http://www.academicjournals.org/AJAR

African Journal of Agricultural Research

Full Length Research Paper

Effect of bulb density, nitrogen application time and deheading on growth, yield and relative economics of daffodil cv. Tunis (*Narcissus* sp.)

I. M. Khan*, F. U. Khan, M. Salmani, M. H. Khan, M. A. Mir and Amir Hassan

Division of Floriculture, Medicinal and Aromatic Plants, Sher-e- Kashmir University of Agricultural Science and Technology of Kashmir, Shalimar, Srinagar, India.

Accepted 8 August, 2013

A two years field experiment was carried out to study the effect of bulb density, nitrogen application time and deheading on the growth and bulb yield of daffodil cv. Tunis was conducted during winter seasons of 2009 to 2010 and 2010 to 2011 on silty clay loam soil, low in available Nitrogen, medium in available phosphorus and potassium with neutral pH. The study revealed that the bulb density at 15.0 t ha⁻¹ proved significantly superior recording higher values of growth characters and resulted in 30.30 and 57.47% higher bulb yield than 12.50 and 10.00 t ha⁻¹, respectively. Application of nitrogen in two splits at 1st week of March and April significantly improved the growth characters and registered 9.88 and 21.56% higher bulb yield than single split of nitrogen at 1st week of March, respectively. Deheading at tight bud stage did not affect the top growth characters *viz.*, number and dry weight of leaves and leaf area however, significantly improved bulb dry weight and increased the bulb yield by 5 to 15% over no deheading. Bulbs planted at 15.0 t ha⁻¹ and supplied with Nitrogen in 2 splits at 1st week of March and April followed by deheading at tight bud stage recorded the highest benefit cost of Rs 0.51(per rupee) and net returns of Rs 6, 30,508.0 ha⁻¹.

Key words: B.C ratio, bulb weight, nitrogen splits, deheading, tight bud stage.

INTRODUCTION

Daffodil (*Narcissus* sp.), the most important early season on blooming flower, is known for its unmatched beauty and fragrance. Like other bulbous crops, the flower and bulb production in daffodil is influenced greatly by agronomic and environmental factors. Unfortunately the work done on these aspects is lacking in the country. As such, it is essential to standardize the cultivation of daffodils so that they can be grown in the farmers field by adopting proper management practices because cultural and management practices play a vital role in the qualitative traits of flowering plants. One of the important management practices is the maintenance of proper bulb

density for obtaining maximum quality bulbs per unit area. Planting of quality bulbs would improve the quality of flowers. No doubt, nitrogen is the limiting nutrient element for growth and development of bulbs but there is need to identity the time for its application so that it is need utilized by the crop to maximum level. Besides, it is a known fact that the flowers and bulbs are two major sinks in bulb crops and the removal of one sink may influence the other sink (John and Khan, 2003). Deheading at tight bud stage would lead to maximum accumulation of photosynthates in bulbs thereby would improve the bulb vield 2005). (Xia et al.,

