

Original Research Article

Effect of integrated nutrient management on yield and yield attributes of Sweet corn (*Zea mays* L. *saccharata*) under temperate conditions of Kashmir Valley

Abstract

A field study was carried out Experimental Farm of Division of Agronomy, Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology of Kashmir, Shalimar, Srinagar during *kharif* 2011 and 2012 to study the influence of integrated nutrient management on yield and yield attributes of sweet corn. Twelve different treatments with three replications each were carried out in a randomized block design. The results revealed that yield contributing characters viz., cob length and diameter with and without husk, cobs plant⁻¹, rows cob⁻¹, grains row⁻¹ and weight of cob with and without husk were significantly higher with application of 75 % (NPK) + FYM (4.5 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) over unfertilized control and other treatments. This treatment 75 % (NPK) + FYM (4.5 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) also proved to be significantly superior to rest of the treatments including unfertilized control in increasing cob yield with and without husk, fodder yield and green biomass yield during both years of experimentation. The ratio of cob to fodder yield during 2011 was recorded highest in treatment FYM (18 t ha⁻¹), while during 2012, NPK (90:60:40 kg ha⁻¹) recorded the highest ratio of cob to fodder yield.

Key words: Sweet maize, organic fertilizer, inorganic fertilizers, growth, yield.

Introduction

Sweet corn (*Zea mays* L. *saccharata*) also known as sugar corn is a hybridized variety of maize (*Zea mays* L.) specifically bred to increase the sugar content. Sweet corn is introduced to India from USA. It has a sugary rather than a starchy endosperm and a creamy texture. The low starch level makes the kernel wrinkled rather than plumpy. At harvest, an optimum kernel moisture content of 70 to 74 per cent is required to achieve acceptable frozen cobs (Pratt, 1939). When the moisture content is higher than 74 per cent the cobs are immature and below 70 per cent they lose the sweetness and develop an unpleasant taste and texture. It has a thinner pericarp than the normal corn making it tender (Pradeep *et al.*, 2005). The green cobs are eaten, roasted or boiled. In sweet corn

best nutritional quality depends on moisture (72.7%) and total solids (22.3%) comprising of carbohydrate (81%), protein (13%) and lipids (3.5%).

Among the various factors affecting the growth and yield of sweet corn, nutrient management plays a vital role. It is desired that the soil should have the required nutrients in sufficient quantities and in optimum proportion to meet the requirement of crop. Presently, the chemical fertilizers are considered as the major source of nutrients. However, the escalating cost, coupled with increasing demand of chemical fertilizers and depleting soil health necessitates the safe and efficient use of organics in crop production. Apart from this, the concept of organic farming which excludes the use of chemical fertilizers and pesticides from the perspective of eco-friendly management, organic agriculture has many advantages over conventional agriculture. We can no longer afford to ignore the need to actively manage ecological services focusing on farming as indicated in the “Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Report.” A recent study by Pimental *et al.* (2005), at Rodale Institute on organic farming over 22 years, showed greater advantages of animal based organic system than conventional system. However, under arable production system organic manures suffers from the drawback of slow release of nutrients at initial stages, may require 2-3 years required to sustain crop yields. To hasten the nutrient availability in organic production system through judicious combination of organic manures by tracing the positive aspects of green manures, crop residues, composts and liquid manures, in a more synchronized system can be developed to maintain long-term soil fertility and sustain higher productivity of crops. Hence, an integrated organic nutrient supply system provides an ideal nutrition for a crop to sustain yield levels and also enhance farm income.

In view of increasing awareness about sustainable agricultural system world wide, a new generation scientists are concentrating upon research in understanding the relationship between organics with components of soil like sustainable soil fertility, crop yield and protection of the environment. However, the change over from chemical to organic agriculture is difficult, as farmers have to forgo yields till the buildup of soil productivity to a desirable level. But, it is possible to effect a quick change over to sustainable agriculture by harnessing different integrated organic approaches mainly green manures, enriched compost, vermicompost, liquid manures, bio-fertilizers etc.

