



Row Spacing, Levels of Fertilizers and Genotypes Influencing Growth, Nutrient Uptake and Yield of Sugarcane (*Saccharum* spp.) Grown under Calcareous Soil

Buddha Priya Mourya ^{a*} and Vipin Kumar ^a

^a *Department of Soil Science, Dr. Rajendra Prasad Central Agricultural University, Pusa, Samastipur-848125, Bihar, India.*

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/IJPSS/2022/v34i2131300

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/89382>

Original Research Article

Received 07 May 2022
Accepted 12 July 2022
Published 19 July 2022

ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted at the crop research center of Dr. Rajendra Prasad Central Agricultural University, Pusa (Bihar) during 2020-21 to access the effect of row spacing, levels of fertilizers and genotypes on growth, nutrient uptake and yield parameters of sugarcane (*Saccharum* spp.) grown under calcareous soil. The experiment was laid out in factorial randomized block design with three replications. Data analysis revealed that significantly higher germination, plant population, number of millable canes, nutrient uptake and cane yield were recorded with planting at row spacing of 90 cm. Irrespective of row spacing and genotypes, application of 150% NPK of RDF exhibited higher plant population (155.2×10^3 /ha at 120 DAP and 159.0×10^3 /ha at 150 DAP), plant height (205.9 cm, 258.0 cm and 325.9 cm at 150 DAP, 180 DAP and 210 DAP, respectively), number of millable canes (123.5×10^3 /ha), length of millable canes (271.5 cm), cane diameter (2.63 cm), nutrient uptake (287.3 Kg ha^{-1} , 28.8 Kg ha^{-1} , 302.6 Kg ha^{-1} and 28.1 Kg ha^{-1} for N, P, K and S, respectively) and cane yield (87.4 t ha^{-1}). Most of the growth and yield attributing characters like germination, plant population, plant height, number of millable canes, length of millable canes, cane diameter, nutrient uptake and cane yield were observed significantly higher in genotype CoP 15436. The results demonstrate that sugarcane growers may increase growth, nutrient uptake and

*Corresponding author: E-mail: buddhapriyamourya@gmail.com;

cane yield per unit area by planting sugarcane at 90 cm spacing, applying 150% NPK of RDF (225 Kg N ha⁻¹ : 127.5 Kg P₂O₅ ha⁻¹ : 90 Kg K₂O ha⁻¹) as fertilizer input and adopting genotype CoP 15436 in cultivation practice which proved itself as an elite sugarcane genotype.

Keywords: Row spacing; Saccharum spp; calcareous soil; nutrient uptake and elite sugarcane genotype.

1. INTRODUCTION

Sugarcane cultivation in India occupies an area of 5.09 Mha (million hectares) with an annual production of 357.67 million tonnes which leads to an average yield of 70.3 t/ha. However, sugarcane cultivation in India constitutes a potential yield of 150 t/ha. A huge gap between its potential yield and actual yield in Bihar is due to improper use of fertilizers, lack of high-potential genotypes and inefficient management practices in the field [1]. It is difficult to increase the growth and yield of sugarcane crop unless farmers adopt improved sugarcane genotypes and efficient management practices on large scale [2]. Sugarcane is also utilized as livestock fodder in some areas. Better tiller development and effective utilization of solar energy and its biomass conversion are possible with the use of proper row spacing. Variation in row spacing within certain limits did not greatly affect cane yield [3]. Shrinivasan (1987) observed cane yield in sub-tropical region and concluded that there was an improvement in cane yield due to closer row spacing but there was very little response by a few varieties in the tropical region [4]. Under tropical regions, genotypes having high tillering potential respond more to wider row spacing as compared to genotypes of low tillering potential [5].

