DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.18782/2320-7051.3007

**ISSN: 2320 – 7051** *Int. J. Pure App. Biosci.* **5** (4): 409-417 (2017)





Research Article

### Residual Effect of Organic Manures and Fertilizer Levels to Preceding Maize on the Nutrient Uptakes of Succeeding Groundnut

T. Bharath<sup>1\*</sup>, G.E. Ch Vidyasagar<sup>2</sup>, V. Praveen Rao<sup>3</sup>, S. Narender Reddy<sup>4</sup> and A. Madhavi<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ph.D (Agronomy), Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, Rajendranagar, Hyd-30
 <sup>2</sup>Professor, Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, Rajendranagar, Hyd-30
 <sup>3</sup>Vice Chancellor, Administrative Office, PJTSAU, Rajendranagar, Hyd-30
 Professor, Department of Crop Physiology, College of Agriculture, Rajendranagar, Hyd-30
 Senior Scientist (SSAC), STCR, ARI, Rajendranagar, Hyd-30
 \*Corresponding Author E-mail: bharath032@gmail.com
 Received: 22.05.2017 | Revised: 3.06.2017 | Accepted: 4.06.2017

#### ABSTRACT

Integrated nutrient management (INM) approach for maize-groundnut cropping system studied in field experiment during 2014-15 and 2015-16.Residual INM treatments and fertilizer levels effected significant differences on the nutrient uptakes of groundnut over control. The plot receiving combination of residual 50% RDF+50% RDN through urban compost ( $M_5$ ) and 100% RDF ( $S_1$ ) exerted significant effect on most of the nutrient uptakes of succeeding groundnut. The highest NPK uptakes was obtained from the plots receiving residual 50% RDF+50% RDN through urban compost ( $M_5$ ) through 100% RDF ( $S_1$ ) and was closely followed by the treatments having residual 50% RDF+50% RDN through FYM ( $M_3$ ) and 100% RDF ( $S_1$ ) at 60,90 days after sowing and at harvest. With regard to interaction between residual treatments and fertilizer levels, combination of  $M_5S_1$  recorded the highest NPK uptake, which was on par with  $M_3S_1$  and  $M_1S_1$  at 60days after sowing during both years of study.

Key words: Urban compost, FYM, INM, NPK uptakes

#### **INTRODUCTION**

One of the most important challenges faced by human beings today is to conserve/sustain natural resources, including soil and water, for increasing food production while protecting the environment. As the world population grows, stress on natural resources increases, making it difficult to maintain food security. Long term food security requires a balance between increasing crop production, maintaining soil health and environmental sustainability. In India, effective nutrient management has played a major role in accomplishing the enormous increase in food production from 52 million tonnes in 1951-52 to 264 million tonnes during 2014-15. However, application of imbalanced and excessive nutrients led to declining nutrientuse efficiency making fertilizer consumption un economical and producing adverse effects on atmosphere<sup>1</sup> groundwater quality causing health hazards and climate change.

**Cite this article:** Bharath, T., Ch Vidyasagar, G.E., Rao, V.P., Reddy, S.N. and Madhavi, A., Residual Effect of Organic Manures and Fertilizer Levels to Preceding Maize on the Nutrient Uptakes of Succeeding Groundnut, *Int. J. Pure App. Biosci.* **5(4):** 409-417 (2017). doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.18782/2320-7051.3007

Groundnut, the premier oilseed crop of India, occupies in an area of about 6.7 million ha and contributes 7.3 million tonnes towards the oilseed production. India stands first in area and second in production, and fifth in productivity (1,000 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) after USA, China, Indonesia and Nigeria. The productivity of groundnut is low in India when compared with other countries mainly due to rain dependency (85%), monoculture (60%) and cultivation on marginal soils of low fertility. Groundnut is an energy rich crop and needs sufficient amount of nutrients and moisture to meet their requirement for growth and development and high yields. Sustainable groundnut production can be achieved by diversifying the groundnut cropping system and nutrient management practices<sup>2</sup>. Integration and incorporation of organic manure (FYM/urban compost) in the agricultural systems helps to improve soil structure, soil microbial activity and soil moisture conservation and which in turn helps to stabilize the production and productivity of the crops. INM is also important for marginal farmers who cannot afford to supply crop nutrients through costly chemical fertilizers.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment entitled "Direct and effect residual of integrated nutrient management in Maize-Groundnut crop sequence in Southern Telangana region" was conducted during kharif and rabi 2014-15 and 2015-16 at College Farm, College of Agriculture, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad, Southern Telangana climatic Zone of Telangana. The soil of experimental site was sandy clay loam with pH of 7.6, Electrical conductivity 0.86 dSm<sup>-1</sup>, low in organic carbon (0.73 dSm<sup>-1</sup>), low in available nitrogen (217 kg  $ha^{-1}$ ) and medium in phosphorus (64 kg  $ha^{-1}$ ) and high in potassium (402 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). The experiment was laid out in a randomized block design for maize during kharif 2014 and 2015 with six treatments consisting of combinations of three fertilizer levels 100,75 and 50 per cent RDF through fertilizer and 25 and 50 per cent RDN through two manures (FYM, Urban compost) with four replications. In succeeding