Therefore, understanding of the influence of these nutrients is quite essential to exploit the field potentiality of the crop. In light of the above fact, the present study was undertaken with an objective to see the effect of integrated nutrient system on yield and its attributes in sweet corn.

Materials and Methods

A field experiment was conducted for two consecutive years (*kharif* 2011 and 2012) at the Experimental Farm of the Division of Agronomy, Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology of Kashmir that lies between 34° 0.8' N latitude and 74° 83' E longitude at an altitude of 1587 meters above mean sea level. The experimental site was well drained and had uniform topography. The experiment comprising of 12 treatments [T(1) = Control , T(2) = Recommended NPK kg ha⁻¹ (90:60:40), T(3) = FYM (18 t ha⁻¹), T(4) = Vermicompost (3.6 t ha⁻¹), T(5) = Biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB), T(6) = 75 % (NPK) + FYM (4.5 t ha⁻¹), T(7) = 75 % (NPK) + Vermicompost (0.9 t ha⁻¹), T(8) = 75 % (NPK) + Biofertilizer , T(9) = 75 % (NPK) + FYM (2.25 t ha⁻¹) + Vermicompost (0.45 t ha⁻¹), T(10) = 75 % (NPK) + FYM (4.5 t/ha) + Biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB), T(11) = 75 % (NPK) + Vermicompost (0.9 t/ha) + Biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) and T(12) = 75 % (NPK) + FYM (2.25 t/ha) + Vermicompost (0.45 t/ha) + Biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB)] was laid in a Randomized Block Design with three replications.

The chemical fertilizers Urea, DAP and MOP were used as source of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium, respectively, FYM and vermicompost were used as source of nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium and micro-elements also in the form of organic manure. The microbial culture of *Azotobacter* and PSB were used as bio-fertilizers. Farmyard manure (FYM) and vermicompost were applied to the respective plots, as per the layout plan, and mixed thoroughly with the soil. Half of the nitrogen was applied as basal at the time of sowing and the remaining half of nitrogen in two splits each at knee high and tassel emergence stage in the respective plots at the rates as per layout plan. Phosphorus and potassium were applied, at the rates as per layout plan to the respective plots at the time of sowing. *Azotobacter* and PSB were used as a seed treatment (50 g kg⁻¹ seed) to the respective plots.

The data were recorded on cob length with and without husk (cm), cob diameter with and without husk (cm), number of cobs plant⁻¹, number of grain rows cob⁻¹, number of grains row⁻¹ and weight of green cob (g) from 5 cobs taken randomly from each net plot. Green cob yield with and without husk (q ha⁻¹), green fodder yield (q ha⁻¹) and biomass yield (q ha⁻¹) plot were harvested and recorded separately as q plot⁻¹ and then converted in q ha⁻¹. The ratio of cob to fodder yield was determined by dividing the cob yield with husk by fodder yield per plot. The data obtained in respect of various observations were statistically analyzed by the method described by Cochran and Cox (1967). The significance of “F” and “t” was tested at 5 % level of significance. The critical difference was determined when “F” test was significant.

Results

Yield contributing characters

1. Length of cob with and without husk (cm)

Data presented in Table 1 makes it evident that the length of cob with and without husk varied significantly amongst treatments. The treatment 75 % (NPK) + FYM (4.5 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) at par with 75 % (NPK) + vermicompost (0.9 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) and 75 % (NPK) + FYM (2.25 t ha⁻¹) + vermicompost (0.45 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) recorded significantly higher cob lengths with husk i.e., 26.05, 26.34 and 26.20 cm and without husk i.e., 22.21 and 22.53 cm during 2011 and 2012, respectively compared to other treatments. Significantly lowest cob length with and without husk was recorded under unfertilized treatment during both years of experimentation.

