

2 **Influence of zypmite on productivity and nutrient uptake of chickpea (*Cicer***
3 ***arietinum* L.) Crop under rainfed condition Chhattisgarh plain region**

4 L.K. xxxxxxxxxxx, Awxxxxxxxx^{1*}, S.S. xxxxxx, V.N. xxxxxx and A. xxxxxx¹

5 Department of Soil Science,

6 Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalya, Raipur, Chhattisgarh-492012, India

7 **ABSTRACT**

8 A field experiment was conducted to evaluate the effect of Zypmite fertilizer along with di-
9 ammonium phosphate (DAP) in study. The application of Zypmite exhibited in growth, yield,
10 nutrients uptake and availability of nutrient in soil. Zypmite response, the maximum number of
11 branches (25.8 p⁻¹), test weight (18.5 gm) and grain yield (17.10 q ha⁻¹) was observed with 50 kg
12 P₂O₅ through DAP + 40 kg S through Zypmite (T₆). The nitrogen (69.52 kg ha⁻¹) and phosphorous
13 (7.89 kg ha⁻¹) uptake was also found maximum under T₆ and minimum in control (T₁). The
14 potassium (39.27 kg ha⁻¹) and sulphur (7.85 kg ha⁻¹) uptake was observed maximum under 50 kg
15 P₂O₅ through DAP + 20 kg S through Zypmite (T₅). After harvesting of crop, available nutrient
16 status was observed higher available nitrogen (243.0 kg ha⁻¹) under T₆ and available phosphorous
17 was significantly higher in T₂ and T₉ (18.0 kg ha⁻¹) as compared to control. Availability of
18 potassium in all treatments was significantly not influenced during both years. The sulphur
19 availability in soil was significantly influenced among treatment and found maximum (23.0 kg ha⁻¹)
20 under 40 kg sulphur through Zypmite (T₇). It was observed that Zypmite and chemical fertilizers,
21 enhanced yield and higher uptake of nutrient as well as improved soil fertility.

22 **Key Words- Zypmite, Sulphur, Productivity, Chickpea, Yield**

23 **INTRODUCTION**

24 Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) is a most important pulse crop grown in India. Pulses can be
25 grown on a varied soil series and climatic environments, and play important role in crop rotation,
26 mixed and inter-cropping and maintain soil fertility through nitrogen (N) fixation in soil. Pulse
27 crops are major source of protein among the all vegetarian in India, and having essential amino
28 acids, vitamins and minerals Pingoliya *et al.* (2013). They contain 22 to 24 percent protein, which is
29 just about double in wheat and thrice in rice Shukla *et al.* (2013). It is an integral part of the
30 cropping system of the farmers all over the country, because this crop fits well in the crop rotation

31 *Corresponding Email:-xxxxxxxx@gmail.com

32 ¹Indian Institute of Soil Science, Bhopal-462038, India

33 and mixed cropping. It has multipurpose use and ability to grow under the condition of low fertility
34 and varying conditions of soil and climate. Kumbhare *et al.* (2014) concluded that good agronomic
35 management practices, awareness campaign of integrated pest management (IPM) and use of high
36 yielding varieties (HYV), pulses are more economic as compared to cereals. Dry land areas comprise
37 virtually 64% of the total cultivated area and recorded 42% of total food grain production in the
38 Indian agriculture (Anonymous, 2011). In Chhattisgarh state about 803.03 ha area under chickpea
39 cultivation (ICRISAT- Annual progress report 2011-12).