*rabi* season, the experiment was laid out in split- plot design by taking five residual treatments from preceding maize as main plots and each at 50, 75 and 100 per cent RDF as three sub-treatments with 3 replications for groundnut during *rabi* 2014-15 and 2015-16. The data on nutrient uptakes included nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium were recorded after harvesting in groundnut during both years of study.

Succeeding rabi Groundnut (Kadire-6) was sown on  $26^{\text{th}}$  November during first year and  $16^{\text{th}}$  October during second year adopting a spacing of  $30 \times 10$  cm.

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION** *Nitrogen uptake at different stages*

Nitrogen uptake at 60 and 90 days after sowing observed with 50% RDF+50% RDN through urban compost  $(M_5)$  to preceding maize was comparable with 50% RDN through farmyard manure  $(M_3)$  in the both investigations years of in succeeding groundnut. In both the years, application of 50% RDF+50% RDN through urban compost  $(M_5)$  to preceding maize resulted significantly higher N uptake than that of  $(M_2)$  and  $(M_4)$  it was comparable with uptake recorded in 50% RDF+50% RDN through farmyard manure  $(M_3)$  and 100% RDF  $(M_1)$  at harvest by succeeding groundnut. In both the years, N uptake by groundnut at 30 days after sowing was not significantly different among the treatments.

Whereas, extent of crop removal of these nutrients was comparatively low in treatments with organic manures alone than the chemical treatments which might be due to non-availability of adequate quantity of nutrients throughout the crop growth period as slow release of nutrients from the organic manures become available only in the later stages and making the crop suffer in the early growth period due to want of sufficient nutrients. On the contrary, treatments without nitrogen substitution neither with organics nor with chemical fertilizers (i.e. only organics) recorded lower uptake of these nutrients, because, these manures might not have

ISSN: 2320 - 7051

provided enough nutrients in the area of application, but they help in buildup of soil fertility through quick build up of micro flora and fauna<sup>1</sup>, which might have helped in the supply of considerable amounts of native pool of nutrients from the soil. The variations in nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium uptake through different organic sources (*viz.*, urban compost, FYM) might be attributed to their inherent capacity to supply these nutrients during the crop growth period which in turn influenced the nutrients uptake by the crop.

During both the years of study, fertilizer levels exerted a significant influence on nitrogen uptake of groundnut and it was the highest with 100% RDF  $(S_1)$ , which was however, comparable with 75% RDF  $(S_2)$  and significantly superior to 50% RDF (S<sub>3</sub>) at 60, 90 days after sowing and at harvest. Application of FYM along with N and P fertilizers resulted in the highest total uptake of N, P and K by soybean which was due to higher availability of these nutrients in soil reservoir besides the additional quantity of nutrients supplied by FYM<sup>5</sup>. Similarly, Swetha<sup>4</sup> reported soybean-wheat as efficient cropping system in terms of productivity and profitability.

With regard to interaction between residual treatments and fertilizer levels, combination of  $M_5S_1$  recorded the highest nitrogen uptake, which was on par with  $M_3S_1$  during both years of study at 60 days after sowing.

#### Phosphorus uptake at different stages

Phosphorus uptake at 60 and 90 days after sowing observed with 50% RDF+50% RDN through urban compost ( $M_5$ ) to preceding maize was comparable with 50% RDN through farmyard manure ( $M_3$ ) in the both years of investigations. In both the years, application of 50% RDF+50% RDN through urban compost ( $M_5$ ) to preceding maize resulted significantly higher phosphorus uptake than that of ( $M_2$ ) and ( $M_4$ ) it was comparable with uptake recorded in 50% RDF+50% RDN through farmyard manure ( $M_3$ ) and 100% RDF ( $M_1$ ) at harvest by succeeding groundnut. In both the years, phosphorus uptake by groundnut at 30 days after sowing was not significantly different between the treatments. The positive residual effect of INM and 100% RDF may be due to improvement in greater uptake of nutrients as result of higher nutrient availability with application of organic manure (FYM or urban compost). Other researchers Nathiya and Sanjivkumar<sup>3</sup> reported improvement in soil nutrient status thereby growth of crop with integrated use of manures and fertilizers which improved yield attributes and yield.