2. Diameter of cob with and without husk (cm)

Diameter of cob showed marked variation amongst the treatments. The treatment 75 % (NPK) + FYM (4.5 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) recorded significantly highest cob diameter with husk i.e., 6.01 and 6.08 cm and without husk i.e., 4.92 and 4.98 cm during 2011 and 2012. The treatment 75 % (NPK) + FYM (2.25 t ha⁻¹) + vermicompost (0.45 t ha⁻¹) though recorded significantly lower cob diameter with husk than 75 % (NPK) + FYM (4.5 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) was the second highest treatment being at par with 75 % (NPK) + vermicompost (0.9 t ha⁻¹), 75 % (NPK) + vermicompost (0.9 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) and 75 % (NPK) + FYM

(2.25 t ha⁻¹) + vermicompost (0.45 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) was significantly superior to rest of the treatments (Table 1). As regards cob diameter without husk the treatment 75 % (NPK) + FYM (2.25 t ha⁻¹) + vermicompost (0.45 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) was second highest treatment being at par with 75 % (NPK) + vermicompost (0.9 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) but significantly superior to rest of the treatments. It was also noted that unfertilized control recorded significantly lowest cob diameter with and without husk during both years of investigation.

3. Cobs plant⁻¹

Number of cobs plant⁻¹ has a direct bearing on yield of the crop. The data with respect to cobs plant⁻¹ is presented in (Table1) indicated that treatment 75 % (NPK) + FYM (4.5 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) significantly increased the number of cobs plant⁻¹ over unfertilized control, NPK (90:60:40 kg ha⁻¹) and 75 % (NPK) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) though being at par with rest of the treatments during 2011 and 2012. The magnitude of increase in cobs plant⁻¹ recorded with 75 % (NPK) + FYM (4.5 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) over unfertilized control was to the tune of 70.0 and 75.0 per cent during 2011 and 2012.

4. Number of grains row⁻¹

Number of grains row⁻¹ showed that the treatment 75 % (NPK) + FYM (4.5 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) being at par with 75 % (NPK) + vermicompost (0.9 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) and 75 % (NPK) + FYM (2.25 t ha⁻¹) + vermicompost (0.45 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) significantly improved number of grains row⁻¹ over rest of the treatments during two years of investigation. Significantly lowest number of grains row⁻¹ were recorded under unfertilized treatment (Table 1).

5. Number of rows cob⁻¹

The data pertaining to number of rows cob⁻¹ exhibited that the treatment 75 % (NPK) + FYM (4.5 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) at par with NPK (90:60:40 kg ha⁻¹), 75 % (NPK) + FYM (2.25 t ha⁻¹) + vermicompost (0.45 t ha⁻¹), 75 % (NPK) + vermicompost (0.9 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) and 75 % (NPK) + FYM (2.25 t ha⁻¹) + vermicompost (0.45 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) was

significantly superior over rest of the treatments during 2011 and 2012 (Table 1). The unfertilized control recorded significantly lowest number of rows cob⁻¹ compared to other treatments during both years of investigation.

6. *Weight of green cob with and without husk (g)*

It was observed that significantly highest green cob weight with and without husk was recorded under treatment 75 % (NPK) + FYM (4.5 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) (Table 2). As regards weight of green cob with husk it was found that 75 % (NPK) + FYM (4.5 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) remained at par with NPK (90:60:40 kg ha⁻¹) but significantly increased weight of green cob with husk over rest of the treatments and the magnitude of increase over unfertilized treatment was to the tune of 22.14 and 31.40 per cent during 2011 and 2012, respectively. As regards weight of green cob without husk it was noticed that 75 % (NPK) + FYM (4.5 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) being at par with NPK (90:60:40 kg ha⁻¹) and 75 % (NPK) + FYM (2.25 t ha⁻¹) + vermicompost (0.45 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) significantly increased the weight of green cobs over rest of the treatments and the magnitude of increase recorded by the treatment over unfertilized control was to the tune of 17.56 and 26.65 per cent during 2011 and 2012, respectively.