40 Sulphur is now recognized as major plant nutrient, along with nitrogen (N), phosphorus (P),
41 and potassium (K). Poor nutrient management is vital rationale of low productivity of chickpea.
42 Phosphorus is an important fertilizer in chickpea production (Dotaniya *et al.*, 2014; Dotaniya *et al.*,
43 2013; Dutaniya and Datta, 2013). Phosphorus has a positive effect on nodule formation and
44 nitrogen fixation in legume crops (Deo and Khaldelwal, 2009). Sulphur constitutes the main
45 element of amino acids such as cysteine and methionine, which are of essential nutrient value. In
46 addition to these functions, ferro-sulphur proteins play an important role in nitrogen fixation. This
47 element positively affects nodulation in legume crops in particular. It is essential for the growth and
48 development of all crops, without exception. Most of the plants requirement of Sulphur is absorbed
49 through the roots in the form of sulphate (SO_4^{2-}). Sulphur deficiency is becoming more critical with
50 each passing year which is severely restricting crop yield, produce quality, nutrient use efficiency
51 and economic returns on millions of farms. Like any essential nutrient, sulphur also has certain
52 specific functions to perform in the plant. Thus, sulphur deficiencies can only be corrected by the
53 application of sulphur fertilizer (Tandon and Messick, 2007).

54 Due to continuous cropping and imbalanced use of fertilizers, the deficiencies of secondary
55 nutrients are also coming up. The continuous use of S- free fertilizers has also created the problem
56 of S deficiency. Zypmite is a new source of S which contains 15% S and can be a beneficial to
57 different crops. In present study, Zypmite product was tested with combinations of different
58 fertilizer sources in different quantities to study the effect of Zypmite on chickpea crop. The
59 experiment was under taken during Rabi season 2010-11 and 2011-12 with chickpea as a test crop
60 in *Vertisols* of the instructional cum research farm of IGKV Raipur, with the objectives to study the
61 effect of Zypmite on the productivity of chickpea crop and nutrient uptake.

62 MATERIALS AND METHODS

63 The experiment was conducted rabi session of 2010-11 and 2011-12 at the research cum
64 instructional farm of Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur Chhattisgarh. The soil of the
65 experimental field comes under the soil order of *Vertisols*. This soil is locally known as *Kanhar* and
66 identified as Arang II series. It is clayey in texture, dark brown to black in color, neutral to alkaline

67 in soil reaction (pH 7.6) due to presence of lime concretion in lower horizon. The soil is 1-1.5 meter
68 deep. Soil is represented as typical fine *montmorillonitic, hyperthermic, udic chromustert*. The ten
69 treatments were selected with three replicates and each consisted of a Control (T₁), 50 kg P₂O₅
70 through DAP (T₂), 50 kg P₂O₅ through DAP+ Ca through CaCO₃+ Zn (5 kg) through EDTA (T₃),
71 50 kg P₂O₅ through DAP+ Ca through CaCO₃ (T₄), 50 kg P₂O₅ through DAP+ 20 kg S through
72 Zypmite (T₅) 50 kg P₂O₅ through DAP+ 40 kg S through Zypmite (T₆), 40 kg S through Zypmite
73 (T₇), 50 Kg P₂O₅ through DAP+ 0.5 % S spray through Zypmite (T₈), 50 kg P₂O₅ through DAP+ 1
74 % S spray through Zypmite (T₉) and Soil test based fertilizer recommendation (T₁₀) with chickpea
75 (JG -226) crop having a plot size 5x5 m. The treatments were replicated thrice and laid out under
76 randomized block design (RBD). After thorough field preparation initial soil samples were taken to
77 analyze the initial soil properties. The initial soil sample was analyzed for available major nutrients;
78 nitrogen (N), phosphorous (P), potassium (K) and sulphur (S), organic carbon (OC), pH and soluble
79 salts. The pH of the experimental field was 7.6, EC 0.42 dSm⁻¹, CEC (c mol (p⁺) kg⁻¹) 39.38 and
80 organic carbon was 0.56%. The N status of the experimental field was low (218 kg ha⁻¹), medium in
81 available P (16.40 kg ha⁻¹) and S (18.20 kg ha⁻¹) while available K status was in higher range (432.0
82 kg ha⁻¹). Phosphorus and sulphur were applied through DAP and Zypmite, respectively. At harvest,
83 seed and straw yields were recorded. Plant samples were collected for chemical analysis of
84 phosphorus, sulphur and nitrogen in seed and straw samples. In ground seed and straw samples, N
85 was estimated by micro Kjeldahal method (Piper 1966). For P and S, plant samples were digested
86 (ratio 9:3) in a diacid (HNO₃:HClO₄) mixture and P in the extract was determined by
87 vanadomolybdate yellow colour method (Jackson 1973). Sulphur content in the same extract was
88 determined according to method outlined by Tabatabai and Bremner (1970). Surface soil samples
89 (0-15 cm depth) were collected for chemical analysis after harvesting the crop each year from all
90 plots. For available P, soil samples were extracted with 0.5 M NaHCO₃ (pH = 8.5) (Olsen *et al.*
91 1954) and P content in the extracts was determined as described by Jackson (1973). Available S was
92 determined by extracting soil samples with 0.15% CaCl₂ (Williams and Steinbergs 1959), and S in
93 the extract was estimated by turbidimetric method (Chesnin and Yien 1951).