During both the years of study, fertilizer levels exerted a significant influence on phosphorus uptake of groundnut and it was the highest with 100% RDF ( $S_1$ ), which was however, comparable with 75% RDF ( $S_2$ ) and significantly superior to 50% RDF ( $S_3$ ) at 60, 90 DAS and at harvest.

With regard to interaction between residual treatments and fertilizer levels, combination of  $M_5S_1$  recorded the highest phosphorus uptake, which was on par with  $M_3S_1$  during both years of study at 60 days after sowing.

#### Potassium uptake at different stages

Potassium uptake by groundnut also showed similar trend as that of nitrogen and phosphorus uptake at 30, 60, 90 DAS and at harvest.

Similar results of residual effect with organic manures were also reported by others<sup>1</sup>. The addition of FYM and urban compost in the present study might have helped the surface soil structure favorable for easy penetration of pegs and better development of pods through increased supply of essential nutrients. In general, the status of available N P K after harvest of groundnut was higher the preceding seasons following INM treatments than that of the non-INM treatment. The status of available N P K, however, decreased with decreasing rate of recommended N to maize substituted with organic sources, FYM or urban compost. Addition of FYM or urban compost in addition to N P K recommended or in conjunction with recommended N P K might have conserved N P K otherwise lost and made available in due

#### Int. J. Pure App. Biosci. 5 (4): 409-417 (2017)

ISSN: 2320 - 7051

course by enhanced microbial activity. Applying of organic plant nutrients along with inorganic fertilizers in the soil, the complexing properties of organic materials which prevented the precipitation and fixation of nutrients and kept them in soluble form. The solubilization action of organic acids produced during the degradation of organic materials

Bharath *et al* 

resulted in better release of the essential nutrients in the soil ecosystem and effectively utilized by the plants for their growth and development and also sustaining the soil quality. Increased retention and availability of N P K with the use of organic manures in cropping systems have been reported by Nathiya and Sanjivkumar<sup>3</sup>.

Table 1: N uptake (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) at 30 DAS of <i>rabi</i> groundnut after kharif maize as influenced by differen
treatments

Treatments given to kharif maize(M)	M) Treatments given to rabi groundnut (S)								
		2014-15	5		2015-16				
	Recom	Recommended Dose of Fertilizer (%)				nmended I	Oose of Fertilize	r (%)	
	100(S <sub>1</sub> )	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	50(S <sub>3</sub> )	Mean	100(S <sub>1</sub> )	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	<b>50(S<sub>3</sub>)</b>	Mean	
M <sub>1</sub> - 100% RDF of NPK	15.26	14.09	12.44	13.93	17.77	16.33	14.95	16.35	
$M_{2}\text{-}$ 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-FYM	13.98	12.68	11.65	12.77	16.05	15.07	13.81	14.98	
$M_{3}\text{-}~50\%$ RDF of NPK +50% N-FYM	17.36	16.11	15.04	16.17	19.45	17.95	16.68	18.03	
$M_{4^{\text{-}}}$ 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-Urban	15.13	13.60	12.40	13.71	17.28	15.55	14.48	15.77	
Compost									
$M_{5^{\text{-}}}$ 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-Urban	19.90	18.64	17.81	18.79	21.65	19.76	18.56	19.99	
Compost									
Mean	16.33	15.02	13.87		18.44	16.93	15.69		
	$S.Em \pm$	CD(P=0.05)				S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)		
Μ	1.85	NS			М	2.80	NS		
S	1.03	NS			S	1.35	NS		
M at S	2.10	NS			M at S	0.33	NS		
S at M	1.27	NS			S at M	0.85	NS		

 Table 2: N uptake (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) at 60 DAS of *rabi* groundnut after *kharif* maize as influenced by different treatments

Treatments given to <i>kharif</i> maize(M)		,	Treatmen	ts given t	o rabi grou	ndnut (S)		
		2014-15	5			201	15-16	
	Recom	Recommended Dose of Fertilizer (%)			Recommended Dose of Fertilizer (%			
	100(S <sub>1</sub> )	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	50(S <sub>3</sub> )	Mean	100(S <sub>1</sub> )	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	50(S <sub>3</sub> )	Mean
M <sub>1</sub> - 100% RDF of NPK	47.69	42.79	38.42	42.97	49.78	45.84	41.53	45.71
$M_{2^{\text{-}}}$ 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-FYM	40.68	36.86	33.16	36.90	43.43	39.75	36.28	39.82
$M_{3^{\text{-}}}$ 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-FYM	54.65	49.89	44.59	49.71	57.77	52.81	47.62	52.73
M <sub>4</sub> - 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-Urban Compost	43.97	41.09	36.96	40.68	46.88	43.98	39.85	43.57
M <sub>5</sub> - 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-Urban Compost	61.54	56.89	51.76	56.73	64.66	59.75	55.41	59.94
Mean	47.69	42.79	38.42		49.78	45.84	41.53	
	S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)				S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)	
Μ	3.41	7.55			М	4.36	9.44	
S	3.48	7.71			S	3.78	6.63	
M at S	4.08	8.79			M at S	4.75	10.87	
S at M	3.56	7.73			S at M	2.76	5.69	