Yield

1. *Cob yield with and without husk (q ha⁻¹)*

Yield is the final criterion to judge the efficiency of the treatment. The perusal of the Table 3 revealed that the treatment 75 % (NPK) + FYM (4.5 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) proved to be significantly superior to rest of the treatments including unfertilized control in increasing the cob yield with and without husk during both years of experimentation. The treatment 75 % (NPK) + FYM (2.25 t ha⁻¹) + vermicompost (0.45 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) was the next best treatment to improve cob yield as compared to other treatments, however without husk it remained at par with 75 % (NPK) + vermicompost (0.9 t ha⁻¹) + Biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB). The yield superiority of 75 % (NPK) + FYM (4.5 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) over unfertilized control with regard to cob yield with husk was to the tune of 107.64 and 129.96 per cent and with regard to cob yield without

husk the increase in yield was to the tune of 99.86 and 121.63 per cent during 2011 and 2012, respectively.

2. *Fodder yield ($q\ ha^{-1}$)*

The treatment 75 % (NPK) + FYM ($4.5\ t\ ha^{-1}$) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) recorded significantly higher yield compared to rest of the treatments and the yield superiority recorded over unfertilized control was to the tune of 115.98 and 124.78 per cent during 2011 and 2012 and, respectively (Table 3). It was also observed that the treatment 75 % (NPK) + FYM ($2.25\ t\ ha^{-1}$) + vermicompost ($0.45\ t\ ha^{-1}$) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) being the next best treatment was at par with FYM ($18\ t\ ha^{-1}$), 75 % (NPK) + FYM ($2.25\ t\ ha^{-1}$) + vermicompost ($0.45\ t\ ha^{-1}$) and NPK (90:60:40 $kg\ ha^{-1}$) but significantly superior to rest of the treatments during the period of study.

3. *Green biomass yield ($q\ ha^{-1}$)*

It was observed that green biomass yield varied significantly under the influence of different treatments and followed a similar trend as that of yield (Table 3). The treatment 75 % (NPK) + FYM ($4.5\ t\ ha^{-1}$) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) recorded significantly highest green biomass yield compared to other treatments during both years of investigation and pooled data over years. 75 % (NPK) + FYM ($2.25\ t\ ha^{-1}$) + vermicompost ($0.45\ t\ ha^{-1}$) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) was the next best treatment with regard to increase in green biomass yield over other treatments except that it was at par with 75 % (NPK) + vermicompost ($0.9\ t\ ha^{-1}$) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB). Significantly lowest green biomass yield was recorded with unfertilized control.

4. *Ratio of cob to fodder yield*

Data presented in Table 3 revealed that there was no definite trend amongst different treatments with regard to ratio of cob to fodder yield. During 2011 the treatment FYM ($18\ t\ ha^{-1}$) recorded the highest cob to fodder ratio of 1:1.50 which was closely followed by NPK (90:60:40 $kg\ ha^{-1}$) with the ratio of 1:1.40, whereas during 2012 NPK (90:60:40 $kg\ ha^{-1}$) recorded the highest cob to fodder ratio of 1:1.32 which was closely followed by Biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) with ratio of 1:1.31 and 75 % (NPK) + FYM ($2.25\ t\ ha^{-1}$) + vermicompost ($0.45\ t\ ha^{-1}$) with ratio of 1:1.30. Among the 12 treatments the lowest ratio of cob to fodder yield was observed in unfertilized control during both years of study.

Discussion

Sweet corn being a C4 plant is very efficient in converting solar energy into dry matter. As heavy feeder of nutrients, its productivity is largely dependent on nutrient management. Therefore, it needs fertile soil to express its yield potential. Ideal soils are rarely found in nature. Organic manures not only supply the plant nutrients but also improve soil health. Moreover, the amount of micronutrients present in organic manures may be sufficient to meet the requirement of crop production (Duhan and Singh, 2002). Low soil fertility is one of the bottlenecks to sustain agricultural production and productivity. Anthropogenic factors such as inappropriate land use systems, monocropping, nutrient mining and inadequate supply of nutrients are aggravated the situation. To alleviate the problem, INM is an option as it utilizes available organic and inorganic nutrients to build ecologically sound and economically viable farming system. Intensive cultivation, growing of exhaustive crops, use of unbalanced and inadequate fertilizers accompanied by restricted use of organic manures have made the soils not only deficient in the nutrients, but also deteriorated the soil health resulting in decline in crop response to recommended dose of N-fertilizer in the region under such situation, integrated plant nutrient system (IPNS) has assumed a great importance and has vital significance for the maintenance of soil productivity. Organic manures, particularly FYM and vermicompost, not only supply macronutrients but also meet the requirements of micronutrients, besides improving soil health (Alam *et al.*, 2003 and 2005; Ayoola and Makinde, 2007). To sustain the soil fertility and crop productivity the role of organic manures and fermented organic nutrients are very important. The organic fertilizers in addition to nutrients contain microbial load and growth promoting substances which helps in improving the plant growth, metabolic activity and resistance to pest and diseases. Boosting yield, reducing production cost and improving soil health are three inter-linked components of the sustainable triangle. Biofertilizers are low cost, environmentally safe and non bulky agricultural inputs as a supplementary and complementary factor to mineral nutrition (Sahai, 2004). Plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) affect plant growth through different mechanisms like their ability to fix atmospheric nitrogen fixation and production of plant growth regulators (PGRs). Plant growth regulators (PGRs) are one of the major constituent through