94 The observations on plant height, No. of branches plant⁻¹ were recorded manually on five
95 randomly selected representative plants from each plot of each replication separately as well as
96 yield and yield attributing character were recorded as per the standard method. Yield attributes were
97 also recorded at physiological maturity stage. The seed and straw yield was recorded from net plot
98 area of each treatment. The data obtained from various characters under study were analyzed by the
99 method of analysis of variance as described by (Gomez and Gomez, 1984).

100

101

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

102 **Yield and Yield Attributes:** The data can be recorded and analyzed for yield attributing characters
103 of chickpea (Table 1). Among the different treatment maximum number of branches (25.80 per
104 plant) was observed under treatment T₆, and which was found to be at par with T₂, T₃, T₄, T₅, T₈, T₉
105 th and T₁₀. The maximum test weight (18.50 gm) was also observed under T₆. The grain and stover
106 yield data was significantly influenced by different nutrient treatment. The maximum grain yield
107 17.10 (q ha⁻¹) was observed under T₆ and stover yield (15.89 q ha⁻¹) in T₅. Similar finding was
108 reported Lal *et al.* (2014) and Lakpale *et al.* (2003).

109 Data in Table 1 show that treatments had significant effect on grain and straw yields of
110 chickpea. Srividya *et al.* (2009) reported that the P at 50 kg P₂O₅ ha⁻¹ was supplied through SSP,
111 rock phosphate (20% wt/wt) and DAP produced maximum yield of chickpea over control. Although
112 the significant differences were not observed between control and application of P through DAP. It
113 indicates that P response to the test crop did not have a remarkable effect. Similar results were
114 finding by Singh and Rana (2006). Verma and Singh (2008) reported that seed and straw yield of
115 moong bean significantly increased with the application of 75 kg P₂O₅ ha⁻¹ with Rhizobium treated.
116 Similar result was reported by Pingoliya *et al.* (2014). Other treatments were also not statistically
117 significant, however; Zypmite application and soil test based fertilizer application had significant
118 effect over control treatment. Nawange *et al.* (2011) also reported that application 40 kg S increase
119 the seed yield of chickpea. The straw yield also showed identical results to that of yields. The data
120 on phenology like number of branches, plant heights and test weight showed supporting results of
121 grain and straw yield.

122 **Nutrient Uptake:** The data analyzed on two year mean basis data of Nutrient uptake was tabulated
123 in (Table 2). The N uptake was found maximum (69.52 kg ha⁻¹) under T₆, and which was
124 significantly higher over all other treatment. In contrast to the application of 20 kg ha⁻¹ N and 25 kg
125 P₂O₅ ha⁻¹ significantly increased number of branches and nutrients over the control. The P uptake is
126 important in pulses for maximum production, the uptake of P was found maximum (7.87 kg ha⁻¹)
127 under T₆, while treatment T₂, T₃, T₄, T₅, T₈, T₉ and T₁₀ found to be at par. Krishna and Yadav (1997)
128 conducted a field experiment with different levels of P and S and micronutrients concentration on
129 chickpea and we concluded that significantly higher yield with copper content decreased with
130 increasing dose of P and minimum copper content was found in grain and straw and higher uptake
131 of P and S. Similar results were reported by Singh and Singh (2004) in black gram; Deo and
132 Khaldelwal, (2009) and Ammal *et al.* (2001) in chickpea. The formation of acids by soil micro-

