



P-ISSN: 2349-8528  
 E-ISSN: 2321-4902  
 IJCS 2018; 6(2): 42-46  
 © 2018 IJCS  
 Received: 28-01-2018  
 Accepted: 28-02-2018

**PN Magare**  
 Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola, Maharashtra, India

**RN Katkar**  
 Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola, Maharashtra, India

**SD Jadhao**  
 Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola, Maharashtra, India

## Effect of fertigation on yield, quality and soil fertility status under cotton grown in Vertisol

**PN Magare, RN Katkar and SD Jadhao**

### Abstract

The experiment was conducted to study the effect of fertigation on yield, quality and soil nutrient status under cotton grown in Vertisol at Akola during kharif season of 2009-10 to 2011-12. The experiment consists of various levels of fertilizers through drip fertigation along with Zn laid out in randomized block design with three replications. The results of the present experiment revealed that, the maximum values of nutrient uptake, fibre quality parameters, economics and highest seed cotton ( $18.19 \text{ q ha}^{-1}$ ) and stalk ( $41.89 \text{ q ha}^{-1}$ ) yield was recorded with 100% RD ( $100:50:50 \text{ kg N:P}_2\text{O}_5:\text{K}_2\text{O ha}^{-1}$ ) along with combined application of Zn ( $4 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) + Fe ( $5 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) through drip from water soluble fertilizers (WSF). The higher values of N, P, K Zn and Fe was recorded with 100 % recommended dose of fertilizer alongwith combined application of Zn ( $4 \text{ kg Zn ha}^{-1}$ ) + Fe ( $5 \text{ kg Fe ha}^{-1}$ ) through soil application from conventional fertilizer (Urea,DAP, MOP). Application of 75% RD + ( $3 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) + Fe ( $3.75 \text{ kg Fe ha}^{-1}$ ) through drip (WSF) recorded higher Gross monetary returns (Rs.  $74914 \text{ ha}^{-1}$ ), net monetary returns (Rs.  $34447 \text{ ha}^{-1}$ ) and B:C ratio (1.85). The performance of treatment 75% RD + Zn ( $3 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) + Fe ( $3.75 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ )through drip from water soluble fertilizers was found at par with the treatment giving the highest yield showing its importance in saving of 25% N, P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, K<sub>2</sub>O, Zn and Fe through drip from water soluble fertilizers.

**Keywords:** cotton, fertigation, nutrient uptake, nutrient status, fibre quality, yield, economics

### Introduction

In India, area under cotton cultivation is 11.06 million ha while area of the World is 30.44 million ha. The productivity of cotton in India is low ( $503 \text{ kg lint ha}^{-1}$ ) as compared to World average productivity ( $742 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ). Maharashtra ranks first in acreage (39.73 lakh ha) with the production of 67.60 lakh bales while the productivity is very low ( $329 \text{ kg lint ha}^{-1}$ ) as compared to national average. In Vidarbha, area under cotton is 15.27 lakh hectares with productivity of  $325 \text{ kg lint ha}^{-1}$  (Anonymous, 2011)<sup>[1]</sup>. Maharashtra has large scope to increase its production. The cultural practices along with balanced use of fertilizer and optimum use of irrigation water helps to increase productivity of cotton. As water and fertilizers are limited and costly inputs in agriculture, its proper utilization is very essential. Fertigation found most important in this case.

Fertigation implies application of water soluble fertilizers along with irrigation water near the root zone as per need of crop, which results into better utilization of fertilizers along with higher yields of better quality of cotton. The experimental evidences have clearly demonstrated that the system economizes the use of fertilizer and water ranging from 40 to 60 per cent (Nanda, 2010)<sup>[11]</sup>. Hence, the experiment was conducted to work out effect of nutrient application through drip irrigation on seed cotton yield, uptake of nutrients, fiber quality and economics of cotton.

### Materials and Methods

The field experiment was conducted on very fine, smectitic, hyperthermic family of Typic Haplustert at Research Farm, Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola during kharif season of 2009-10 to 2011-12. The soil of experimental site was moderately alkaline in reaction (pH - 8.12), free from soluble salts (EC-  $0.29 \text{ dS m}^{-1}$ ), medium in organic carbon content ( $4.19 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$ ), available nitrogen was low ( $189.30 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ), medium in available P ( $15.88 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ), high in available K ( $338.32 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ), deficient in available Zn ( $0.53 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$ ) and medium in available iron ( $4.84 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$ ). The seeds were sown dry and irrigation was given through drip. The irrigations were given as per need of the crop.