which PGPR affect the plant growth and development (Arshad and Frankenberger, 1998). In contemporary agriculture use of PGPR to improve crop productivity is apprehended to be a rising development in the stores (Pal *et al.*, 2000). Therefore suitable combination of chemical fertilizer and organic manures cultures need to be developed for particular cropping system and soil.

The results of the present study indicated that application of 75 % (NPK) + FYM (4.5 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) significantly increased cob length, cob diameter, weight of cob with and without husk, number of cobs plant⁻¹, grains cob⁻¹ and number of rows cob⁻¹. These results are in conformity with the earlier findings of Tank (2000), Channabasavanna *et al.* (2007), Panwar (2008), Dadarwal *et al.* (2009) and Dilshad (2010). A faster growth CGR and RGR under the influence of NPK + FYM + biofertilizer might have played a significant role in reducing competition for photosynthates and nutrients with other plants resulting in healthy plants. The increased availability of photosynthates might have enhanced number of flowers and their fertilization resulting in higher number of filled cobs and grains cob⁻¹. Further, in most of the cereals, greater assimilating surface at reproductive developments resulted in better grain formation because of adequate production of metabolites and their translocation to grain. The increased NPK concentration and their uptake with better fertilization might have resulted in increased fresh weight of cob with and without husk. It appears that application of 75 % (NPK) + FYM (4.5 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) not only supplied adequate amount of NPK but also might have played a major role (through FYM) in improving physico-chemical and biological properties of soil which might have resulted in the improvement of crop growth and finally enhancing yield attributes of the test crop. Besides, the marked improvement in the productivity of individual plant due to biofertilizer application might be due to its profound effect on dry matter production alongwith accumulation of nutrients. Thus, the greater availability of both these growth inputs might have maintained adequate supplies as per need of plant for yield impact on improving productivity of individual plant which could be ascribed to the fact that crop yield is a function of several yield attributing factors which are dependent on complementary interaction between vegetative and reproductive growth of the crop. The

existence of favourable biofertilizer had a positive influence on both the phases of crop which ultimately led to realization of greater yield attributes.

Yield

Yield is the net result of various agronomic inputs influencing growth and yield attributing characters during the life cycle of the crop. The efficiency of different factors is judged mainly by their contribution towards economic yield. Significantly higher green cob yield with and without husk, green fodder and biomass yield of sweet corn were obtained with application of 75 % (NPK) + FYM (4.5 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) during 2011 and 2012. Higher yields of sweet corn obtained with the application of integrated nutrients was mainly due to their positive effect on various yield contributing characters like cob length, number of cobs per plant, number of grains per cob, length and diameter of cob etc. Earlier Afifi *et al.* (2003), Kumar and Thakur (2004), AICMIP (2004 and 2006) and Dadarwal *et al.* (2009) also found significant and consistent increase in cob and fodder yield with combined application of organic and mineral fertilizers. Concomitant release of nitrogen at most critical stages of their need is a key to ensure higher yields. In the present study, application of FYM and biofertilizer alongwith 75% NPK resulted in maximum yield that establishes the fact of synchrony between availability of nitrogen at critical stages of crop as well as other benefits derived from FYM. Further, application of FYM adds and exploits the fixed nutrients of soil in available form and regulates its supply to the crop through mineralization and prevents them from leaching and other losses (Singh *et al.*, 1996). Therefore, this study clearly revealed the importance of both inorganic and organic nutrients for enhancing the productivity of sweet corn. Increase in fodder yield with application of 75 % (NPK) + FYM (4.5 t ha⁻¹) + biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* + PSB) could be attributed to significant improvement in plant height and dry matter accumulation of sweet corn. Increase in fodder yield with integrated nutrient management has also been reported by Mahala *et al.* (2006) Das *et al.* (2008), Panwar (2008), Singh *et al.* (2009), and Balai *et al.* (2011).

