

ISSN : 1812-5379 (Print)
ISSN : 1812-5417 (Online)
<http://ansijournals.com/ja>

JOURNAL OF AGRONOMY



ANSI*net*

Asian Network for Scientific Information
308 Lasani Town, Sargodha Road, Faisalabad - Pakistan

Plant Spacings cum Nitrogen Management Effects on Forage Yield of Mott Elephantgrass

Muhammad Yasin, M. Asghar Malik and M. Shafi Nazir

Department of Agronomy, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad-38040, Pakistan

Abstract: The main objective of present study was to determine the effect of different levels of nitrogen and plant spacings on yield of Mott grass (*Pennisetum purpureum schum*) at different cuttings. Plant spacings (inter row and intra row spacings) are $S_1 = 45 \times 45$ cm, $S_2 = 60 \times 60$ cm and $S_3 = 75 \times 75$ cm and nitrogen levels included $N_0 = 0$ (control), $N_1 = 100$ kg, $N_2 = 200$ kg, $N_3 = 300$ kg and $N_4 = 400$ kg ha⁻¹. Production potential of Mott grass was determined on the basis of green fodder and dry matter yield. Application of N at different plant spacings increased both green fodder and Dry matter yield significantly over control in all the three cuttings. Crop fertilized at 300 kg N ha⁻¹ produced the maximum green fodder yield 509 t ha⁻¹ and Dry matter yield (97 t ha⁻¹) of all the three cuttings at the spacing pattern of 45 × 45 cm.

Key words: Plant spacing, nitrogen, forage yield, mott grass

Introduction

Forages are the major and cheap source of feed for livestock. In Pakistan, about 16% of the total cropped area is put under fodder crops annually, even then regular supply of adequate and quality fodder is not being made. (Hanjra *et al.*, 1995). This results in lowered production due to under fed animals. There may be many alternatives to overcome the shortage of forage but one of them is the introduction of high yielding crop varieties.

Mott elephantgrass is a vegetative perennial, highly productive, stay for years in the field and maintains its quality over long regrowth intervals. In a field of one acre, a fresh matter yield of 192 tons per year can be produced with improved agronomic practices (Gill and Bhatti, 1996). Mott grass is also important because of its availability during feed shortage period (May and June).

Mott grass was introduced to Pakistan in 1988. Although some of the farmers have started its cultivation yet its success will depend upon the evolution of a comprehensive package of agro-technology compatible with the local agro-climatic conditions. Two vital components of agro-technology for Mott grass are proper plant spacing and adequate nitrogen fertilization which play a key role in the development of quick growing grasses like Mott that tillers profusely (Bilal *et al.*, 2000). Percentage of planted stems that produce at least one emerged stems that produce

at least one emerged shoot increase linearly from 50 to 88 as nitrogen rate increases from 0 to 400 kg ha⁻¹ (Sollenberger *et al.*, 1988). Therefore, the present study was planned to determine the effect of different plant spacings and nitrogen levels on the yield of Mott grass at various cuttings.

Materials and Methods

In this experiment, effect of different levels of nitrogen and plant spacings on the productivity of Mott grass was studied. The experiment was laid out in a randomized complete block design (RCBD) with a split plot arrangement and three replications. Main plot size was 8x9m. This plot was subdivided into three plots according to row spacings and these were 5 rows of Mott grass in each sub plot. N₂ fertilizer levels were placed in the main and planting methods in the sub plots. Urea (46% N₂) was used as nitrogen source. The experiment was conducted at Research Area of Agronomy, Forage Production Section, Ayub Agricultural Research Institute (AARI) Faisalabad. Experiment comprised the following treatments. Plant spacing S₁ = 45 × 45 cm, S₂ = 60 × 60 cm and S₃ = 75 × 75 cm and nitrogen levels included N₀ = 0 (control), N₁ = 100 kg, N₂ = 200 kg, N₃ = 300 kg and N₄ = 400 kg ha⁻¹. From the specified dose of nitrogen for each treatment 50% N₂ was applied after planting with first irrigation while the remaining 50% was applied 5 weeks after the first application of nitrogen. Similarly after each harvest the same amount of N₂ as per treatment was applied in two equal splits i.e. 50% with first irrigation after the crop harvest and 50% 5 weeks after the first application of nitrogen. All other agronomic practices were kept normal and uniform for all the treatments. Five plants per plot were selected at random (one plant from each row except two aside rows and tagged. These plants were used throughout the production trial. Three cuttings were taken, first after 90 days of planting and sub sequent cuttings with an interval of 60 days each. The data recorded was green fodder and dry matter yield.