**Correspondence**  
**PN Magare**  
 Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola, Maharashtra, India

The fertilizers were applied through drip irrigation as per the treatments.

The treatments comprised of T<sub>1</sub>-100% RD through drip from water soluble fertilizer (WSF), T<sub>2</sub> -75% RD through drip (WSF), T<sub>3</sub>-100% RD soil application (Urea, DAP, MOP), T<sub>4</sub>-100% RD + Zn (4 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) + Fe(5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>)through drip ZnSO<sub>4</sub>, FeSO<sub>4</sub> (WSF), T<sub>5</sub>-75% RD + Zn (3 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) + Fe (3.75 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) through drip ZnSO<sub>4</sub>, FeSO<sub>4</sub> (WSF), T<sub>6</sub>-100% RD + Zn (4 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) + Fe (5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) soil application (Urea, DAP, MOP) and T<sub>7</sub> - 75% RD through drip (Urea, Phosphoric acid, MOP). The land was ploughed once followed by three harrowing and it was brought to fine tilth and experiment was laid into 20 x 3 m<sup>2</sup> plot size in paired row plots. Cotton hirsutum hybrid (PKV Hy-5) was dibbled at 90 cm x 60 cm. The seed was treated with imidachloprid and then sown by dibbling at 5 cm depth and covered with soil. The recommended dose of 100:50:50 N, P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> and K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> was given as per treatments. Nitrogen and potassium was applied in five splits (20% in each split) at sowing, 35 DAS, 55 DAS, 75 DAS and 95DAS. Phosphorus was applied in four splits (25% in each split) at sowing, 35 DAS, 55 DAS and 75 DAS. Twenty five per cent each of zinc and iron was applied at sowing, 35 DAS, 55 DAS and 15 per cent of zinc and iron applied at 75 DAS and remaining 10 per cent at 95 DAS. The yield of cotton was recorded in five pickings.

The plot wise soil samples (0-20 cm) were collected after harvest of cotton. These samples were analyzed for pH (1:2.5 soil: water suspension), electrical conductivity by conductivity meter (Jackson, 1967) [4], organic carbon by rapid titration method (Walkley and Black, 1936) [23], available N by alkaline permanganate method (Subbiah and Asija, 1956) [19], available P by Olsen's method (Olsen *et al.* 1954) [12], available K by ammonium acetate extraction method (Jackson, 1967) [4] and available micronutrients *viz.*, Zn, Fe by extracting soil with 0.005 M DTPA (Lindsay and Norvell, 1978) [7]. The plant samples were analyzed at harvest stage for N, P, K and micronutrients by acid digestion technique (Piper 1966 [14] and Isaac and Kerber, 1971) [3]. The ginning percentage was determined and the fiber quality parameter *viz.*, 2.5 per cent span length, uniformity ratio, fineness micronaire, bundle strength tenacity were evaluated at Ginning Training Centre, Central Institute for Research on Cotton Technology, Regional Quality Evaluation Unit, Nagpur. Fertilizer use efficiency was calculated by using the formula given by (Mohanty and Singh, 2002) [10].

## Results and Discussion

### Seed cotton yield

The pooled results indicated that the seed cotton yield was recorded significantly highest (18.19 q ha<sup>-1</sup>) under 100% recommended dose + Zn (4 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) + Fe (5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) through drip from water soluble fertilizer (18.19 q ha<sup>-1</sup>) (T<sub>4</sub>), which was at par with T<sub>5</sub>, 75 % recommended dose + Zn(3 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) + Fe (3.75 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) fertilizer through drip irrigation (16.99 q ha<sup>-1</sup>) and T<sub>1</sub> 100%recommended dose of fertilizer through drip from water soluble fertilizer (16.68 q ha<sup>-1</sup>) (Table 1).