Int. J. Pure App. Biosci. 5 (4): 409-417 (2017)

Table 3: N uptake (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) at 90 DAS of <i>rabi</i> groundnut after <i>kharif</i> maize as influenced by different
treatments

Treatments given to <i>kharif</i> maize(M)	Treatments given to rabi groundnut (S)							
		2014-15	;			20	15-16	
	Recom	mended Dose of	f Fertilize	r (%)	Recom	mended D	ose of Fertilize	r (%)
-	100(S <sub>1</sub> )	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	50(S <sub>3</sub> )	Mean	100(S <sub>1</sub> )	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	<b>50(S<sub>3</sub>)</b>	Mean
M <sub>1</sub> - 100% RDF of NPK	77.03	71.54	64.22	71.19	78.98	73.39	66.48	77.03
M <sub>2</sub> - 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-FYM	66.28	61.64	57.77	62.19	67.06	64.21	60.64	66.28
M <sub>3</sub> - 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-FYM	85.93	84.12	79.61	83.08	84.31	80.81	82.99	85.93
M <sub>4</sub> - 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-Urban	69.78	67.54	63.88	66.83	71.07	67.93	63.79	69.78
Compost								
M <sub>5</sub> - 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-Urban	85.46	84.63	79.21	82.77	90.70	86.36	86.35	85.46
Compost								
Mean	76.90	73.89	68.94		78.42	74.54	72.05	
	S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)				S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)	
М	1.57	2.45			М	0.91	1.78	
S	2.06	4.23			S	1.84	4.75	
M at S	2.39	NS			M at S	1.88	NS	
S at M	2.22	NS			S at M	1.94	NS	

# Table 4: N uptake (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) of haulm at harvest of *rabi* groundnut after *kharif* maize as influenced by different treatments

Treatments given to <i>kharif</i> maize(M)	Treatments given to rabi groundnut (S)								
		2014-15	;		2015-16				
	Recom	mended Dose of	f Fertilize	r (%)	Recommended Dose of Fertilizer (%)				
	100(S <sub>1</sub> )	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	50(S <sub>3</sub> )	Mean	100(S <sub>1</sub> )	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	<b>50(S<sub>3</sub>)</b>	Mean	
M <sub>1</sub> - 100% RDF of NPK	66.9	65.5	50.7	61.0	75.3	69.9	56.9	67.4	
$M_2\text{-}75\%$ RDF of NPK +25% N-FYM	50.8	47.0	38.6	45.5	53.5	49.5	46.0	49.7	
$M_3$ - 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-FYM	69.6	64.5	50.0	61.4	74.2	68.3	55.8	66.1	
M <sub>4</sub> - 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-Urban	54.0	50.4	42.7	49.0	59.0	54.7	47.7	53.8	
Compost									
M <sub>5</sub> - 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-Urban	77.5	71.6	54.1	67.7	83.8	77.4	63.5	74.9	
Compost									
Mean	63.8	59.8	47.2		69.2	64.0	54.0		
	S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)				S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)		
Μ	2.59	6.90			М	4.07	10.01		
S	2.51	5.52			S	2.71	5.53		
M at S	2.70	NS			M at S	4.71	NS		
S at M	3.02	NS			S at M	3.47	NS		

### Table 5: N uptake (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) of pod at harvest of *rabi* groundnut after *kharif* maize as influenced by different treatments

Treatments given to <i>kharif</i> maize(M)	Treatments given to rabi groundnut (S)								
		2014-15	5			20	15-16		
	Recom	<b>Recommended Dose of Fertilizer (%)</b>				Recommended Dose of Fertilizer (%)			
	$100(S_1)$	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	<b>50(S<sub>3</sub>)</b>	Mean	100(S <sub>1</sub> )	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	<b>50(S<sub>3</sub>)</b>	Mean	
M <sub>1</sub> - 100% RDF of NPK	66.25	62.38	52.07	60.23	71.64	66.00	54.94	64.19	
M <sub>2</sub> - 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-FYM	50.77	46.95	38.66	45.46	50.72	46.00	38.01	44.91	
M <sub>3</sub> - 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-FYM	69.81	65.00	50.03	61.61	74.03	68.31	54.33	65.55	
M <sub>4</sub> - 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-Urban	54.25	50.92	43.23	49.47	58.19	53.68	45.87	52.58	
Compost									
$M_5$ - 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-Urban	75.89	70.81	54.76	67.15	81.03	75.77	59.87	72.22	
Compost									
Mean	63.39	59.21	47.75		67.12	61.95	50.60		
	S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)				S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)		
Μ	4.50	10.37			Μ	4.00	9.23		
S	2.80	5.67			S	3.76	7.58		
M at S	2.78	NS			M at S	1.70	NS		
S at M	4.73	NS			S at M	4.23	NS		