In view of this, the present study was initiated during winter seasons of 2009 to 2010 and 2010 to 2011.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment to study the effect of bulb density, nitrogen application time and deheading on growth, bulb production in daffodil cv. Tunis was conducted during winter seasons of 2009 to 2010 and 2010 to 2011 at the Research Farm, Division of Floriculture, Medicinal and Aromatic plants, Sher-e- Kashmir University of Agriculture Sciences and Technology of Kashmir, Shalimar on a silty clay loam soil low in available nitrogen (269.0 kg ha⁻¹), medium in available phosphorus (14.6 kg ha¹) and potassium (160.0 kg ha⁻¹) with neutral pH (7.5). The treatments consisting of 3 factors viz., 3 bulb densities (10.00, 12.50 and 15.00 kg ha⁻¹), 3 nitrogen application time (2 splits in 2nd week of Nov and 1st week of March, 2 splits in 1st week of March and April and single split in 1st week of March), 2 deheadings (no deheading and deheading at tight bud stage) were laid out in a randomized block design replicated thrice. The fertilizers viz., phosphorus at the rate of 150 kg ha⁻¹ and potassium at the rate of 75 kg ha⁻¹ through single super phosphate and murate of potash, respectively were applied as basal before planting of bulbs. Nitrogen at the rate of 150 kg ha⁻¹ through urea was applied as per treatments. Other cultural and management operations were carried as per recommended package of practices. Uniform sized bulbs at the rate as per treatment were planted in 2nd week of November, 2009. Deheading operation as per treatment was carried at tight bud stage as per treatment. Observations on various parameters viz., number and dry weight of leaves paint¹, leaf area per plant at 30, 60 and 90 DAM during 2009 to 2010 and 2010 to 2011, bulb dry weight at 30, 60, and 90 DAM during 2010 to 2011 and bulb yield were recorded from 5 randomly selected plants from each plot. Bulbs were excavated on 25.07.2011. Data was analysed by the method given by Panse and Sukhatme (1985). Benefit cost ratio and net returns were determined on the basis of cost of cultivation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The growth characters viz., number and dry weight of leaves and leaf area recorded significant improvement with bulb density of 15.00t ha⁻¹ over 10.00 t ha⁻¹ during 2010 to 2011 at 30, 60 and 90 days after March 1st (DAM), however, all these parameters remained non significant during 2009 to 10 (Table 1). Number of bulbs and bulb yield was significantly highest at bulb density of 15.0 t ha⁻¹ (Table 2). Whereas bulb dry weight at 30, 60 and 90 DAM was significantly highest bulb density of 10.0 t ha⁻¹. Bulb yield at 15.0 t ha⁻¹ 30.30 and 57.47% more than 12.5 and 10.0 t ha⁻¹, respectively, Leopold and Kriedmann (1980) indicated that within limits, plants inherent capacity for growth is direct consequence of how successfully it exploits the local environment. Such factors as light, temperature, moisture and mineral nutrition assumes major importance. The higher density affords more leaves, greater leaf area and more bulb dry weight per unit area and therefore greater potential for overall yield. When higher density does not produce competition for above factors, the photosynthetic rate of individual leaves would tend to increase Kumar et al.

(2003) and Nazki et al. (2005) also support the results. Singh and Singh (2005) found that medium bulb spacing of 20×25 cm produced maximum growth and number of bulbs in tuberose as compared to bulb spacings of 20×20 cm and 30×30 cm. Similarly, Patel et al. (2006) reported that for higher yield of bulbs, tuberose could be planted at closer spacing instead of wider spacing.

Application of nitrogen in splits at 1st week of March and April resulted in significant improvement in growth characters that is, number and dry weight at 30, 60 and 90 DAM and number of bulbs ha during 2010 to 2011 in comparison to single split of nitrogen at 1st week of March and 2 splits of nitrogen at 2nd week of November and 1st week of March and the treatments recorded 9.88 and 21.56% higher bulb yield than single nitrogen split in 1st week of March and 2 splits of nitrogen in 2nd week of November and 1st week of March, respectively. The treatment ensured regular supply of nitrogen is small quantities at critical growth stages. Thus, proper utilization of applied nitrogen might be responsible for better growth. Goss (1973) also reported similar findings. Besides, Nitrogen is an essential constituent of proteins, chlorophyll and amino acids. Regular and timely supply of nitrogen to bulbs might have increased the weight of bulbs and hence increase in total bulb yield. Singh et al. (2005) and Hermandez et al. (2008) found that application of nitrogen in 2 splits viz., half at planting and half at spike initiation increased the number of leaves plant⁻¹, leaf length, plant height, reduced the days to sprouting and lesser number of stems of inferior quality of tuberose bulbs. These results also support the present findings.

Deheading did not affect the growth characters *viz.*, number of leaves, leaf dry weight and leaf area. However, deheading at tight bud stage significantly improved bulb dry weight at 30, 60 and 90 DAM and number of bulbs than no deheading. The treatment recorded 5.15% increase in total bulb yield over no deheading. Increase in bulb dry with and total bulb yield under deheading at tight bud stage is obviously a result of more resource allocation to the under ground sinks which could other wise have been used by the developing flowers (Wang and Breen, 1984). Any relocation of photosynthates as a consequence of elimination of floral sink mostly takes place to the main bulb. The results agree with those of John and Khan (2003).