The use of fertilizers and plant protection agents regularly may have harmed soil microbial activity, resulting in poor soil health [6]. Thus, maintaining soil fertility and crop yield in a sustainable way can only be accomplished by combining optimum spacing, fertilizer amounts and genotype to get maximum benefits. Among all the commercial crops cultivated in India, the sugarcane crop has occupied the highest output value and the desired position, making the sugarcane a highly choice crop for producers wherever climatic condition supports its growth and development. However, nutrients are a constraint in their production and quality [7]. Nitrogenous fertilizer is not only responsible for cane yield but also improves the quality of sugarcane juice.

The sugarcane plant is the most efficient at harvesting solar energy, utilizing 2% of incident

radiation more efficiently than wheat, rice and other crops. Sugarcane cultivation has been going on for more than 20 years, resulting in many issues. Continuous sugarcane farming alters the physio-chemical properties of soils, contributing to the significant aspects that determine the crop's production and economic viability. A variety with the highest nutrient uptake potential, showed a high yield potential [8]. The selection of new genotypes resistant to the diverse climatic conditions and soil types in several regions is one of the key factors for higher yield per unit area and augmentation of sugarcane as a profitable crop [9]. It is difficult to explore the area of sugarcane cultivation in the country due to the industrialization of cultivable land and thus the production would be increased only through the use of improved genotypes and good management practices such as optimum row spacing and proper nutrient management [10]. In this context, the present investigation was carried out to examine the impact of spacing, levels of fertilizers and genotypes on the growth, nutrient uptake and yield of sugarcane.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was conducted at crop research centre of Dr. Rajendra Prasad Central Agricultural University, Pusa, Bihar (India), during 2020-21. The experimental plot was medium upland, well-drained and having uniform topography. The farm is situated at 25°98' N latitude, 85°67' E longitude and an altitude of 52.0 m above mean sea level. The climate of the experimental site was sub-tropical. It is situated on the southwest bank of the river Burhi Gandak in the Samastipur district of Bihar, India. The soil of the practical site belongs to order Entisol, suborder Fluvents and great group Typic Ustifluent. The experimental site had hot and humid summer and too cold winter with an average rainfall of 135 mm. 78% of total rain was received during the period of monsoon (mid-June to mid-September). Droughts and floods are frequently shared in this region. The mean minimum and maximum temperatures recorded were 18.3°C and 29.5°C, respectively. Various

other important meteorological parameters like humidity, evaporation, average rainfall, sunshine hours and wind speed were recorded 75.04%, 4.01 mm, 44.40 mm, 1.4 hours and 4.68 km hr⁻¹ respectively. 884 mm of total rainfall was received during the crop growth season with maximum rain in July 2020 (245.40 mm). Maximum rainfall was obtained from April 2020 to October 2020 as per meteorological data recorded by the department (Fig.1). The experiment was carried out in Randomized Complete Block Design in factorial combination with three replications. The factorial combination comprised of three factors: - two row spacing (90 cm and 120 cm), three levels of fertilizers (100% NPK of RDF, 125% NPK of RDF and 150% NPK of RDF) and six genotypes (CoLk 15466, CoLk 15467, CoP 15436, CoSe 15452, CoSe 15455 and CoLk 94184). Recommended dose of N: P: K fertilizer (RDF) was in the ratio of 150 Kg N ha⁻¹: 85 Kg P₂O₅ ha⁻¹: 60 Kg K₂O ha⁻¹ and applied as per requirement of the treatment details. Fertilizer input applied in the field was Urea as N source, Single Superphosphate (SSP) as P source and Muriate of Potash (MOP) as K source. The total P and K, along with half of N, were applied as basal. Urea and SSP were applied in split doses. Planting was done in the last week of February, 2020. Package and practices for various operations in the field were followed as per recommendation. Composite soil samples from three different places in the field were taken with the help of core sampler at a depth of 0-15 cm during the season. Mechanical and chemical analysis was done for the collected

soil sample. In all the plots, furrows were made as per spacing of the treatments with Bihar senior ridger. Fertilizers were used as per treatments. The remaining half of N was top-dressed in two equal splits after the first irrigation and at the time of earthing up. Good quality, healthy, insect-free, and disease-free sugarcane varieties viz., CoLk 15466, CoLk 15467, CoLk 94184, CoSe 15452 CoSe 15455 and CoP 15436 having 9-month-old seed cane were carefully chosen as a seed for planting the sugarcane. Seed canes were cut into three budded setts. Germination per cent was calculated after 30 days and 45 days from planting by counting the number of germinated seeds per hundred seeds sown as per the formula suggested below [11].