Int. J. Pure App. Biosci. 5 (4): 409-417 (2017)

Table 6: P uptake (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) at 30 DAS of <i>rabi</i> groundnut after <i>kharif</i> maize as influenced by differen
treatments

Treatments given to <i>kharif</i> maize(M)			Treatmen	ts given t	o rabi grou	ndnut (S)		
		2014-15	5			201	15-16	
	Recom	mended Dose of	f Fertilize	r (%)	Recom	mended D	ose of Fertilizer	· (%)
	$100(S_1)$	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	50(S <sub>3</sub> )	Mean	$100(S_1)$	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	<b>50(S<sub>3</sub>)</b>	Mean
M <sub>1</sub> - 100% RDF of NPK	4.50	4.00	3.40	3.97	6.20	5.60	5.00	5.60
M <sub>2</sub> - 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-FYM	4.23	3.76	3.44	3.81	5.86	5.37	4.90	5.38
M <sub>3</sub> - 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-FYM	5.23	4.80	4.33	4.79	6.90	6.43	5.86	6.40
M <sub>4</sub> - 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-Urban	4.53	4.17	3.70	4.13	6.20	5.76	5.23	5.73
Compost								
$M_5$ - 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-Urban	6.10	5.63	5.23	5.65	7.83	7.17	6.70	7.23
Compost								
Mean	4.92	4.47	4.02		6.60	6.07	5.54	
	S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)				S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)	
Μ	0.95	NS			Μ	1.23	NS	
S	0.28	NS			S	0.48	NS	
M at S	0.64	NS			M at S	0.51	NS	
S at M	0.16	NS			S at M	1.24	NS	

### Table 7: P uptake (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) at 60 DAS of *rabi* groundnut after *kharif* maize as influenced by different treatments

		ti cath	lents							
Treatments given to <i>kharif</i> maize(M)		Treatments given to rabi groundnut (S)								
		2014-15				2015-16				
	Recom	mended Dose o	f Fertilize	er (%)	Recom	mended D	ose of Fertilizer	· (%)		
	100(S <sub>1</sub> )	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	50(S <sub>3</sub> )	Mean	<b>100(S</b> <sub>1</sub> )	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	<b>50(S<sub>3</sub>)</b>	Mean		
M <sub>1</sub> - 100% RDF of NPK	18.24	15.2	12.65	15.36	25.68	21.2	18.34	21.74		
M <sub>2</sub> - 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-FYM	13.37	11.3	8.86	11.18	19.06	16.5	13.6	16.39		
M <sub>3</sub> - 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-FYM	19.33	16.7	13.46	16.50	26.5	23.5	19.6	23.20		
M <sub>4</sub> - 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-Urban	14.9	13.03	10.3	12.74	20.9	18.73	15.43	18.35		
Compost										
M <sub>5</sub> - 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-Urban	22.53	19.74	16.66	19.64	30.63	27.16	23.83	27.21		
Compost										
Mean	17.67	15.19	12.39		24.55	21.42	18.16			
	S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)				S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)			
М	1.39	3.32			Μ	2.14	4.25			
S	1.24	2.49			S	1.58	3.17			
M at S	1.32	2.71			M at S	1.40	2.85			
S at M	1.51	3.02			S at M	1.64	3.43			

### Table 8: P uptake (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) at 90 DAS of *rabi* groundnut after *kharif* maize as influenced by different

		tı	eatment	S				
Treatments given to <i>kharif</i> maize(M) Treatments given to rabi groundnut (S)								
		2014-15	i			20	15-16	
	Recom	mended Dose of	f Fertilize	r (%)	Recommended Dose of Fertilizer			
	100(S <sub>1</sub> )	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	50(S <sub>3</sub> )	Mean	100(S <sub>1</sub> )	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	<b>50(S<sub>3</sub>)</b>	Mean
M <sub>1</sub> - 100% RDF of NPK	23.6	20.56	17.64	20.60	33.64	29.31	26.43	29.79
$M_{2^{\text{-}}}$ 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-FYM	18.73	16.23	13.4	16.12	26.23	23.76	20.4	23.46
$M_{3^{\text{-}}}$ 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-FYM	24.7	22.03	18.76	21.83	34.63	31.43	27.64	31.23
M <sub>4</sub> - 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-Urban Compost	20.46	18.47	15.56	18.16	28.53	25.9	22.23	25.55
M <sub>5</sub> - 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-Urban Compost	28.33	25.13	21.43	24.96	38.96	35.17	30.9	35.01
Mean	23.16	20.48	17.36		32.40	29.11	25.52	
	S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)				S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)	
М	1.96	4.46			Μ	1.95	4.29	
S	1.34	3.76			S	1.51	3.03	
M at S	1.34	NS			M at S	1.46	NS	
S at M	1.54	NS			S at M	1.02	NS	