133 organism and root exudates enhanced nutrients mobilization in soil Ammal *et al.* (2001). The uptake
134 of potassium and sulphur in chickpea crop was observed higher (39.27 and 7.85 kg ha⁻¹) under T₅.
135 The S uptake of treatment T₂, T₃, T₆, T₉ and T₁₀ found at par with it. Chaudhary and Goswami
136 (2005) reported that P and S application in chickpea significantly increased the yield and yield
137 attributes over the control. Similar results were found Sharma and Jat (2003).

138 **Available Soil Nutrients:** After harvesting of crop, soil was analyzed for available soil nutrient and
139 data was analyzed and tabulated in (Table 3). The available soil N was found maximum (243.0 kg
140 ha⁻¹) under T₆. Khoja *et al.* (2002) reported that application of nitrogen with phosphatic fertilizers
141 improve soil fertility levels in chickpea over the control. The available P in soil was maximum (18.0
142 kg ha⁻¹) under treatment T₂ and T₉. There was no significant change in available K in soil in due to
143 treatments. The S availability in soil was significantly influenced among treatment and was found
144 maximum (23.0 kg ha⁻¹) under treatment T₇. Kothari and Jethra (2002); Chandra Dev and
145 Khaldelwal, (2009) also reported that the available sulphur increased with increasing levels of
146 sulphur application. Phosphorus application had no effect on the sulphur content of soil.

147 The data showed that post-harvest soil test status in relation to different treatments
148 application. The results show that the changes in soil test values with respect to available N did not
149 have remarkable effect in relation to the different treatments application. Since the test crop is a
150 leguminous crop and initial starter dose of fertilizer N was given, hence control and Zypmite
151 application resulted low available N level after the crop harvest. Available P and S level slightly
152 increased in comparison to other treatments application. The levels of these nutrients were low in
153 control treatment which was expected due to uptake of nutrient from the soil source only. The level
154 of available K did not show any significant variation due to the application of deferent treatments.

155 CONCLUSION

156 The explosions of Indian population enhance the demand of pulses. The high human
157 population needs higher pulse production for satisfying the nutritive protein requirements. We are
158 celebrating international pulse years 2016 and we will produce more amounts of pulses in upcoming
159 centuries. Experiment results revealed that chickpea responds to P and S fertilization and improves
160 the productivity of the seeds. Therefore, 50 kg P₂O₅ ha⁻¹ along with 40 kg S ha⁻¹ through Zypmite
161 should be applied in heavy textured soils for chickpea production. Application of Zypmite along
162 with phosphatic fertilizers in chickpea production, improved soil fertility in long run. The
163 continuous use of sulphur containing fertilizer has also reduced the problem of S deficiency in
164 Indian soils and protect to plant by fungal infestation. Sulfur had better for included in nutrient
165 management to get maximum yield of chickpea. We have a duty to develop new HYV with

166 resistance to insect-pest and disease and making a new combination of fertilizer to enhanced higher
167 use efficiency.

168

169

REFERENCES

170 Ammal, U.B., Mathan, K.K., Mahimairaja, S. (2001). Effect of different levels of rock phosphate -
171 sulphur granule on yield and nutrient availability. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Research*, **35**:166-
172 170.