The treatment T<sub>4</sub> showed 7 and 9 % increase in yield over T<sub>5</sub> and T<sub>1</sub> treatments, respectively. Similarly, T<sub>4</sub> showed 13% increase in yield over 100% RD + Zn (4 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) + Fe (5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) through soil application (T<sub>6</sub>). The treatment T<sub>4</sub>, T<sub>5</sub> and T<sub>1</sub> were higher in yield over soil application of fertilizers. It is indicated that fertigation through water soluble fertilizers can increase seed cotton yield and save the fertilizers. These results are in conformity with Raskar *et al.* (2001) [17], Patil *et al.* (2009) [13], Veeraputhiran and Chinnusamy (2009) [21] and

Wadatkar *et al.* (2001) [22]. As regards cotton stalk yield almost more or less similar trend was noticed as that of seed cotton yield.

### Uptake of Nutrients

The data regarding uptake of N, P, K, Zn and Fe are presented in Table 2. The pooled results revealed that, treatment (T<sub>4</sub>) of 100% RD + Zn (4 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) + Fe (5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) through drip from water soluble fertilizers showed significantly higher total N (100.4 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), P (27.94 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), K (106.65 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), Zn (347.8 g ha<sup>-1</sup>) and Fe (1620.5 g ha<sup>-1</sup>) over all the treatment except T<sub>5</sub> which was at par in case of P uptake by cotton. The similar results were also reported by Bharambe *et al.* (1997) [2], Rao and Janawade (2009) [15].

### Soil Properties

The soil pH, electrical conductivity and organic carbon (Table 3) were not influenced significantly due to various treatments. The findings are line with the results reported by Singh *et al.* (1980) [18] and Halemani *et al.* (2004) [5].

### Soil fertility status

The available N (Table 4) in soil was recorded significantly highest in the treatment of soil application of 100 % recommended dose of fertilizer + Zn (4 kg Zn ha<sup>-1</sup>) + Fe (5 kg Fe ha<sup>-1</sup>) from conventional fertilizer (T<sub>6</sub>) followed by 100 % recommended dose of fertilizer through drip + Zn (4 kg Zn ha<sup>-1</sup>) + Fe (5 kg Fe ha<sup>-1</sup>) from water soluble fertilizer (T<sub>4</sub>) and at par with 100 % recommended dose of fertilizer through soil (T<sub>3</sub>) and application of 75 % recommended dose of fertilizer + Zn (3 kg Zn ha<sup>-1</sup>) + Fe (3.75 kg Fe ha<sup>-1</sup>) (T<sub>5</sub>) through drip in the form of water soluble fertilizer. The treatment of 75 % recommended dose of fertilizer through drip from conventional fertilizer (T<sub>7</sub>) recorded less available nitrogen due to low nutrient use efficiency of conventional fertilizers through drip system. Similar trend was noticed in case of available P and K. The higher availability of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium after harvest of cotton might be attributed to the less uptake by the cotton crop during growth and development due to their less availability. These results are inconformity with Mathur *et al.* (1997) [8], Katkar *et al.* (2007) [6] and Rao and Janawade (2009a) [16].

The available zinc & iron (Table 5)in soil was recorded highest in the treatment of soil application of 100 % recommended dose of fertilizer + Zn (4 kg Zn ha<sup>-1</sup>) + Fe (5 kg Fe ha<sup>-1</sup>) through conventional fertilizer (T<sub>6</sub>) followed by 100 % recommended dose of fertilizer through drip + Zn (4 kg Zn ha<sup>-1</sup>) + Fe (5 kg Fe ha<sup>-1</sup>) from water soluble fertilizer (T<sub>4</sub>) and application of 75 % recommended dose of fertilizer + Zn (3 kg Zn ha<sup>-1</sup>) + Fe (3.75 kg Fe ha<sup>-1</sup>) (T<sub>5</sub>) through drip using water soluble fertilizer. These results are inconformity with Mathur *et al.* (1997) [8], Katkar *et al.* (2007) [6] and Rao and Janawade (2009a) [16].