The study revealed that the bulbs planted at the rate of 15.0 t ha⁻¹ and supplied with 150 kg ha⁻¹ nitrogen in 2 splits at 1st week of March and April followed by deheading at tight bud stage recorded the highest benefit cost ratio of Rs 0.51 and net returns of 6,30,508.16 ha⁻¹ (Table 3). Thus the study leads to the conclusion that for producing economic highest bulb yield in daffodil cv. Tunis bulb at the rate of 15.00 t ha⁻¹ be planted and supplied with 150 kg N ha⁻¹ in 2 splits at 1st week of March and April followed by deheading at tight bud stage.

Table 1. Growth characters in daffodil cv. Tunis as affected by bulb density, nitrogen application time and deheading.

	Days after March 1st (DAM)												
_		Nu	mber of lea	aves plant ⁻¹	(g)				Leaf area	palnt ⁻¹ (m ²)			
Treatment		30		60		90		30		60		90	
	2009- 2010	2010- 2011	2009- 2010	2010- 2011	2009- 2010	2010- 2011	2009- 2010	2010- 2011	2009- 2010	2010- 2011	2009- 2010	2010- 2011	
ted bulb weight (t ha ⁻¹)													
10.00	3.20	3.77	4.18	4.47	3.88	4.17	24.08	28.30	34.90	38.00	28.36	31.26	
12.50	3.28	3.92	4.26	4.64	3.96	4.34	26.78	31.60	35.05	34.26	28.55	33.05	
15.00	3.34	4.13	4.31	4.87	4.01	4.59	27.98	32.54	27.98	32.54	29.16	33.66	
P= 0.05)	NS	0.25	NS	0.39	NS	0.37	NS	0.85	NS	1.58	NS	1.74	
gen application time (150 kg ha ⁻¹))												
Two splits (2 nd week of Nov. and 1st week of March)	3.24	3.88	4.24	4.52	3.98	4.22	25.81	30.89	35.00	39.78	28.50	31.80	
Two splits (1st week of March and 1st week of April)	3.30	4.10	4.31	4.98	4.02	4.68	26.98	31.70	35.40	42.74	29.21	34.61	
Single split (1st week of March)	3.29	3.84	4.20	4.50	3.85	4.20	35.85	29.85	35.20	37.17	28.36	31.66	
P= 0.05)	NS	0.25	NS	0.39	NS	0.37	NS	1.85	NS	1.58	NS	1.74	
No deheading	3.26	3.91	4.24	4.71	3.98	4.39	26.36	31.22	25.30	40.12	29.05	32.94	
Deheading at tight bud stage	3.28	3.97	4.26	4.62	3.92	4.34	26.20	80.40	35.10	39.74	28.33	32.44	
P= 0.05)	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	
	red bulb weight (t ha ⁻¹) 10.00 12.50 15.00 P= 0.05) gen application time (150 kg ha ⁻¹) Two splits (2 nd week of Nov. and 1st week of March) Two splits (1st week of March and 1st week of April) Single split (1st week of March) P= 0.05) No deheading Deheading at tight bud stage	2009- 2010 red bulb weight (t ha ⁻¹) 10.00	### 30 2009- 2010- 2010 2011 2010- 2010 2011 2010 2011 201	30 6 2009- 2010- 2010 2009- 2010 2009- 2010 red bulb weight (t ha ⁻¹) 10.00 3.20 3.77 4.18 12.50 3.28 3.92 4.26 15.00 3.34 4.13 4.31 P= 0.05) NS 0.25 NS gen application time (150 kg ha ⁻¹) Two splits (2 nd week of Nov. and 1st week of March) 3.24 3.88 4.24 Two splits (1st week of March and 1st week of April) 3.30 4.10 4.31 Single split (1st week of March) 3.29 3.84 4.20 P= 0.05) NS 0.25 NS No deheading 3.26 3.91 4.24 Deheading at tight bud stage 3.28 3.97 4.26	Two splits (2 nd week of March) and 1st week of March) and 1st week of April) Single split (1st week of March) and 1st week of March) Single split (1st week of March) Single split (1st week of March) Single split (1st week of March) Deheading at tight bud stage 3.28 3.91 4.26 4.52	Number of leaves plant (y) (y)	Number of leaves plant 1900 2010 2009 2010 2009 2010 2009 2010 201	Parison Pari	Part Part				