$$\text{Germination (\%)} = \frac{\text{Number of germinated buds plot}^{-1}}{\text{Number of buds planted plot}^{-1}} \times 100$$

Plant height was recorded after 150 days, 180 days and 210 days from planting using ten randomly selected plants in each of the plot. Green and dry leaves from the upper part of the matured cane were cut off after harvesting the canes from the ground level. Plant population and number of millable canes were calculated on thousand per hectare basis from the plot. Crop was harvested in the second week of February, 2021. After harvesting the cane, it was detopped and detashed and using a spring balance cane weight per plot was recorded. Recorded weight was then converted in the form of t ha⁻¹ to determine the cane yield. Furthermore, sugar




Fig. 1. Meteorological data of experimental site during sugarcane growing season (2020-21)

Table 1. Major physico-chemical properties of initial soil at the experimental site (2020-21)

S. No.	Soil Properties	Value
1.	Textural class	Sandy loam
2.	Sand (%)	61.8
3.	Silt (%)	22.9
4.	Clay (%)	15.3
5.	Bulk density (g/cc)	1.52
6.	Porosity (%)	39.75
7.	pH (1:2)	8.52
8.	EC (dSm ⁻¹)	0.38
9.	Organic carbon (%)	0.49
10.	Available N (kg/ha)	194.6
11.	Available P ₂ O ₅ (kg/ha)	24.02
12.	Available K ₂ O (kg/ha)	110.50
13.	Free calcium carbonate (%)	32.21
14.	Available S (kg/ha)	18.64
15.	Fe (mg/kg)	13.72
16.	Zn (mg/kg)	0.72
17.	Cu (mg/kg)	0.98
18.	Mn (mg/kg)	2.29
19.	B (mg/kg)	0.53

*EC- Electrical conductivity;

yield was determined by multiplying commercial cane sugar (%) with cane yield per plot (t ha⁻¹) and it was then transformed in t ha⁻¹. Textural class of the soil was sandy loam with sand (61.8%), silt (22.9%) and clay (15.3%). The soil was low in available N (194.6 kg/ha), medium in available P (24.02 kg/ha) and low in available K (110.50 kg/ha). The chemical property of soil like Electrical conductivity (EC) was 0.38 dS/m, pH (soil: water=1:2.5) 8.52 and organic carbon 0.49% (Table 1).

Available soil N was determined using the alkaline KMnO₄ method [12]. Available soil P was estimated using 0.5M NaHCO₃ (p^H=8.5) as per the standard procedure followed in Olsen method [13]. Available soil K extracted with the help of 1N NH₄OAc (p^H 7.0) flame photometric method [14]. Available soil S was determined using 0.15% CaCl₂ solution [15]. Free CaCO₃ in the soil sample was estimated by the method suggested by Piper [16]. Micronutrient analysis was done by using DTPA extractant with taking soil: extractant in the ratio of 1:2 and was predicted with the help of instrument-AAS (Atomic Absorption spectrophotometer) [17]. Total uptake (Kg ha⁻¹) of N, P, K and S by sugarcane crop was calculated by simply multiplying the N, P, K and S content (%) with cane yield (t ha⁻¹) using the appropriate factor.

$$\text{Nutrient uptake (Kg ha}^{-1}\text{)} = \frac{\text{Nutrient content (\%)} \times \text{Cane yield (t ha}^{-1}\text{)} \times 0.375}{100}$$