Green fodder and dry matter yield ha⁻¹

At harvest, all the plants of a plot were cut at an appropriate height and weighed with the help of a spring balance. Then green fodder yield per plot was converted to green fodder yield per hectare. Green samples from each plot were chopped and dried in hot air oven to a constant weight. The dry matter (DM) percentage was calculated as follows.

$$\text{DM \%} = \frac{\text{Weight of dried sample}}{\text{Weight of fresh sample}} \times 100$$

DM yield/ha was calculated on the basis of DM percentage. The data were subjected to statistical analysis by using Fisher's analysis of variance technique and the treatments mean were compared by using least significant differences (LSD) test at 0.05 (Steel and Torrie, 1984).

Results and Discussion

Green fodder yield (t ha^{-1})

The data regarding the effect of different plant spacings and nitrogen levels on forage yield ha^{-1} are embodied in Table 1. Forage yield ha^{-1} (FYH) was significantly affected by different spacing patterns in all the three cuttings. In the 1st cutting the crop spaced at 45×45 cm gave the maximum forage yield ha^{-1} against the minimum 55.4 t ha^{-1} at 75×75 cm. Whereas 60×60 cm intermediate. On the basis of total FYH, the maximum FYH of three cuttings was recorded at narrow spacing and the minimum of 176.21 t at the widest spacing. These results are in consonance with those of Khan and Manghatt (1965) and Saeed *et al.* (1996) who reported that green fodder yield of Mott grass decreased as plant spacing was increased.

FYH was increased significantly with the application of nitrogen over control in all the three cuttings. In 1st cut, the crop fertilized at 300 kg N ha^{-1} produced significantly the maximum FYH against the minimum of 52.51 t with no nitrogen. The same trend was observed in case of 2nd and 3rd cutting. Significantly the maximum total FYH of 3 cuttings was recorded at 300 kg N ha^{-1} against the minimum of 165.4 t ha^{-1} with no nitrogen. These findings are in line with those of Ethredge *et al.* (1973), Mathias *et al.* (1978) who reported that forage yield of Bermuda grass increased with each successive increase in nitrogen.

Similarly Saeed *et al.* (1996) also recorded the promotive effect of N on FYH of Mott grass. The maximum of three cuttings was recorded in case when the crop was planted at 45×45 cm spacing and given 300 kg N ha^{-1} . However, the minimum FYH was recorded when the crop was grown at 75×75 cm spacing and no nitrogen was given.

Dry matter yield (t ha^{-1})

The dry matter yield (DMY) decreased significantly with an increase in plant spacing from 45×45 cm to 75×75 cm (Table 2). However, the maximum DMY was produced in the 1st cutting when the crop was raised at 45×45 cm spacing and was followed by 60×60 cm which produced 14.6 t ha^{-1} . Whereas the minimum DMY of 10.47 t ha^{-1} was recorded when the crop was planted at 75×75 cm. The same trend was observed in 2nd and 3rd cutting. On the basis of total DMY of three cuttings, the maximum DMY of 79.6 t ha^{-1} was recorded at narrow spacing against the minimum of 33.9 t ha^{-1} at 75×75 cm spacing. These findings are in line with those of Cox (1996), Ahmad (1998) and Mohsan (1999).

The different N_2 levels enhanced the DMY significantly over control. Maximum DMY was recorded in 1st cutting when the crop was fertilized at 300 kg N ha^{-1} which was at the par with that fertilized at 400 kg N ha^{-1} against the minimum of 10.69 t ha^{-1} in check. Similar trend was noted in 2nd and 3rd cutting. The total DMY of three cuttings was the maximum when the crop fertilized @ 300 kg N ha^{-1} against the minimum of 35.22 t ha^{-1} with out nitrogen. Promotive effect of nitrogen application on DMY have also been reported by Bangarwa *et al.* (1988), Ahmad (1989) and Dobos and Nagy (1998).