Int. J. Pure App. Biosci. 5 (4): 409-417 (2017)

Table 9: P uptake (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) of haulm at harvest of <i>rabi</i> groundnut after <i>kharif</i> maize as influenced by
different treatments

Treatments given to <i>kharif</i> maize(M)	Treatments given to rabi groundnut (S)								
		2014-15			2015-16				
	Recom	mended Dose of	f Fertilize	r (%)	Recom	mended Do	ose of Fertilizer	· (%)	
	100(S <sub>1</sub> )	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	<b>50(S<sub>3</sub>)</b>	Mean	$100(S_1)$	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	50(S <sub>3</sub> )	Mean	
M <sub>1</sub> - 100% RDF of NPK	13.25	11.69	8.2	11.05	15.32	13.46	10.67	13.15	
M <sub>2</sub> - 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-FYM	10.81	9.81	7.57	9.40	12.99	12.02	9.55	11.52	
M <sub>3</sub> - 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-FYM	14.9	13.72	9.83	12.82	17.15	15.85	11.93	14.98	
M <sub>4</sub> - 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-Urban	11.08	10.04	7.93	9.68	13.7	12.68	10.48	12.29	
Compost									
M <sub>5</sub> - 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-Urban	16.57	14.86	10.58	14.00	18.67	17.13	13.09	16.30	
Compost									
Mean	13.32	12.02	8.82		15.57	14.23	11.14		
	S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)				S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)		
М	1.65	3.82			М	2.79	3.07		
S	0.62	1.21			S	1.15	2.31		
M at S	1.23	NS			M at S	1.34	NS		
S at M	0.68	NS			S at M	0.84	NS		

# Table 10: P uptake (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) of pod at harvest of *rabi* groundnut after *kharif* maize as influenced by different treatments

Treatments given to <i>kharif</i> maize(M)		,	Treatmen	eatments given to rabi groundnut (S)					
		2014-15	5		2015-16				
	Recom	mended Dose of	f Fertilize	r (%)	Recom	mended Do	se of Fertilizer	(%)	
	$100(S_1)$	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	<b>50(S<sub>3</sub>)</b>	Mean	100(S <sub>1</sub> )	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	<b>50(S<sub>3</sub>)</b>	Mean	
M <sub>1</sub> - 100% RDF of NPK	12.34	11.02	8.76	10.71	18.65	17.96	12.86	16.49	
M <sub>2</sub> - 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-FYM	10.27	9.4	7.33	9.00	15.37	14.15	11.26	13.59	
M <sub>3</sub> - 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-FYM	13.73	12.6	9.27	11.87	20.65	19.22	14.27	18.05	
M <sub>4</sub> - 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-Urban	10.87	9.93	8.06	9.62	15.83	14.62	11.91	14.12	
Compost									
M <sub>5</sub> - 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-Urban	15.1	13.67	10.3	13.02	22.61	20.67	15.3	19.53	
Compost									
Mean	12.46	11.32	8.74		18.62	17.32	13.12		
	S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)				S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)		
М	1.81	3.72			Μ	1.68	3.14		
S	0.57	1.18			S	0.74	1.69		
M at S	0.78	NS			M at S	0.69	NS		
S at M	0.65	NS			S at M	0.92	NS		

# Table 11: K uptake (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) at 30 DAS of *rabi* groundnut after *kharif* maize as influenced by different treatments