The "Analysis of Variance Technique" was used to carry out statistical analysis of data relevant to various parameters in factorial randomised block design [18]. Treatment means were compared at 5% level of significance.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The effect of spacing on germination per cent at 30 days after planting was found non-significant. However, at 45 days after planting, the effect was significantly highest in 90 cm spacing having 31.6% germination. The levels of fertilizer also did not show significant results with germination per cent at 30 DAP. In comparison, at 45 DAP, treatment with 100% NPK of RDF showed significantly higher germination (32.4% germination) over the rest of the fertiliser levels. The result on germination per cent at 30 DAP and 45 DAP indicate that significantly higher germination of 30.7% and 34.2% respectively was recorded by genotype CoP 15436 (Table 2). Study on the effect of sugarcane genotype noted significantly higher germination percent in all test genotypes as compared to check variety [19]. The superiority of this treatment combination over the rest of the other treatment combinations might be due to the genetic potential of the particular genotype. The effect of row spacing was found significant at both the stage of the plant population count. The reduction in plant population was observed due to an increase in spacing from 90cm to 120cm. It is due to the fact

that a higher number of plants are accommodated in less row spaced plants. In the case of levels of fertilizers, at 120 DAP, a significantly higher plant population was recorded in 150% NPK of RDF. At 150 DAP, significantly higher plant population was recorded at 150% NPK of RDF, which was at par with 125% NPK of RDF treatment. Genotypes had a significant impact on the plant population at both stages. Initially (at 120 DAP), CoP 15436 had significantly higher plant population (165.2×10^3 /ha) followed by CoSe 15452 (157.1×10^3 /ha), CoLk 15466 (145.6×10^3 /ha), CoSe 15455 (139.7×10^3 /ha), CoLk 15467 (138.7×10^3 / ha) and CoLk 94184 (129.6×10^3 /ha). A similar trend was also noticed at 150 DAP, maximum plant population was recorded for genotype CoP 15436 (170.5×10^3 /ha), which was followed by CoSe 15452, CoLk 15466, CoSe 15455, CoLk 15467 and a minimum plant population of 133.9×10^3 /ha was recorded in check genotype CoLk 94184. However, genotype CoSe 15452 was found at par with CoP 15436 at both stages (Table 2). The data indicated that row spacing failed to influence plant height at all the stages of observation. Effect of row spacing on plant height was found non-significant. Though, a comparatively higher value at all the stages was recorded under 90cm spacing. Plant height significantly increases from 160.8 cm to 205.9 cm, 209.1 to 258.0 cm and 272.9 cm to 325.9 cm at 150 DAP, 180 DAP and 210 DAP, respectively. The plant height was observed significantly higher at 150% NPK of RDF treatment at all the stages. At 150 DAP, CoP 15436 showed the significantly highest plant height (196.0 cm) over other genotypes, which were statistically at par with CoSe 15452 (192.7 cm) and CoLk 15466 (189.5 cm). At 180 DAP, CoP 15436 maintained maximum plant height of 245.5 cm and a minimum of 227.5 cm in the case of CoLk 94184 (Check). All the genotypes were significantly superior over the check (CoLk 94184). At 210 DAP, CoP 15436 showed the highest plant height (314.2 cm) (Table 2). This might be due to the genetic ability of a particular genotype to the varied expression of the characters at different stages of plant growth. Significantly higher plant height was obtained by applying a higher dose of fertilizers and better genotypes [20]. From the result, it appeared that row spacing fails to bring significant improvement in single cane weight. However, the single cane weight obtained at 90 cm row spacing (707 g/plant) was higher than 120 cm (704 g/plant). It might be due to narrow spacing have provided more nutrients to the crop for its better growth