References

- Afifi, M. H., Manal, F. M. and Gomaa, A. M. 2003. Effect of biofertilizer under different levels of chemical fertilizers on maize (*Zea mays* L). *Annals of Agricultural Science Moshtonor* **41**: 1411–1420.
- AICMIP. 2004. 47th Annual Progress Report, All India Coordinated Maize Improvement Project, Directorate of Maize Research, Pusa Campus, New Delhi pp.75.
- AICMIP. 2006. 49th Annual Progress Report, 2005-2006. All India Coordinated Maize Improvement Project, Directorate of Maize Research, Pusa Campus, New Delhi pp.76.
- Alam, S.M., Shah., S.A. Ali, S. and Iqbal, M.M. 2003. Effect of integrated use of industrial wastes and chemical fertilizer on phosphorus uptake and crop yields. *Pakistan Journal Soil Sciences***22**: 81-86.
- Alam, S.M., Shah., S.A. Ali, S. and Iqbal, M. M. 2005. Yield and phosphorus uptake by crops as influenced by chemical fertilizer and integrated use of industrial by-products. *Songkla Journal of Science and Technology* **27**: 9-16.
- Arshad, M. and Frankenberger, W.T. 1998. Plant growth regulating substances in the rhizosphere: Microbial production and functions. *Advances in Agronomy* **62**: 145-151.
- Ayoola, O.T. and Makinde, E.A. 2007. Complementary organic and inorganic fertilizer application: influence on growth and yield of cassava/maize/melon intercrop with a relayed cowpea. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences***1**(3): 187-192.
- Balai, M.L., Verma, A., Nepalia, V. and Kanthaliya, P.C. 2011. Productivity and quality of maize (*Zea mays* L.) as influenced by integrated nutrient management under continuous cropping and fertilization. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences* **81**:374-376.
- Channabasavanna, A.S., Nagappa and Biradar, D.P. 2007. Effect of Integrated nutrient management on Productivity, profitability, and sustainability of irrigated maize. *Karnataka Journal of Agricultural Sciences***20**: 837-839.
- Cochran, W.G. and Cox, G.M. 1967. Experimental Designs. 2nd Ed. Johan Wiley and Sons Inc., New York.