### Fiber quality

The fibre quality parameters *viz.*, 2.5 per cent span length, uniformity ratio, fineness micronaire was found non significant due to different treatments (Table 6). However, the bundle strength tenacity at 3.2 mm gauge was significantly higher (23.03 g tex<sup>-1</sup>) due to application of 100% RD+ Zn (4 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) + Fe (5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) through drip from water soluble fertilizers treatment T<sub>4</sub> which was on par with T<sub>5</sub> and T<sub>6</sub> treatments. Bharambe *et al.* (1997) [2], Raskar *et al.* (2001) [17], Suresh and Chellamuthu (2004) [20], Mehta *et al.* (2009) [9] and Patil *et al.* (2009) [13] also reported slight improvement in fibre quality of cotton in fertigation.

**Economics**

The data presented in Table 7 clearly indicate that application of 75% RD + (3 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) + Fe (3.75 kg Fe ha<sup>-1</sup>) through drip (WSF) recorded higher Gross monetary returns (Rs. 74914 ha<sup>-1</sup>), net monetary returns (Rs.34447 ha<sup>-1</sup>) and B:C ratio (1.85) with saving of 25% NPK, Zn and Fe dose.

**Conclusion**

From the three years of study, it could be concluded that, application of 100 % recommended dose of fertilizer (100:50:50 NPK kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) along with micronutrients Zn (4 kg Zn ha<sup>-1</sup>) + Fe (5 kg Fe ha<sup>-1</sup>) through drip (WSF) (18.19 q ha<sup>-1</sup>)

& 75 % recommended dose of fertilizer (75:37.5:37.5 NPK kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) along with micronutrients (3 kg Zn ha<sup>-1</sup> + 3.75 kg Fe ha<sup>-1</sup>) in the form of water soluble fertilizer through drip recorded significantly higher seed cotton yield (16.99 q ha<sup>-1</sup>). Uptake of nutrients was found higher and improved soil fertility status. the application of 75 % RD + Zn (3 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) + Fe (3.75 kg Fe ha<sup>-1</sup>) through drip irrigation using water soluble fertilizer (WSF) was beneficial for increasing cotton yield and economic benefit beside improvement in span length, uniformity ratio, fineness micronaire and bundle strength.

**Table 1:** Seed cotton yield as influenced by various treatments

Treatment	Seed cotton (q ha <sup>-1</sup> )			Pooled mean	Cotton stalk (q ha <sup>-1</sup> )			Pooled mean
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	mean	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	mean
T <sub>1</sub> - 100% RD through drip (WSF)	16.45	17.58	16.01	16.68	36.78	38.80	38.07	37.88
T <sub>2</sub> - 75% RD through drip (WSF)	14.90	15.43	14.74	15.02	36.42	36.78	33.75	35.65
T <sub>3</sub> - 100% RD soil application	15.80	15.00	14.19	15.00	38.66	36.00	35.78	36.81
T <sub>4</sub> - 100% RD + Zn (4 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) + Fe (5 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) through drip (WSF)	18.10	18.69	17.78	18.19	42.40	43.08	40.21	41.89
T <sub>5</sub> - 75% RD + Zn (3 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) + Fe (3.75 kg Fe ha <sup>-1</sup> ) through drip (WSF)	16.50	17.63	16.85	16.99	39.30	41.30	37.86	39.49
T <sub>6</sub> - 100% RD + Zn (4 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) + Fe (5 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) soil application	17.50	16.12	14.56	16.06	41.48	35.92	33.44	36.94
T <sub>7</sub> - 75% RD through drip (Urea, Phosphoric acid, MOP)	14.00	14.45	13.72	14.05	34.67	33.14	29.45	32.42
SE (m) ±	1.20	0.75	0.77	0.70	1.73	1.71	1.99	1.72
CD at 5%	3.57	2.24	2.28	2.09	4.87	5.08	5.93	5.11
C.V	14.87	9.21	9.99		9.01	9.10	11.16	