and development which resulted in higher single cane weight per plant. From fertilizer treatment point of view, it failed to bring about the significant difference in single cane weight, though the single cane weight obtained at 100% NPK of RDF (706 g/plant) was comparatively higher than 150% NPK of RDF (705 g/plant) and 125% NPK of RDF (704 g/plant). Varietal difference in respect of single cane weight was found to be significant. The genotype CoLk 15466 recorded significantly higher single cane weight (720 g/plant) and was statistically similar to CoLk 15467 and CoSe 15455 (Table 3). The significantly higher effect of row spacing on the number of millable canes (NMC) was observed in narrow spacing, i.e., at 90 cm row spacing (125.7×10^3 /ha). In comparison, fewer millable canes were observed for wider row spacing of 120 cm. A higher number of millable canes at narrow spacing are attributed to more plant population at narrow spacing since narrow spacing accommodates more plants per unit area, resulting in a higher number of millable canes. Various fertiliser levels showed a significant effect on the number of millable canes, and it was significantly highest in treatment, having 150% NPK of RDF (123.5×10^3 /ha). Effect of genotype on NMC was also recorded significantly highest in treatment having genotype CoP 15436 (121.4×10^3 /ha); however, treatment having genotype CoSe 15452 was found at par. Treatment with genotype CoP 15436 recorded 121.4×10^3 /ha and treatment having genotype CoSe 15452 recorded 118.7×10^3 /ha of NMC. It might be due to varied genetic constitutions. Genotypes CoLk 15466, CoP 15436, CoSe 15452 were found superior to check variety CoLk 94184 (Table 3). Results are in agreement with earlier findings which reported an increase in the number of millable canes with increasing fertilizer levels and the use of promising genotypes [21,22,23]. The effect of row spacing on the length of millable canes was found non-significant. Non-significant effect of row spacing was also observed on millable cane length [24]. A significantly higher value for cane length was recorded in treatment with 150% NPK of RDF (271.5 cm). It was followed by 125% NPK of RDF (269.6 cm) and then by 100% NPK of RDF (268.7 cm). The significantly higher value of millable cane length recorded for genotype CoP 15436 (283.2 cm) (Table 3). It might be due to varied expression of genotype. Row spacing influenced cane diameter non-significantly. 90 cm row spacing produced significantly thicker cane (2.56 cm) than 120 cm row spacing (2.46 cm). Levels of fertilizer greatly influenced cane

diameter. A significant variation in the case of cane diameter was observed among the NPK levels. 150% NPK of RDF showed significantly higher cane diameter (2.63 cm) compare to the rest of NPK fertilizer treatment. Application of nitrogen and phosphorus might have increased translocation of photosynthates from source to sink because of partitioning of nutrients in to different components of the plant and hence higher cane diameter was observed at the high dose of NPK fertilizer [25]. The genotype CoP 15436 showed the most increased cane diameter (2.79 cm), which was significantly superior to the rest of the genotypes (Table 3). The effect of various treatments on cane yield has been depicted in Table 3. A close analysis of the result indicated that the effect of row spacing on cane yield was found significant. Significantly higher cane yield was recorded in treatment having a narrow spacing of 90 cm (85.0 t ha^{-1}) compared to cane yield in treatment with wider row spacing of 120 cm (74.8 t ha^{-1}). Higher cane yield in narrow spacing compared to wider spacing may be attributed to higher plant population and no. of millable canes in narrow spacing. These results are in accordance with those who reported higher cane yield with 90 cm row spaced sugarcane planting [26,27]. The effect of levels of fertilizer was also found significant on cane yield. Maximum cane yield was recorded in treatment with 150% NPK of RDF (87.4 t ha^{-1}), which was at par with treatment 125% NPK of RDF having cane yield 83.0 t ha^{-1} . The lowest cane yield was recorded in treatment with 100% NPK of RDF (69.3 t ha^{-1}). Maximum cane yield in treatment 150% NPK of RDF might be attributed to the higher dose of fertilizer resulting in a higher nutrient supply. These results were found to be similar with the findings in fenugreek and French bean [28,29,30]. In addition, the higher yield at higher fertilizer level input was owing to better partitioning of photosynthates as nitrogen and phosphorous being important constituents of amino acids and enzymes which plays a vital role in successful running of various metabolic activities essential for proper crop growth and development [31]. Genotypes also had a significant effect on cane yield. The highest cane yield was found in CoP 15436 (85.7 t ha^{-1}) which was significantly superior over the rest of the genotypes; however, it was at par with CoSe 15452 (84.3 t ha^{-1}). The lowest cane yield was recorded in genotype CoLk 94184 (Table 3). The highest cane yield in CoP 15436 may be attributed to the genetic potentiality of the genotype [32]. Genotypes CoLk 15466, CoLk