- 340 Dadarwal, R.S., Jain, N.K. and Singh, D. 2009. Integrated nutrient management in baby
341 corn (*Zea mays* L.). *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences***79**:1023-1025.
- 342 Das, A., Lenka, N.K., Sudhishri, S. and Patnaik, U.S. 2008. Influence of integrated
343 nutrient management on production, economics and soil properties in tomato
344 (*Lycopersicon esculentum*) under on-farm condition in Eastern Ghats of Orissa.
345 *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences* **78**:40-43.
- 346 Dilshad, M.D., Lone, M.I., Jilani, G., Azim Malik, M., Yousaf, M., Khalid, R. and
347 Shamin, F. 2010. Integrated nutrient management (IPNM) on maize under
348 rainfed condition. *Pakistan Journal of Nutrition***9**: 896-901.
- 349 Duhan, B.S. and Mahendera Singh. 2002. Effect of green manuring and nitrogen on yield
350 and uptake of micronutrients of rice. *J. Indian Soc. Soil. Sci.*, **50**(2): 178-180.
- 351 Kumar, A. and Thakur, S.K. 2004. Effect of integrated nutrient management on
352 promising composite maize varieties under rainfed mid-hill conditions of
353 Himachal Pradesh. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences* **74** (1) : 40-42.
- 354 Mahala, H.L., Shaktawat, M.S., and Shivran, R.K. 2006. Direct and residual effect of
355 sources and levels of phosphorus and farmyard manure in maize (*Zea mays* L.) -
356 mustard (*Brassica juncea*) cropping sequence. *Indian Journal of*
357 *Agronomy***51**:10-13.
- 358 Pal, K. K, R. Dey, D. M. Bhatt and S. M. Chauhan. 2000. Plant growth promoting
359 fluorescen-Pseudomonads enhanced peanut growth, yield and nutrient
360 uptake. Auburn University WebSite, Available: [http://](http://www.ag.auburn.edu/pdfmanuscripts/pal.pdf)
361 www.ag.auburn.edu/pdfmanuscripts/pal.pdf
- 362 Panwar, A.S. 2008. Effect of integrated nutrient management in maize (*Zea mays* L.) –
363 mustard (*Brassica campestris* var. *toria*) cropping system in mid hills altitude.
364 *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*,**78**: 27-31.
- 365 Pimental, S.R., Patel, G.H. and Ghosh, H.K. 2005. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
366 Report. *Ann. Repo.* pp. 34-36.
- 367 Pradeep, K.R., Yogesh, K. and Saraf, A. 2005. Cultivation of sweet corn (*Zea mays* L.
368 *saccharata*). *Ind. Farming*, **10**-12.
- 369 Pratt, L.F. 1939. Moisture content as an indication of maturity of sweet corn (*Zea mays*
370 *L.saccharata*). *Canna*, **88**: 80.

- 371 Sahai, V. N. 2004. Fundamentals of Soil 3rd edition. Kalyani publishers, New Delhi,
372 India. 245.
- 373 Singh, G., Marwaha, T.S. and Kumar, D. 2009. Effect of resource conserving techniques
374 on soil microbiological parameters under long term maize (*Zea mays* L.) –
375 wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) crop rotation. *Indian Journal of Agricultural*
376 *Sciences* **79**: 94-100.
- 377 Singh, G.R., Choudhary, K.K., Chaure, N.K. and Pandya, K.S. 1996. Effect of seed
378 bacterization and nitrogen level on soil properties, yield parameters and
379 economics of sunflower. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences* **66** (4) : 250-
380 252.
- 381 Tank, R.C. 2000. Effect of zinc fertilization at different levels of nitrogen and
382 phosphorous in conjunction with FYM on nutrient availability and yield of
383 maize in Alfisol. Ph. D. Thesis, Department of Agricultural Chemistry and Soil
384 Science. Maharana Pratap University of Agriculture and Technology, Udaipur.
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401

Table 1. Effect of integrated nutrient management on yield attributes of sweet corn