		Leaf dry weight plant ⁻¹ (g)						
Treatment		30		60		90		
		2009-2010	2010-2011	2009-2010	2010-2011	2009-2010	2010-2011	
Plante	d bulb weight (t ha ⁻¹)							
W_1	10.00	0.79	0.93	0.90	1.04	0.99	1.14	
W_2	12.50	0.82	1.00	0.92	1.11	1.00	1.18	
W_3	15.00	0.82	1.04	0.94	1.15	1.04	1.25	
CD (P:	= 0.05)	NS	0.05	NS	0.06	NS	0.08	
Nitrog	en application time (150 kg ha ⁻¹)							
N ₁	Two splits (2 nd week of Nov. and 1st week of March)	0.81	0.97	0.91	1.08	1.00	1.16	
N_2	Two splits (1st week of March and 1st week of April)	0.82	1.02	0.95	1.17	1.05	0.28	
N_3	Single split (1st week of March)	0.80	0.98	0.90	1.05	0.98	1.30	
CD (P:	= 0.05)	NS	0.05	NS	0.06	NS	0.08	
Dehea	ding							
D_0	No deheading	0.81	1.00	0.93	1.11	1.03	1.21	

Table 1. Contd.

D ₁ Deheading at tight bud stage	0.81	0.98	0.91	1.09	0.99	1.17
CD (P= 0.05)	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

Table 2. Bulb dry weight (after March 1st) and total bulb yield daffodil cv. Tunis as affected by bulb density, nitrogen application time and deheading.

Tractment	Bulb	dry weight plan	t ⁻¹ (g)	Bulb weight	Number of bulbs ha ⁻¹	Total bulb yield
Treatment —	30	60	90	plant ⁻¹ (g)	(lakhs)	(q/ha ⁻¹)
Planted bulb weight (t ha ⁻¹)						
W ₁ 10.00	10.85	13.261	15.94	39.02	6.101	14.86
W ₂ 12.50	10.03	12.74	15.06	38.85	7.141	17.16
W ₃ 15.00	9.70	11.50	13.37	37.29	9.864	22.36
CD (P= 0.05)	0.29	0.38	0.36	0.97	0.72	0.39
Nitrogen application time (150 kg ha ⁻¹)						
N ₁ Two splits (2 nd week of Nov. and 1st week of March)	10.19	12.07	14.15	37.02	7.262	16.37
N ₂ Two splits (1st week of March and 1st week of April)	10.65	13.06	15.70	39.77	8.130	19.90
N ₃ Single split (1st week of March)	10.34	12.33	14.52	38.37	7.711	18.11
CD (P= 0.05)	0.29	0.38	0.36	0.97	0.72	0.39
Deheading						
D ₀ No deheading	10.18	12.20	14.20	37.74	7.655	17.67
D ₁ Deheading at tight bud stage	10.60	12.78	15.38	39.02	7.747	18.58
CD (P= 0.05)	0.23	8.31	0.29	0.79	NS	0.32

Table 3. Relative economics (hectare Basis) of daffodil cv. Tunis as affected by bulb density, nitrogen application time and deheading.

Treatment combination	Gross returns (ha ⁻¹)	Cost of cultivation (ha ⁻¹)	Net returns (ha ⁻¹)	Benefit cost ratio (returns per rupee invested)
$W_1 N_1 D_0$	10,02,240.00	8,29,061.84	1,73,178.16	0.21
$W_1 N_1 D_1$	10,27,800.00	8,29,061.84	1,98,738.16	0.24
$W_1 N_2 D_0$	11,22,660.00	8,29,061.84	2,93,598.16	0.35
$W_1 N_2 D_1$	11,39,220.00	8,29,061.84	3,10,158.16	0.37
$W_1 N_3 D_0$	10,92,060.00	8,29,061.84	2,62,998.16	0.32
$W_1 N_3 D_1$	11,08,620.00	8,29,061.84	2,79,558.16	0.34
$W_2 N_1 D_0$	11,96,460.00	10,29,611 .84	1,66,848.16	0.16
$W_2 N_1 D_1$	12,13,020.00	10,29, 611.84	1,83,40.08	0.18

Table 3. Contd.

