T_{16} - T_4 + Mo + B + DAP | 1391 | 1943 | 1667 | 1902 | 2276 | 2089 | 42.18 | 46.11 | 44.14 |
| $T_{17} - T_4 + M_0 + B$ | 1211 | 1660 | 1436 | 1479 | 1826 | 1653 | 45.02 | 47.54 | 46.28 |
| T_{18} - T_4 + Mo + DAP | 1233 | 1668 | 1451 | 1500 | 1858 | 1679 | 45.25 | 47.34 | 46.29 |
| SEm± | 81.11 | 100.81 | 93.65 | 102.02 | 112.57 | 81.89 | 2.09 | 1.97 | 1.53 |
| CD (P=0.05) | 233.27 | 289.93 | 269.34 | 293.42 | 323.77 | 235.53 | NS | NS | NS |

References

- Ahlawat IPS, Gangaiah B, Zadid MA. Nutrient management in chickpea. In: Chickpea breeding and management (Yadav S.S., Redden R., Chen W., Sharma B., eds). CAB International, Wallingford, Oxon, United Kingdom, 2007, 213-232.
- 2. Anonymous. Directorate of Economics, Ministry of Agriculture, 2012.
- 3. Anonymous. Directorate of Agriculture, Chhattisgarh Govt., 2015.
- 4. Asad A, Blamey FPC, Edwards DG. Effects of boron foliar applications on vegetative and reproductive growth of sunflower. Annals of Bot. 2003; 92:565-570.
- Bahavar N, Ebadi A, Tobeh A, Jamaati SH, Somarian E. Effects of mineral nitrogen on water use efficiency of chickpea under water deficit condition Res. J Environ. Sci. 2009; 3(3):332-338.
- 6. Basole VD, Deotale RD, Ilmulwar SR, Raut SS, Kadwe SB. Effect of hormone and nutrients on morphophysiological characters and yield of soybean. J Soils and Crops. 2003; 13:135-139.
- Bixby DW, Beaton JD. Sulphur containing fertilizers properties and application. Technical Bulletin No. 17. The sulphur Institute, Washington, 1970, 3.
- 8. Devi U, Singh KP. Integrated nutrient management in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). Haryana J Agron. 2005; 21:74-74.
- Ganie Mumtaz A, Akhter Farida, Bhat MA, Najar GR. Growth, yield and quality of french bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) as influenced by sulphur and boron application on inceptisols of Kashmir. The Bioscan. 2014; 9(2):513-518.
- 10. Farooq M, Wahid A, Siddique KHM. Micronutrient application through seed treatments-a review. J Soil Sci. Plant Nutr. 2012; 12(1):125-142.
- Kassab OM. Soil moisture stress and micronutrients foliar application effects on the growth and yield of mungbean plants. J Agric. Sci. Mansoura University. 2005; 30:247-256.
- 12. Kokani JM, Shah KA, Tandel BM, Bhimani GJ. Effect of Fym, phosphorus and sulphur on yield of summer Blackgram and post harvest nutrient status of soil. The Bioscan. 2015; 10(1):379-383.
- 13. Michail T, Walter T, Astrid W, Walter G, Dieter G, Maria SJ *et al.* A survey of foliar mineral nutrient concentrations of *Pinus canariensis* at field plots in Tenerife. Forest Ecology and management. 2004; 189:49-55.
- Nawange DD, Yadav AS, Singh RV. Effect of phosphorus and Sulphur application on growth, yield attributes and yield of chickpea. Legume Res. 2011; 34(1):4850.
- Rahman MS, Islam MN, Shaheb MR, Arafat MA, Sarker PC, Sarker MH. Effect of seed treatment with boron and molybdenum on the yield and seed quality of chickpea. Int. J Expt. Agric. 2014; 4(3):1-6.

- Sarkar RK, Malik GC. Effect of foliar spray of potassium nitrate and calcium nitrate on grasspea (*Lathyrus sativus* L.) grown in rice fallows. Lathyrus Lathyrism Newsletter, 2001, 2.
- Srivastava SP, Yadav CR, Rego TJ, Johansen C, Saxena NP. Diagnosis and alleviation of boron deficiency causing flower and pod abortion in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) in Nepal. In: Boron in soils and plants. Developments in Plant and Soil Sciences 76 (Bell R.W., Rerkasem B., eds). Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 1997, 95-99.
- Thalooth AT, Tawfik MM, Magda MH. A comparative study on the effect of foliar application of Zinc, Potassium and magnesium on growth, yield and some chemical constituents of mungbean plants grown under water stress conditions. World J Agric Sci. 2006; 2:37-46.
- Thiyagarajan TM, Backiyavathy MR, Savithri P. Nutrient management for pulses – A review. Agric. Rev. 2003; 24(1):40-48.
- Tomar TS, Kumar S, Tomar S. Effects of plant density, nitrogen and phosphorus on blackgram (*Vigna mungo* L. hepper). Annals Agril. Res. (New Series). 2013; 34(4):374-379.
- Valenciano JB, Boto JA, Marcelo V. Response of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) yield to zinc, boron and molybdenum application under pot conditions. Spanish J Agril. Res. 2010; 8(3):797-807.
- 22. Wang Q, Lu L, Wu X, Li Y, Lin J. Boron influences pollen germination and pollen tube growth in *Picea meyeri*. Tree Physiol. 2003; 23:345-351.