Treatments	Length of cob with husk (cm)		Length of cob without husk (cm)		Diameter of cob with husk (cm)		Diameter of cob without husk (cm)		Cobs plant ⁻¹		No. of grains row ⁻¹		No. of rows cob ⁻¹	
	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
T1	19.95	19.27	17.16	16.78	3.76	3.70	3.07	3.02	1.00	1.00	29.25	28.31	13.30	13.20
T2	24.04	24.33	20.22	20.52	5.47	5.56	4.14	4.18	1.32	1.40	34.16	34.95	16.40	16.50
T3	22.13	24.22	18.34	20.43	4.82	5.32	3.90	4.10	1.50	1.60	31.22	33.16	14.40	15.90
T4	22.53	23.65	18.76	19.82	5.31	5.47	4.07	4.15	1.45	1.50	32.37	34.32	15.10	15.90
T5	23.00	24.12	19.21	20.33	4.80	4.98	3.95	4.00	1.30	1.35	32.94	34.87	15.60	16.00
T6	23.83	24.59	20.03	20.82	5.57	5.65	4.17	4.21	1.50	1.55	33.19	35.41	15.20	16.10
T7	24.11	24.54	20.32	20.75	5.61	5.69	4.23	4.27	1.45	1.45	34.33	35.11	15.80	16.10
T8	24.69	24.88	20.86	21.10	5.09	5.25	4.11	4.18	1.30	1.40	35.00	36.12	15.90	16.30
T9	24.81	25.11	21.02	21.32	5.80	5.89	4.33	4.38	1.40	1.50	34.27	37.28	16.10	16.40
T10	26.05	26.34	22.21	22.53	6.01	6.08	4.92	4.98	1.70	1.75	36.22	37.85	16.60	16.90
T11	25.11	25.71	21.32	21.92	5.71	5.79	4.62	4.73	1.50	1.60	35.39	36.72	15.90	16.50
T12	25.32	25.84	21.51	22.05	5.79	5.86	4.75	4.80	1.55	1.65	35.67	36.96	16.20	16.50
SEm±	0.383	0.412	0.360	0.365	0.064	0.064	0.049	0.050	0.085	0.087	0.345	0.384	0.181	0.203
CD (p≤0.05)	1.13	1.22	1.06	1.07	0.188	0.190	0.144	0.149	0.249	0.257	1.07	1.19	0.56	0.63

Table 2. Effect of integrated nutrient management on weight of green cob with and without (g) of sweet corn

Treatments	Weight of green cob with husk (g)		Weight of green cob without husk (g)	
	2011	2012	2011	2012
T1	223.60	216.02	168.51	162.11
T2	265.03	272.92	191.03	196.92
T3	222.12	262.87	165.12	190.87
T4	240.11	257.21	176.11	187.21
T5	216.36	223.65	163.36	170.72
T6	247.23	254.26	180.23	184.79
T7	254.31	259.13	184.31	188.32
T8	257.42	265.16	187.42	192.51
T9	261.32	268.41	190.32	195.86
T10	273.11	283.86	198.11	205.31
T11	255.76	267.80	187.76	195.76
T12	259.92	269.93	190.92	197.93
SEm_±	3.390	4.728	2.645	2.781
CD (p≤0.05)	10.01	13.96	7.81	8.21

Table 3. Effect of integrated nutrient management on yield of sweet corn

Treatments	Cob yield with husk (q ha ⁻¹)		Cob yield without husk (q ha ⁻¹)		Fodder yield (q ha ⁻¹)		Green biomass yield (q ha ⁻¹)		Ratio of cob to fodder yield	
	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012	2011	2012
T1	167.42	161.74	126.17	121.38	187.98	182.52	355.40	344.26	1:1.12	1:1.13
T2	261.94	286.08	188.80	206.42	367.70	378.09	629.64	664.17	1:1.40	1:1.32
T3	249.47	314.91	185.45	228.66	374.87	389.69	624.34	704.60	1:1.50	1:1.24
T4	260.68	288.88	191.20	210.26	354.03	363.65	614.71	652.53	1:1.36	1:1.26
T5	210.60	226.07	159.01	172.56	273.53	295.45	484.13	521.52	1:1.30	1:1.31
T6	277.67	295.08	202.42	214.46	351.40	357.79	629.07	652.87	1:1.27	1:1.21
T7	276.10	281.33	200.10	204.45	358.46	354.15	634.56	635.48	1:1.30	1:1.26
T8	250.56	277.95	182.43	201.80	339.75	357.02	590.31	634.97	1:1.36	1:1.28
T9	273.93	301.45	199.50	219.97	382.05	390.98	655.98	692.43	1:1.39	1:1.30
T10	347.63	371.94	252.17	269.02	406.01	410.27	753.64	782.21	1:1.17	1:1.10
T11	287.25	320.82	210.88	234.52	387.99	390.96	675.24	711.78	1:1.35	1:1.22
T12	301.65	333.48	221.57	244.53	388.65	391.76	690.30	725.24	1:1.29	1:1.17
SEm±	3.187	3.455	3.766	4.075	5.179	5.259	12.281	13.924	-	-
CD (p≤0.05)	9.41	10.20	11.12	12.03	15.29	15.52	36.26	41.11	-	-