173 Anonymous, (2011). Agricultural statistics at a glance. DAC, Government of India.

174 Annual progress report ICRISAT (2012). Enhancing chickpea production in Rainfed Rice Fallow
175 Lands (RRFL) of Chhattisgarh (CG) and Madhya Pradesh (MP) states of India following Improved
176 Pulse Production and Protection Technologies (IPPPT). pp. 27

177 Chandra Dev and Khaldelwal, R.B. (2009). Effect of P and S nutrition on yield and quality of
178 chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *Journal of Indian society of soil science*, **57**: 352-356.

179 Chaudhary, V.K. and Goswami, V.K. (2005) Effect of phosphorus and sulphur fertilization on
180 chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) cultivar. *Annals Agriculture Research*, **26**: 322–323.

181 Chesnin, L. and Yien, C.H. (1951). Turbidimetric determination of available sulphate. *Soil Science*
182 *Society of America Proceedings*, **15**:149-151.

183 Dotaniya, M.L., Datta, S.C., Biswas, D.R., Meena, H.M., Kumar, K. (2014). Production of oxalic
184 acid as influenced by the application of organic residue and its effect on phosphorus uptake by
185 wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) in an Inceptisol of north India. *National Academic Science Letter*,
186 **37**:401-405. DOI: 10.1007/s40009-014-0254-3.

187 Dotaniya, M.L. and Meena, V.D. (2013). Rhizosphere effect on nutrient availability in soil and Its
188 uptake by plants -A review. *Proceedings of National Academic Science, India Sec. B: Biological*
189 *Science*, DOI: 10.1007/s40011-013-0297-0.

190 Dotaniya, M.L. and Datta, S.C. (2013). Impact of bagasse and press mud on availability and
191 fixation capacity of phosphorus in an Inceptisol of north India. *Sugar Tech*. **16**:109-112. DOI:
192 10.1007/s12355-013-0264-3.

193 Gomez, K.A. and Gomez, A.A. (1984). Statistical procedures for agricultural research (2nd Edn.).
194 John Wiley and Sons, New York. pp. 680.

- 195 Jackson, M.L. (1973). *Soil Chemical Analysis*. Prentice Hall of India Private Limited, New Delhi.
- 196 Khoja, J.R., Khangarot, S.S., Gupta, A.K., Kulhari, A.K. (2002). Effect of fertility and biofertilizer
197 on growth and yield of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *Annals of Plant and Soil Research*, **4**:357-
198 358.
- 199 Kothari, M.L. and Jethra, J.K. (2002). Response of wheat to sulphur application in loamy sand soil.
200 *Annals of Arid Zone*, **41**: 191-194.
- 201 Krishna, S. and Yadav, R.S. (1997). Effect of varying levels of P and S on concentration of copper,
202 manganese and iron in chickpea. *Legumes Research*, **20**:127-129.
- 203 Kumbhare, N.V., Dubey, S.K., Nain, M.S., Ram Bahal. (2014). Micro analysis of yield gap and
204 profitability in pulses and cereals. *Legume Research*, **37**: 532-536. DOI: 10.5958/0976-
205 0571.00671.7.
- 206 Lakpale, R., Shrivastava, G.K., Chaube, N.K., Singh, A.P., Joshi, B.S., Pandey, R.L. (2003).
207 Response of gram (*Cicer arietinum* L.) to integrated nutrient management in Vertisols of
208 Chattisgarh plains. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Science*, **73**:162-163.
- 209 Lal, B., Rana, K.S., Rana, D.S., Gautam, P., Shivay, Y.S., Ansari, M.A., Meena B.P. and Kumar
210 K. (2014). Influence of intercropping, moisture conservation practice and p and s levels on growth,
211 nodulation and yield of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) under rainfed condition. *Legume Research*,
212 **37**: 300-305.
- 213 Nawange, D.D. Yadav, A.S. Singh, R.V. 2011. Effect of phosphorus and sulphur application on
214 growth, yield attributes and yield of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) *Legume Research*, **34**:48-50.
- 215 Olsen, S.R. Cole, C.V. Watanabe, F.S. Dean, L.A. 1954. Estimation of available P in soils by
216 extraction with sodium bicarbonate. *Circular of the United States Department of Agriculture*, **939**.
- 217 Pingoliya, K.K., Dotaniya, M.L., Mathur, A.K. (2013). Role of phosphorus and iron in chickpea
218 (*Cicer arietinum* L.). Lap Lambert Academic Publisher, Germany.
- 219 Pingoliya, K.K., Mathur, A.K., Dotaniya, M.L., Jajoria, D.K., Narolia, G.P. (2014). Effect of
220 phosphorus and iron levels on growth and yield attributes of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) under
221 agro-climatic zone IV A of Rajasthan, India. *Legume Research*, **37**:537-541.
- 222 Piper, C.S. 1966 *Soil and Plant Analysis*. Hans publishers.