		treatm	ents							
Treatments given to <i>kharif</i> maize(M)		Т	reatment	s given to	to rabi groundnut (S)					
-	2014-15				2015-16					
-	Recomm	Recommended Dose of Fertilizer (%)				Recommended Dose of Fertilizer (%)				
-	100(S <sub>1</sub> )	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	50(S <sub>3</sub> )	Mean	100(S <sub>1</sub> )	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	50(S <sub>3</sub> )	Mean		
M <sub>1</sub> - 100% RDF of NPK	16.99	15.62	13.84	15.48	19.44	18.00	16.52	17.99		
M <sub>2</sub> - 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-FYM	15.19	13.71	12.55	13.82	17.23	16.20	14.87	16.10		
$M_{3^{\text{-}}}$ 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-FYM	19.21	17.96	16.70	17.96	21.69	19.87	18.31	19.96		
M <sub>4</sub> - 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-Urban Compost	16.42	15.05	13.74	15.07	18.82	17.47	16.04	17.44		
M <sub>5</sub> - 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-Urban Compost	22.22	20.75	19.54	20.84	24.24	22.30	20.78	22.44		
Mean	18.00	16.62	15.28		20.28	18.77	17.30			
	S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)				S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)			
Μ	1.06	NS			Μ	1.51	NS			
S	0.87	NS			S	0.98	NS			
M at S	1.23	NS			M at S	1.30	NS			
S at M	0.63	NS			S at M	0.56	NS			

Int. J. Pure App. Biosci. 5 (4): 409-417 (2017)

Table 12: K uptake (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) at 60 DAS of <i>rabi</i> groundnut after <i>kharif</i> maize as influenced by different
treatments

Treatments given to <i>kharif</i> maize(M)	Treatments given to rabi groundnut (S)								
		2014-15	5		2015-16				
	Recom	mended Dose o	f Fertilize	er (%)	Recommended Dose of Fertilizer (%)				
	$100(S_1)$	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	<b>50(S<sub>3</sub>)</b>	Mean	100(S <sub>1</sub> )	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	50(S <sub>3</sub> )	Mean	
M <sub>1</sub> - 100% RDF of NPK	64.40	56.17	48.98	56.39	72.40	64.94	57.26	65.09	
M <sub>2</sub> - 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-FYM	55.70	49.44	42.90	49.47	64.40	57.81	51.05	57.52	
M <sub>3</sub> - 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-FYM	76.38	68.32	59.80	68.05	86.21	78.31	68.81	77.64	
M <sub>4</sub> - 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-Urban	60.63	55.50	47.82	54.54	69.51	63.97	56.08	63.36	
Compost									
M <sub>5</sub> - 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-Urban	87.19	79.51	70.89	79.28	98.32	89.73	82.16	89.98	
Compost									
Mean	68.86	61.79	54.08		78.17	70.95	63.07		
	S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)				S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)		
М	5.98	12.56			Μ	4.07	9.86		
S	4.45	8.95			S	4.54	8.72		
M at S	5.31	11.34			M at S	4.21	9.82		
S at M	5.15	10.37			S at M	3.23	6.76		

### Table 13: K uptake (Kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) at 90 DAS of *rabi* groundnut after *kharif* maize as influenced by different treatments

		tieath	lents							
Treatments given to <i>kharif</i> maize(M)		,	Freatmen	ts given t	o rabi grou	ndnut (S)				
		2014-15				2015-16				
	Recom	Recommended Dose of Fertilizer (%)				Recommended Dose of Fertilizer (%)				
	100(S <sub>1</sub> )	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	<b>50(S<sub>3</sub>)</b>	Mean	$100(S_1)$	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	<b>50(S<sub>3</sub>)</b>	Mean		
M <sub>1</sub> - 100% RDF of NPK	42.20	39.15	35.15	38.66	45.54	41.94	38.00	41.76		
M <sub>2</sub> - 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-FYM	36.61	34.28	31.83	34.31	35.18	36.97	34.82	52.55		
M <sub>3</sub> - 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-FYM	45.90	43.40	40.80	43.23	48.53	46.74	43.57	45.85		
M <sub>4</sub> - 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-Urban	38.92	36.98	34.93	37.21	40.78	38.93	36.46	39.21		
Compost										
M <sub>5</sub> - 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-Urban	49.85	46.93	44.26	46.79	52.38	50.19	47.38	49.43		
Compost										
Mean	42.70	40.15	37.39		44.48	42.95	40.05			
	S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)				S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)			
М	3.09	6.33			Μ	3.34	8.08			
S	1.42	3.68			S	0.72	2.64			
M at S	5.94	NS			M at S	6.95	NS			
S at M	1.64	NS			S at M	5.54	NS			

 Table 14: K uptake (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) of haulm at harvest of *rabi* groundnut after *kharif* maize as influenced by different treatments