Table 1: Forage yield (t ha^{-1}) as affected by different plant spacing and nitrogen levels

	Cutting No.			
Treatments	1st	2nd	3rd	Total
A. Plant Spacings (cm)				
S ₁ (45 × 45)	122.6a*	152.1a	133.2 a	407.9a
S ₂ (60 × 60)	74.8b	93.5b	81.2 b	249.5b
S ₃ (75 × 75)	55.4c	63.6c	57.2 c	176.2c
LSD (0.05)	2.26	1.75	0.89	3.58
B. Nitrogen levels (kg ha ⁻¹)				
N ₀ = control	52.5e	57.8e	54.7d	165.4e
N ₁ = 100	81.5d	90.1d	87.3c	258.9d
N ₂ = 200	89.5c	114.0c	98.8b	302.3c
N ₃ = 300	101.9a	130.8a	111.7a	344.4a
N ₄ = 400	95.9b	122.5b	100.0b	318.4b
LSD (0.05)	2.26	3.42	2.98	4.10
C. Interaction (S × N)				
S ₁ N ₀	78.0e	84.6h	81.3g	243.9i
S ₁ N ₁	122.3c	130.3d	126.9d	379.5d
S ₁ N ₂	126.2c	168.8c	142.2c	437.2c
S ₁ N ₃	146.7a	193.0a	169.3a	509.0a
S ₁ N ₄	139.6b	183.6b	146.2b	469.4b
S ₂ N ₀	46.8h	51.4j	48.5k	146.7m
S ₂ N ₁	70.8f	84.7h	81.3g	236.8e
S ₂ N ₂	80.4e	102.8g	90.4f	273.6h
S ₂ N ₃	92.7d	118.3e	97.1e	308.1f
S ₂ N ₄	83.6e	110.0f	88.8f	282.4g
S ₃ N ₀	32.8i	37.4k	34.4l	104.6n
S ₃ N ₁	51.6h	55.2j	53.8j	160.6l
S ₃ N ₂	61.9g	70.5i	63.8i	196.2k
S ₃ N ₃	66.3fg	81.0h	68.8h	216.2j
S ₃ N ₄	64.4fg	74.0i	65.1i	203.5k
LSD (0.05)	6.67	5.40	8.01	8.01

* Any two means in a column not sharing a letter differ significantly at $P \leq 0.05$

Table 2: Dry matter yield (t ha^{-1}) as affected by different plant spacings and nitrogen levels

	Cutting No.			
Treatments	1st	2nd	3rd	Total
A. Plant Spacings (cm)				
S ₁ (45 × 45)	23.7a	29.2a	26.7a	79.6
S ₂ (60 × 60)	14.6b	19.1b	16.7b	50.4
S ₃ (75 × 75)	10.5c	12.3c	11.1c	33.9
LSD (0.05)	0.8	1.5	2.4	
B. Nitrogen levels (kg ha ⁻¹)				
N ₀ = control	10.7c	12.6c	12.0c	35.3
N ₁ = 100	14.9b	19.2b	17.3b	51.4
N ₂ = 200	17.5ab	20.5b	19.5b	57.4
N ₃ = 300	19.5a	25.0a	22.3a	66.8
N ₄ = 400	18.8a	23.7a	19.9ab	62.4
LSD (0.05)	3.7	2.2	2.7	
C. Interaction (S × N)				
S ₁ N ₀	15.5e	18.6e	18.4	52.6
S ₁ N ₁	21.6c	25.9c	25.1	72.6
S ₁ N ₂	25.0b	30.2b	28.1	83.2
S ₁ N ₃	28.2a	36.3a	32.9	97.1
S ₁ N ₄	28.0a	35.0a	29.1	92.3
S ₂ N ₀	9.8hi	11.7f	10.6	32.1
S ₂ N ₁	13.5f	19.5e	16.3	49.3
S ₂ N ₂	15.8de	18.6e	18.5	53.0
S ₂ N ₃	17.5d	23.9cd	20.3	61.7
S ₂ N ₄	16.5de	21.7de	18.1	56.2
S ₃ N ₀	6.8j	7.6g	7.0	21.3
S ₃ N ₁	9.4i	12.2f	10.6	32.1
S ₃ N ₂	11.5gh	12.6f	11.8	36.0
S ₃ N ₃	12.9fg	14.9f	13.6	41.5
S ₃ N ₄	11.7fg	14.4f	12.6	38.7
LSD (0.05)	0.83	3.4	NS	