- 223 Sharma SK, Jat NL (2003). Effect of phosphorus and sulphur on growth and yield of cowpea
224 (*Vigna unguiculata* L.). *Annals of Agriculture Research*, New Series, **24**:215-216.
- 225 Shukla, M., Patel R.H., Verma, R., Deewan, P., Dotaniya, M.L. (2013). Effect of bio-organics and
226 chemical fertilizers on growth and yield of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) under middle Gujarat
227 conditions. *Vegetos*. **26**:183-187. DOI: 10.5958/j.2229 4473.26.1.026.
- 228 Srividya, S., Prasad, P.V.N., Srivinas, R.V., Veeraraghavaiah, R. (2009). Influence of alternate
229 source of phosphorus to conventional sources on the yield attributes and yield of chickpea.
230 *Legumes Research*, **32**:218- 219.
- 231 Singh, T. and Rana K.S. (2006) Effect of moisture conservation and fertility on Indian mustard
232 (*Brassica juncea*) and lentil (*Lens culinaris*) intercropping system under rainfed conditions. *Indian*
233 *Journal Agronomy*, **51**: 266-270.
- 234 Singh, Y.P. and Singh, Ranbir 2004. Interaction effect of sulphur and phosphorus on growth and
235 nutrient content of blackgram (*Phaseolus mungo* L.). *Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science*,
236 **52**: 266-269.
- 237 Tabatabai, M.A. and Bremner, J.M. 1970. A simple turbidimetric method of determination of total
238 sulphur in plant materials. *Agronomy Journal*, **62**: 805-806.
- 239 Tondon, H.L.S. and Messick, D.L. 2007. Practical of Sulphur guide .The Sulphur Institute,
240 Washington, D.C. pp. 1-2.
- 241 Verma, L.K., Singh, P.R. (2008). Effect of phosphorus on nitrogen fixing potential of Rhizobium
242 and their response on yield of mung bean (*Vigna radiate* L.). *An Asian Journal of Soil Science*,
243 **3**:310-312.
- 244 Williams, C.H. and Steinbergs, A. 1959. Soil sulphur fractions as chemical indices of available
245 sulphur in some Australian soils. *Australian Journal of Agricultural Research* **10**:340-352.

TABLE 1: Yield and yield attributing parameters for chickpea crop in relation to different treatments application