$W_2 N_2 D_0$	13,52,700.00	10,29, 611.84	3,23,088.16	0.31	
$W_2 N_2 D_1$	13,69,280.00	10,29, 611.84	3,39,668.16	0.33	
$W_2 N_3 D_0$	12,77,280.00	10,29, 611.84	2,47,668.16	0.24	
$W_2 N_3 D_1$	12,93,840.00	10,29, 611.84	2,64,228.16	0.25	
$W_3 N_1 D_0$	16,88,220.00	12,30,151.84	4,58,068.16	0.37	
$W_3 N_1 D_1$	17,04,780.00	12,30 ,151.84	4,74,628.16	0.38	
$W_3 N_2 D_0$	18,44,460.00	12,30 ,15 1.84	6,14,308.16	0.50	
$W_3 N_2 D_1$	18,60,660.00	12,30 ,151.84	6,30,508.16	0.51	
$W_3 N_3 D_0$	17,69,040.00	12,30 ,15 1.84	5,38,888.16	0.44	
$W_3 N_3 D_1$	17,85,600.00	12,30 ,15 1.84	5,55,448.16	0.45	

Where: $W_{1=10.00}$ t ha⁻¹, $W_{2=12.50}$ t ha⁻¹, $W_{3=15.00}$ t ha⁻¹, $N_{1}=2$ splits in 2nd week of November and 1st week of March, $N_{2}=2$ splits in 1st week of March and April, $N_{3}=10.00$ single split in 1st week of March, $N_{0}=10.00$ No deheading, $N_{1}=10.00$ Deheading at tight bud stage.

REFERENCES

- Goss GA (1973). Physiology of plants and their cells Pergamon Press, INC, New York.
- Hermandez DMI, Marrero GV, Gonzalez HM, Salgado PJM, Geda VA (2008). Nitrogen levels and their fractioning in gladiolus cultivation for Fessalitic red soils. Pesquisa Agropecuaria Erasileira. 43(1):21-27.
- John AQ, Khan FU (2003). Effect of flower and leaf removal on bulb production in tulip cv. Cassini. SKUAST J. Res. 5:190-193.
- Kumar R, Chaturvedi OP, Misra RL (2003). Effect of N and P on growth and flowering of gladiolus. J. Ornamental Hortic. 6(2):100-103.
- Leopold AC, Kriedemann PE (1980). Plant growth and development. 2nd Ed. Tata Mc Graw-Hill Publications, New Delhi
- Nazki IT, Khan FU, Qadri ZA, Paul TM, Sheikh MQ (2005). Effect of crop duration, planting density and bulb grade on foliar, floral and bulb growth in *Naciassus tazetta* linn. cv. Paper White Grandiflorus. J. Ornamental Hortic. 8(3):222-224.

- Panse VG, Sukhatme PV (1985). Statistical Method for Agricultural Workers. (2nd Eds.). Indian council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi. P. 381.
- Patel MM, Parmar PB, Parmar BR (2006). Effect of nitrogen, phosphorus and spacing on growth and flowering in tuberose (*Polyanthus tuberosa* Linn.) cultivar Single. J. Ornamental Hortic. 9(4):286-289.
- Singh SK, Singh RK (2005). Response of different levels of nitrogen and plant density on the performance of tuberose (*Polyanthus tuberosa* L.) cv. Double Plant Arch. 4(2):515-517.
- Singh SRP, Dhiraj K, Singh VK, Dwivedi R (2005). Effect of NPK fertilizers on growth and flowering of tubrose cv. Single. Haryana J. Hortic. Sci. 34(1/2):84.
- Wang YT, Breen PJ (1984). respiration and weight changes of Easter lily during development. Hortic. Sci. 19:702-703.
- Xia YP, Zheng HJ, Huang CH (2005). Studies on the bulb development and its physiological mechanism in lilium oriental hybrids. Acta Hortic. 29(3):273-281.