**Table 2:** Uptake of nutrients by cotton as influenced by various treatments (pooled 2009 to 2011-12)

Treatment	Nutrient uptake (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )			Nutrient uptake (g ha <sup>-1</sup> )	
	N	P	K	Zn	Fe
T <sub>1</sub> - 100% RD through drip (WSF)	85.77	23.91	93.73	292.3	1381.8
T <sub>2</sub> - 75% RD through drip (WSF)	80.25	21.89	86.86	264.7	1276.9
T <sub>3</sub> - 100% RD soil application	79.27	20.65	85.40	268.6	1322.7
T <sub>4</sub> - 100% RD + Zn (4 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) + Fe (5 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) through drip (WSF)	100.40	27.94	106.65	347.8	1620.5
T <sub>5</sub> - 75% RD + Zn (3 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) + Fe (3.75 kg Fe ha <sup>-1</sup> ) through drip (WSF)	92.46	25.47	100.02	316.2	1505.1
T <sub>6</sub> - 100% RD + Zn (4 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) + Fe (5 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) soil application	87.62	24.42	95.25	293.9	1403.0
T <sub>7</sub> - 75% RD through drip (Urea, Phosphoric acid, MOP)	72.84	19.56	82.08	238.2	1183.4
SE (m) ±	1.76	0.89	2.04	10.10	40.36
CD at 5%	5.23	2.64	6.07	30.03	111.92

**Table 3:** Chemical properties of soil after harvest of cotton as influenced by various treatments (2011-12)

Treatments	pH (1: 2.5)	EC (dSm <sup>-1</sup> )	Organic carbon(g kg <sup>-1</sup> )
	Nitrogen	Phosphorous	Potassium
T <sub>1</sub> -100% RD through drip (WSF)	8.15	0.31	4.28
T <sub>2</sub> -75% RD through drip (WSF)	8.14	0.28	4.25
T <sub>3</sub> -100% RD soil application	8.15	0.27	4.27
T <sub>4</sub> -100% RD + Zn (4 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) + Fe (5 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) through drip (WSF)	8.21	0.28	4.33
T <sub>5</sub> -75% RD + Zn (3 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) + Fe (3.75 kg Fe ha <sup>-1</sup> ) through drip (WSF)	8.23	0.26	4.27
T <sub>6</sub> -100% RD soil application + soil application of Zn (4 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) + Fe (5 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	8.21	0.30	4.36
T <sub>7</sub> -75% RD through drip (Urea, Phosphoric acid, MOP)	8.22	0.31	4.27
SE(m)±	0.03	0.02	0.05
CD at 5%	-	-	-
Initial status	8.12	0.29	4.19

**Table 4:** Soil fertility status (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) of soil after harvest of cotton as influenced by various treatments (2011-12)

Treatments	Available nutrients (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )		
	Nitrogen	Phosphorous	Potassium
T <sub>1</sub> -100 % RD through drip (WSF)	227.2	16.15	416.9
T <sub>2</sub> -75 % RD through drip (WSF)	220.1	13.32	398.7
T <sub>3</sub> -100 % RD soil application (Urea, DAP, MOP)	225.2	15.19	403.4
T <sub>4</sub> -100 % RD + Zn(4 kg Zn ha <sup>-1</sup> )+Fe (5 kg Fe ha <sup>-1</sup> ) through drip (WSF)	229.0	18.00	429.9
T <sub>5</sub> -75 % RD through drip + Zn (3 kg Zn ha <sup>-1</sup> )+ Fe (3.75 kg Fe ha <sup>-1</sup> ) through drip (WSF)	221.3	13.95	400.6
T <sub>6</sub> -100 % RD soil application + soil application of Zn (4 kg Zn ha <sup>-1</sup> ) + Fe (5 kg Fe ha <sup>-1</sup> ) (Urea, DAP, MOP)	231.0	19.22	406.1
T <sub>7</sub> -75 % RD through drip (Urea, Phosphoric acid, MOP)	211.1	10.91	342.3
SE (m) ±	3.43	0.31	7.94
CD at 5 %	10.51	0.94	23.61
Initial status	189.3	15.88	338.32

**Table 5:** Available zinc and iron status ( $\text{mg kg}^{-1}$ ) of soil after harvest of cotton as influenced by various treatments (2011-12)