Treatment	No. of branches plant ⁻¹			Test wt. (gm ⁻¹ 100 seed)			Grain Yield (q ha ⁻¹)			Straw Yield (q ha ⁻¹)		
	2011	2012	Mean	2011	2012	Mean	2011	2012	Mean	2011	2012	Mean
T ₁ :Control	21.40	20.40	20.90	17.90	17.60	17.75	14.37	12.35	13.36	13.37	11.57	12.47
T ₂ :50 kg P ₂ O ₅ through DAP	24.60	24.80	24.70	18.20	18.40	18.30	16.31	16.42	16.36	15.21	15.75	15.48
T ₃ : 50 kg P ₂ O ₅ through DAP+ Ca through CaCO ₃ + Zn (5 kg) through EDTA	25.10	25.00	25.05	18.30	18.50	18.40	16.92	15.97	16.45	15.93	15.30	15.61
T ₄ : 50 kg P ₂ O ₅ through DAP+ Ca through CaCO ₃	24.60	24.50	24.55	18.20	18.10	18.15	16.41	16.30	16.35	15.06	15.32	15.19
T ₅ : 50 kg P ₂ O ₅ through DAP+ 20 kg S through Zypmite	25.20	24.60	24.90	18.30	18.40	18.35	17.13	16.98	17.06	15.83	15.95	15.89
T ₆ : 50 kg P ₂ O ₅ through DAP+ 40 kg S through Zypmite	26.00	25.60	25.80	18.30	18.10	18.50	17.43	16.78	17.10	16.08	15.30	15.69
T ₇ : 40 kg S through Zypmite	23.60	24.10	23.85	18.10	18.20	18.15	15.18	15.18	15.18	14.27	14.53	14.40
T ₈ : 50 kg P ₂ O ₅ through DAP+ 0.5 % S spray through Zypmite	24.90	24.80	24.85	18.20	18.10	18.15	16.68	16.22	16.45	15.56	15.42	15.49
T ₉ : 50 kg P ₂ O ₅ through DAP+ 1 % S spray through Zypmite	25.40	25.00	25.20	18.20	18.50	18.35	16.87	16.31	16.59	15.78	15.63	15.71
T ₁₀ : Soil test based fertilizer recommendation	25.20	24.6	24.90	18.00	17.80	17.90	16.76	16.58	16.67	15.77	14.50	15.13
SEm±	0.69	0.53	0.48	0.65	0.75	0.45	0.57	0.28	0.32	0.53	0.67	0.44
CD (P ≤ 0.05)	2.07	1.59	1.44*	NS	NS	NS	1.70	0.84	0.97*	1.59	1.99	1.32*

DAP- Di-ammonium phosphate; Ca- Calcium; EDTA- Ethylene diamine tetraacetic acid; Zypmite- As a source of sulphur fertilizer; *Significant at P ≤ 0.05; NS- Non Significant at P > 0.05

TABLE 2: Nutrient uptake by chickpea crop in relation to different treatment application

Treatment	Total nutrient uptake by gram crop (kg ha ⁻¹)											
	Nitrogen			Phosphorous			Potassium			Sulphur		
	2011	2012	Mean	2011	2012	Mean	2011	2012	Mean	2011	2012	Mean
T ₁ :Control	55.19	53.65	54.42	6.41	6.11	6.26	32.05	31.53	31.79	6.66	6.39	6.53
T ₂ :50 kg P ₂ O ₅ through DAP	63.37	65.32	64.35	7.33	7.40	7.37	37.22	37.60	37.41	7.26	7.33	7.30
T ₃ : 50 kg P ₂ O ₅ through DAP+ Ca through CaCO ₃ + Zn (5 kg) through EDTA	67.27	64.36	65.82	7.59	7.26	7.43	39.35	38.64	39.00	7.83	7.49	7.66
T ₄ : 50 kg P ₂ O ₅ through DAP+ Ca through CaCO ₃	63.36	63.14	63.25	7.22	7.19	7.21	37.20	37.07	37.14	7.37	7.29	7.33
T ₅ : 50 kg P ₂ O ₅ through DAP+ 20 kg S through Zypmite	68.01	66.48	67.25	7.65	7.48	7.57	39.71	38.82	39.27	7.94	7.76	7.85
T ₆ : 50 kg P ₂ O ₅ through DAP+ 40 kg S through Zypmite	70.09	68.95	69.52	7.93	7.80	7.87	38.33	37.70	38.02	7.79	7.66	7.73
T ₇ : 40 kg S through Zypmite	60.97	62.3	61.64	6.80	6.95	6.88	35.15	35.92	35.54	6.77	6.92	6.85
T ₈ : 50 kg P ₂ O ₅ through DAP+ 0.5 % S spray through Zypmite	65.76	65.51	65.64	7.50	7.47	7.49	38.46	38.32	38.39	7.26	7.18	7.22
T ₉ : 50 kg P ₂ O ₅ through DAP+ 1 % S spray through Zypmite	67.83	66.37	67.10	7.53	7.26	7.40	39.33	37.91	38.62	7.96	7.67	7.82
T ₁₀ : Soil test based fertilizer recommendation	66.8	65.68	66.24	7.55	7.31	7.43	39.23	37.98	38.61	7.57	7.38	7.48
SEm±	0.79	0.76	0.48	0.27	0.44	0.25	0.99	1.10	0.73	0.27	0.23	0.16
CD (P ≤ 0.05)	2.37	2.26	1.44*	0.82	NS	0.75*	2.94	3.28	2.18*	0.81	0.69	0.50*