Treatments given to <i>kharif</i> maize(M)		1	[reatment	s given to	to rabi groundnut(S)					
		2014-15				2015-16				
	Recom	mended Dose of	Fertilizer	· (%)	Recommended Dose of Fertilizer (%)					
	100(S <sub>1</sub> )	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	50(S <sub>3</sub> )	Mean	100(S <sub>1</sub> )	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	<b>50(S<sub>3</sub>)</b>	Mean		
M <sub>1</sub> - 100% RDF of NPK	56.45	53.21	42.25	45.55	63.45	58.96	46.78	56.40		
$M_{2}\text{-}$ 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-FYM	42.13	37.96	31.16	42.98	46.63	42.13	34.73	41.16		
$M_{3^{\text{-}}}$ 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-FYM	59.13	55.66	43.7	48.96	65.1	61.4	48.4	58.30		
M <sub>4</sub> - 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-Urban Compost	47.13	44.06	36.83	48.22	52.13	48.83	40.96	47.31		
M <sub>5</sub> - 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-Urban Compost	64.76	60.7	48.06	54.38	71.16	66.8	53.1	63.69		
Mean	53.92	50.32	40.40		59.69	55.62	44.79			
	S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)				S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)			
Μ	4.68	9.18			М	3.93	8.75			
S	2.49	4.03			S	2.53	5.11			
M at S	3.10	NS			M at S	3.19	NS			
S at M	2.83	NS			S at M	3.08	NS			

Int. J. Pure App. Biosci. 5 (4): 409-417 (2017)

 Table 15: K uptake (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) of pod at harvest of *rabi* groundnut after *kharif* maize as influenced by different treatments

Treatments given to <i>kharif</i> maize(M)		•	Treatmen	ts given t	n to rabi groundnut(S)				
	2014-15				2015-16				
	Recom	nended Dose of	f Fertilize	r (%)	Recom	ommended Dose of Fertilizer (%)			
	100(S <sub>1</sub> )	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	50(S <sub>3</sub> )	Mean	100(S <sub>1</sub> )	75(S <sub>2</sub> )	50(S <sub>3</sub> )	Mean	
M <sub>1</sub> - 100% RDF of NPK	13.37	12.23	10.50	12.03	14.67	13.53	11.8	13.33	
$M_{2}\text{-}$ 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-FYM	14.38	12.13	11.57	12.69	15.74	13.49	12.9	14.05	
$M_{3}\text{-}~50\%$ RDF of NPK +50% N-FYM	16.00	14.96	12.27	14.41	17.47	16.43	13.7	15.88	
M <sub>4</sub> - 75% RDF of NPK +25% N-Urban Compost	14.87	12.96	12.08	13.30	16.29	14.38	13.5	14.72	
M <sub>5</sub> - 50% RDF of NPK +50% N-Urban Compost	17.67	15.30	13.27	15.41	19.24	16.87	14.8	16.98	
Mean	15.26	13.52	11.94		16.68	14.94	13.36		
	S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)				S.Em <u>+</u>	CD(P=0.05)		
Μ	1.47	3.27			Μ	1.69	3.69		
S	0.90	1.89			S	0.94	1.81		
M at S	1.20	NS			M at S	1.23	NS		
S at M	0.49	NS			S at M	0.63	NS		

#### CONCLUSION

Nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium uptake at initial stage was not significantly influenced by treatments where as at 60,90 days after sowing and at harvest interaction of residual 50% RDF+50% RDN through urban compost ( $M_5$ ) and 100% RDF ( $S_1$ ) on par with integration of residual 50% RDF+50% RDN through FYM ( $M_3$ ) and 100% RDF( $S_1$ ) during both the years.

#### Acknowledgements

This research was conducted in Professor Jayashankar Telangana State Agricultural University, Hyderabad and Telangana state. I gratefully acknowledge the chairman, Prof. Dr. G.E.Ch Vidyasagar who guided me during the experiments and I thank my family members and friends circle also, who have helped me directly and indirectly.

#### REFERENCES

 Dhadge, S.M. and Satpute, N.R., Integrated nutrient management in groundnut (Arachis hypogaea L.)-maize (Zea mays) cropping system. *International Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 10(1): 365-368 (2014).

- Kannan, K., Khola, O.P.S., Singh, D.V., Selvi, V. and Murugesan, A., Integrated nutrient management for groundnut based cropping system in semi-arid region. Central soil & water conservation research & training institute, Research Centre (2013).
- 3. Nathiya, K.V. and Sanjivkumar,V., Combined effect of different plant nutrients of organic and inorganic sources on nutrient uptake and yield of groundnut crop. *Journal of Applied and Natural Science*, **6(2)**: 463-466 (2014).
- Swetha, B.N., Studies on nutrient management through organics in soybean

   wheat cropping system. M. Sc. (Agri.) Thesis, Univ. Agric. Sci., Dharwad (India) (2007).
- Vidyavathi, G.S., Dasog, H.B., Babalad, N.S., Hebsur, S.K., Gali, S.G., Patil, and Alagawadi, A.R., Influence of nutrient management practices on crop response and economics in different cropping systems in a vertisol. *Karnataka J. Agric. Sci.*, 24(4): 455-460 (2011).