Treatments	Available Zinc & Iron ( $\text{mg kg}^{-1}$ )	
	Zinc	Iron
T <sub>1</sub> - 100 % RD through drip (WSF)	0.50	4.81
T <sub>2</sub> - 75 % RD through drip (WSF)	0.49	4.80
T <sub>3</sub> - 100 % RD soil application (Urea, DAP, MOP)	0.47	4.78
T <sub>4</sub> - 100 % RD through drip + Zn( $4 \text{ kg Zn ha}^{-1}$ )+Fe ( $5 \text{ kg Fe ha}^{-1}$ ) through drip (WSF)	0.64	5.09
T <sub>5</sub> - 75 % RD through drip + Zn ( $3 \text{ kg Zn ha}^{-1}$ )+ Fe ( $3.75 \text{ kg Fe ha}^{-1}$ ) through drip (WSF)	0.63	5.05
T <sub>6</sub> - 100 % RD soil application + soil application of Zn ( $4 \text{ kg Zn ha}^{-1}$ ) + Fe ( $5 \text{ kg Fe ha}^{-1}$ ) (Urea, DAP, MOP)	0.66	5.14
T <sub>7</sub> - 75 % RD through drip (Urea, Phosphoric acid, MOP)	0.48	4.82
SE (m) $\pm$	0.06	0.58
CD at 5 %	NS	NS
Initial status	0.53	4.48

**Table 6:** Fiber quality parameters of cotton as influenced by various treatments

Treatment	2.5% span length (mm)	Uniformity ratio (5)	Fineness micro-naire ( $10^{-6} \text{ g inch}^{-1}$ )	Bundle strength tenacity at 3.2 mm gauge ( $\text{g tex}^{-1}$ )
T <sub>1</sub> - 100% RD through drip (WSF)	26.40	53.25	3.05	20.13
T <sub>2</sub> - 75% RD through drip (WSF)	26.88	53.75	3.20	20.03
T <sub>3</sub> - 100% RD soil application	27.08	52.00	3.23	20.65
T <sub>4</sub> - 100% RD + Zn ( $4 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) + Fe ( $5 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) through drip (WSF)	27.00	55.00	3.13	23.03
T <sub>5</sub> - 75% RD + Zn ( $3 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) + Fe ( $3.75 \text{ kg Fe ha}^{-1}$ ) through drip (WSF)	27.15	54.25	3.05	22.18
T <sub>6</sub> - 100% RD + Zn ( $4 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) + Fe ( $5 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) soil application	27.10	52.45	3.20	21.48
T <sub>7</sub> - 75% RD through drip (Urea, Phosphoric acid, MOP)	26.93	53.00	3.05	19.95
SE (m) $\pm$	0.26	0.90	0.18	0.5
CD at 5 %	NS	NS	NS	1.71

**Table 7:** Monetary return of cotton as influenced by various treatments

Treatment	Yield ( $\text{q ha}^{-1}$ )	GMR (Rs.)	NMR (Rs.)	B:C ratio
T <sub>1</sub> - 100% RD through drip (WSF)	16.68	71571	31794	1.72
T <sub>2</sub> - 75% RD through drip (WSF)	15.02	65393	28477	1.77
T <sub>3</sub> - 100% RD soil application	15.00	64914	26696	1.69
T <sub>4</sub> - 100% RD + Zn ( $4 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) + Fe ( $5 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) through drip (WSF)	18.19	78956	34444	1.77
T <sub>5</sub> - 75% RD + Zn ( $3 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) + Fe ( $3.75 \text{ kg Fe ha}^{-1}$ ) through drip (WSF)	16.99	74914	34447	1.85
T <sub>6</sub> - 100% RD + Zn ( $4 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) + Fe ( $5 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) soil application	16.06	69224	29246	1.73
T <sub>7</sub> - 75% RD through drip (Urea, Phosphoric acid, MOP)	14.05	61020	25180	1.70
SE (m) $\pm$	0.70	1624.0	1258.7	
CD at 5 %	2.09	4825.4	3740.1	