DAP- Di-ammonium phosphate; Ca- Calcium; EDTA- Ethylene diamine tetraacetic acid; Zypmite- As a source of sulphur fertilizer; *Significant at P ≤ 0.05; NS- Non Significant at P > 0.05

TABLE 3: Soil available nutrients status after harvesting of crop

Treatment	Available nutrients (kg ha ⁻¹)											
	N			P			K			S		
	2011	2012	Mean	2011	2012	Mean	2011	2012	Mean	2011	2012	Mean
T ₁ :Control	222.0	219.0	220.5	14.6	13.2	13.9	424.0	419.0	421.5	16.4	15.4	15.9
T ₂ :50 kg P ₂ O ₅ through DAP	232.0	234.0	233.0	17.4	18.6	18.0	428.0	424.0	426.0	16.2	15.8	16.0
T ₃ : 50 kg P ₂ O ₅ through DAP+ Ca through CaCO ₃ + Zn (5 kg) through EDTA	238.0	237.0	237.5	15.8	17.2	16.5	432.0	427.0	429.5	19.6	18.8	19.2
T ₄ : 50 kg P ₂ O ₅ through DAP+ Ca through CaCO ₃	238.0	239.0	238.5	15.8	17.6	16.7	430.0	426.0	428.0	19.7	18.7	19.2
T ₅ : 50 kg P ₂ O ₅ through DAP+ 20 kg S through Zypmite	244.0	241.0	242.5	16.3	17.6	17.0	428.0	433.0	431.0	19.6	20.8	20.2
T ₆ : 50 kg P ₂ O ₅ through DAP+ 40 kg S through Zypmite	242.0	244.0	243.0	16.6	18.4	17.5	426.0	431.0	429.0	20.4	22.2	21.3
T ₇ : 40 kg S through Zypmite	228.0	230.0	229.0	17.6	15.6	16.6	432.0	428.0	430.0	22.2	23.8	23.0
T ₈ : 50 kg P ₂ O ₅ through DAP+ 0.5 % S spray through Zypmite	238.0	236.0	237.0	16.8	18.2	17.5	430.0	431.0	431.0	19.4	18.6	19.0
T ₉ : 50 kg P ₂ O ₅ through DAP+ 1 % S spray through Zypmite	234.0	236.0	235.0	17.2	18.8	18.0	434.0	429.0	432.0	19.6	19.0	19.3
T ₁₀ : Soil test based fertilizer recommendation	234.0	232.0	233.0	17.4	18.2	17.8	432.0	437.0	435.0	19.6	18.4	19.0
SEm±	1.12	1.34	0.72	0.42	0.28	0.28	6.89	5.66	5.95	0.57	0.35	0.27
CD (P ≤ 0.05)	3.32	4.00	2.15*	1.26	0.84	0.84*	NS	NS	NS	1.53	1.06	0.81*

DAP- Di-ammonium phosphate; Ca- Calcium; EDTA- Ethylene diamine tetraacetic acid; Zypmite- As a source of sulphur fertilizer; *Significant at P ≤ 0.05; NS- Non Significant at P > 0.05