15467, CoP 15436, CoSe 15452 and CoSe 15455 were found superior to check variety CoLk 94184. Raskar et al. [24,27] also concluded that heavy doses of NPK fertilizer and various genotypes resulted in higher cane yield. The influence of all three factors on sugar yield was significant. The effect of spacing on nitrogen uptake was significantly higher in narrow spacing (261.4 Kg ha^{-1}) compared to treatment of wider spacing (231.7 Kg ha^{-1}). The effect of levels of fertilizer on nitrogen uptake was also found significant. Nitrogen uptake increased from 195.1 Kg ha^{-1} to 287.3 Kg ha^{-1} as fertilizer level increased from 100 % NPK of RDF to 150 % NPK of RDF. Since sugarcane is a nutrient exhaustive crop, nitrogen uptake in treatment 150 % NPK of RDF is found to be maximum compared to treatment 100% NPK of RDF and 125% NPK of RDF. The effect of genotype on nitrogen uptake was also found significant. The nitrogen uptake was observed to be significantly highest in treatment having genotype CoP 15436 (262.1 Kg ha^{-1}), which was found at par with treatment CoLk 15466 (254.4 Kg ha^{-1}) and CoSe 15452 (259.1 Kg ha^{-1}) (Table 4). These results are in conformity with the experimental finding in which significant effect of sugarcane genotype on nitrogen uptake was observed [33]. The effect of spacing on phosphorus uptake was significantly higher in 90 cm (26.2 kg ha^{-1}) compared to 120 cm (23.2 kg ha^{-1}). The effect of levels of fertilizer on phosphorus uptake was also found significant. Phosphorus uptake by sugarcane crop was found significantly highest in treatment with 150% NPK of RDF (28.8 Kg ha^{-1}), probably due to higher phosphorus availability through phosphatic fertilizer. Significantly highest phosphorus uptake was observed in genotype CoP 15436 (26.2 Kg ha^{-1}), which was found at par with treatment CoLk 15466 (25.5 Kg ha^{-1}) and CoSe 15452 (26.0 Kg ha^{-1}) (Table 4). Maximum uptake in treatment CoP 15436 may be attributed to more phosphorus requirement by this particular genotype to utilize it in various physiological activities like photosynthesis and respiration. A critical examination of data revealed that potassium uptake by sugarcane was significantly affected by row spacing. Potassium uptake was found significantly higher in treatment with 90 cm row spacing (276.0 Kg ha^{-1}) than treatment with 120 cm row spacing (256.6 Kg ha^{-1}). Higher uptake of potassium in closer spacing may be due to minimal losses of nutrients compared to wider spacing. Hence, crops grown at closer spacing utilize the nutrients efficiently. Levels of fertilizer also showed a significant effect on potassium uptake. K uptake

by sugarcane varied from 221.8 to 302.6 kg ha⁻¹ under different NPK fertilizer level treatments. K uptake by sugarcane increased from 221.8 to 274.5 and 302.6 kg ha⁻¹, whereas the per cent increase of K uptake was to a tune of 23.8 and 36.4 per cent over 100% NPK treatment (221.8 kg ha⁻¹). Effect of genotype on potassium uptake was found significantly highest in CoP 15436 (280.7 Kg ha⁻¹) which was found at par with treatment of genotype CoLk 15466 (274.0 Kg ha⁻¹), CoSe 15452 (279.6 Kg ha⁻¹) and CoSe 15455 (266.5 Kg ha⁻¹) (Table 4). A critical examination of data revealed that sulphur uptake by sugarcane was significantly affected by row spacing. Sulphur uptake was found significantly