Any two means in a column not sharing a letter differ significantly at $P \leq 0.05$

NS = Non significant

The maximum DMY was recorded in S_1N_3 treatment combination i.e. when the crop was planted at 45x45cm and fertilized at 300 kg N ha⁻¹ which was at par with S_1N_4 . The minimum DMY was recorded in S_3N_0 i.e when the crop was planted at 75 x 75 cm with no nitrogen.

The interaction between plant spacing and nitrogen level was also significant. Better plant growth of 45x45 cm over other spacing patterns along with N application was associated with their LAIs as a result of which crop plants intercepted more radiation and there by increased crop growth rate. These results corroborate the findings of Ramison and Lucas (1982) and Bangarwa *et al.* (1988).

References

- Ahmad, M.A., 1989. Response of leaf surface and growth of maize to initial dose of nitrogen Ann. Agri. Sci., 34: 857-972.
- Ahmad, N., 1998. Biological efficiency of maize (*Zea mays*) as influenced by population density and split application of nitrogen. Ph.D Thesis, Deptt. of Agronomy, Uni. Agri. Faisalabad, Pakistan.
- Bangarwa, A.S., M.S. Kairon and K.P. Singh, 1998. Effect of plant density, level and proportions of nitrogen fertilization on growth, yield components of winter maize. Ind. J. Agri. Sci., 58: 854-856.
- Bilal, M. Q. M. Saeed and M. Sarwar, 2000. Effect of varying levels of nitrogen and FYM application on tillering and height of Mott grass. Int. J. Agri. Biol., 2: 21-23.
- Cox, W.J., 1996. Whole plant physiological and yield responses of maize to plant density. Agron. J., 88: 489-496.
- Dobos, A. and J. Nagy. 1998. Effect of year and fertilizer application on the dry matter production of maize. Noveeny-termeles, 47: 518-524.
- Ethredge, J., E.R. Beaty and R.M. Lawrence, 1973. Effect of clipping height, clipping frequency and rates of nitrogen on yield and energy content of coasal bermudagrass. Agron. J., 65: 717-719.
- Gill, R.A. and J.A. Bhatti, 1996. Economics of fodder in milk production and draught animal management. Proc. National. Conf. On Improvement of Fodder Production in Pakistan. NARC., Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Hanjra, S.H., J.B. Davis and M.J.A. Akhtar, 1995. Fodder production Pak. 188/072. Small Holder Dairy Development in Punjab. Food and Agri. Organization of the United Nations, Rome.
- Khan, R.A. and M.A. Manghatt, 1965. Spacing experiments with bajra napier grass. Pak. Agri. Sci., 11: 49-50.
- Mathias, E.L., O.L. Pennet and P.E. Lundberg, 1978. Fertilization effect on yield and N concentration of midland bermudagrass. Agron. J., 70: 973-976.
- Mohsan, S., 1999. Population dynamics and nitrogen management effects on maize productively Ph.D. Thesis, Deptt. of Agronomy, Uni. Agri. Faisalabad, Pakistan.

- Ramison, S.U. and E.O. Lucas, 1982. Effect of planting density on leaf area and productivity of two maize cultivars in Nigeria. *Expl. Agri.*, 18:93-100.
- Saeed, M., N.A. Siddiqui, M. Maqsood and T. Mahmood, 1996. Effect of nitrogen and plant spacing on growth, green fodder yield and quality of Mott elephantgrass. *Pak. J. Sci. Ind. Res.*, 39: 54-59.
- Sollenberger, L.E., G.M. Prine, K.R. Woodard and C.S. Jones. Jr., 1988. Planting methodology for Mott dwarf elephantgrass. *Int. Conf. On Livestock and poultry in the tropics*. IFAS, Univ. of FL, Gainesville, USA.
- Steel, R.G.D. and J.H. Torrie, 1984. *Principles and procedures of statistics*. McGraw Hill Book. Co. New York, USA.