**References**

- Anonymous. 2011. From Agriculture Research, Website <http://www.cci.com>
- Bharambe PR, Narwade SK, Oza SR, Vaishnava VG, Shelke DK, Jadhav GS. Nitrogen management in cotton through drip irrigation. Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science. 1997; 45:705-709.
- Isaac RA, Kerber JD. Atomic absorption and flame photometry: Techniques and uses in soil, plant and water analysis. In: Walsh, L.M. (ed.). Instrumental Methods of Soils and Plant Tissue. Soil Science Society of America, Madison, Wisconsin, 1971, 18-37.
- Jackson ML. Soil Chemical Analysis, Prentice Hall of India (Pvt.) New Delhi, 1967.
- Halemani HL, Hallikeri SS, Nandagavi RA, Nooli SS, Mohan Kumar G. Influence of organics, inorganics and their combinations on soil properties and crop productivity in cotton based cropping system. International Symposium on Strategies for sustainable cotton production-Global Vision 2. Crop Production 23<sup>rd</sup> to 25<sup>th</sup> November 2004, UAS, Dharwad, Karnataka, 2004.
- Katkar RN, Bhalerao PD, Ghatol PU, Patil BR. Influence of organics and inorganics on soil fertility, seed cotton yield and fibre quality in Vertisols. PKV Res. J. 2007; 31(2):216-222.
- Lindsay WL, Norwell WA. Development of DTPA soil test for Zn, Fe, Mn and Cu. Soil Science Society of America Journal. 1978; 42:421-428.
- Mathur GM. Effect of long term application of fertilizers and manures on soil properties and yield under cotton-wheat rotation in North-West Rajasthan. J Indian Soc. Soil Sci. 1997; 45(2):288-292.
- Mehta AK, Thakral SK, Saharan HS. Effect of organic and inorganic sources of nutrition on yield and fiber quality of cotton. Journal of Cotton Research Development. 2009; 23:253-257.
- Mohanty SK, Singh TA. Fundamental of Soil Science. Indian Soc. of Soil Sci. IARI, New Delhi, 2002.
- Nanda RS. Fertigation to enhance farm productivity. Indian Journal of Fertilizers. 2010; 6:13-16.
- Olsen SR, Sommers LE. In: Methods of Soil Analysis, Part II, Chemical and Microbiological Methods by Page, A. L., R. H. Miller and D. R. Keeney (eds.) Agronomy Monograph No. 9 (2<sup>nd</sup> edition) American Society of Agronomy and Soil Science Society of America, Madison, Wisconsin, USA, 1982, 421-422.
- Patil VC, Halemani HL, Hallikeri SS, Bandiwaddar TT, Nooli SS. Response of hybrid cotton to drip irrigation and fertigation. Journal of Indian Society of Cotton Improvement. 2009; 23:28-33.

14. Piper CS. Soil and Plant Analysis, Hans Pub. Bombay.  
Asian Edition, 1966, 368-374.
15. Rao S, Janawade D. Nutrient uptake and fibre quality parameters as influenced by integrated nutrient management practices in irrigated hybrid cotton. Journal of Cotton Research Development. 2009; 23:237-239.
16. Rao S, Janawade AD. Influence of integrated nutrient management practices on physico-chemical properties of cotton growing soil. J Cotton Res. Dev. 2009<sup>a</sup>; 23(1):62-63.
17. Raskar BS, Bhoi PG, Pawar DD. Effect of planting technique and water soluble fertilizers on premonsoon cotton under drip irrigation. Journal of Cotton Research Development. 2001; 26:138-143.
18. Singh L, Verma RNS, Lohia SS. Effects of continuous application of farm yard manure and chemical fertilizers on some soil properties. J Indian Soc. Soil Sci. 1980; (28):171-172.
19. Subbiah BV, Asija GV. A rapid procedure for determination of available N in soils. Current Science. 1956; 25:264-265.
20. Suresh P, Chellamuthu V. Seed cotton yield and uptake of nutrients by cotton cultivators (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.) as influenced by different fertilizer levels under irrigated conditions in the coastal region of Karaikal. International Symposium on "Strategies for Sustainable Cotton Production – A Global Vision", Vol. 2. Crop Production. held on 23<sup>rd</sup> to 25<sup>th</sup> November, UAS, Dharwad, Karnataka, 2004.
21. Veeraputhiran R, Chinnusamy C. Soil moisture and water use studies under drip and furrow irrigation methods in hybrid cotton. Journal of Cotton Research Development. 2009; 23:74-79.
22. Wadatkar SB, Thakare SH, Bhamodkar MA, Deshmukh HD. Feasibility of liquid fertilizer through drip irrigation to cotton. PKV Research Journal. 2001; 25:54-55.
23. Walkley A, Black CA. An examination of the different method for determining soil organic matter and proposal modification of the chromic acid titration method. Soil Science. 1934; 37:29-38.