higher in 90 cm row spacing (25.3 Kg ha⁻¹) than 120 cm row spacing (22.4 Kg ha⁻¹). Higher uptake of sulphur in closer spacing may be due to minimal losses of nutrients compared to wider spacing. Hence, crops grown at closer spacing utilized the nutrients efficiently. Sulphur uptake was found significantly highest in treatment with 150% NPK of RDF (28.1 Kg ha⁻¹). Sulphur uptake in the rest of the fertilizer treatment was found significantly lower. Effect of genotype on sulphur uptake was found significantly highest in CoSe 15452 (25.4 Kg ha⁻¹), which was found at par with genotype CoLk 15466 (24.6 Kg ha⁻¹) and CoP 15436 (25.3 Kg ha⁻¹) (Table 4).

Table 2. Effect of row spacing, levels of fertilizers and genotypes on growth attributes of sugarcane crop at different stages

Treatments	Germination %		Plant population (000/ha)		plant height (cm)		
	30 DAP	45 DAP	120 DAP	150 DAP	150 DAP	180 DAP	210 DAP
Spacing							
S ₁ : 90 cm	27.8	31.6	157.1	161.6	198.7	244.6	311.8
S ₂ : 120 cm	26.8	30.4	134.1	139.1	175.0	228.8	291.8
SEm±	0.52	0.18	1.40	0.39	8.06	5.37	3.55
CD (P = 0.05)	NS	1.06	8.30	2.35	NS	NS	NS
Levels of Fertilizer							
F ₁ : 100% NPK of RDF	26.5	32.4	135.1	139.3	160.8	209.1	272.9
F ₂ : 125% NPK of RDF	27.6	30.1	147.6	152.6	193.9	243.0	306.6
F ₃ : 150% NPK of RDF	27.8	30.5	155.2	159.05	205.9	258.0	325.9
SEm±	0.41	0.28	1.59	2.40	2.40	2.83	5.50
CD (P = 0.05)	NS	0.92	5.21	7.82	7.82	9.23	17.93
Genotypes							
V ₁ : CoLk 15466	26.4	31.1	145.6	150.6	189.5	241.4	303.9
V ₂ : CoLk 15467	27.2	29.4	138.7	143.0	181.8	231.4	295.0
V ₃ : CoP 15436	30.7	34.2	165.2	170.5	196.0	245.5	314.2
V ₄ : CoSe 15452	29.7	33.4	157.1	159.7	192.7	242.4	311.1
V ₅ : CoSe 15455	25.9	30.0	139.7	144.2	183.0	232.0	296.1
V ₆ : CoLk 94184 (Check)	24.1	27.8	129.6	133.9	178.2	227.5	290.4
SEm±	0.34	0.71	4.07	3.84	3.84	1.27	3.62
CD (P = 0.05)	0.97	1.99	11.52	10.87	10.87	3.59	10.54

*DAP-Days after planting; NPK-Nitrogen, Phosphorous and Potassium; RDF-Recommended dose of fertilizer

Table 3. Effect of row spacing, levels of fertilizer and genotypes on growth and yield attributes of sugarcane crop

Treatments	Single cane weight (g) at maturity stage	No. of millable canes (000/ha) at harvest	Length of millable canes (cm) at harvest	Cane diameter (cm)	Cane yield (t ha ⁻¹)
Spacing					
S ₁ : 90 cm	707	125.7	268.7	2.56	85.0
S ₂ : 120 cm	704	100.5	271.1	2.46	74.8
SEm±	0.63	0.84	0.45	0.003	1.35
CD (P = 0.05)	NS	4.98	NS	NS	7.98
Levels of Fertilizer					
F ₁ : 100% NPK of RDF	706	99.5	268.7	2.35	69.3
F ₂ : 125% NPK of RDF	704	116.3	269.6	2.56	83.0
F ₃ : 150% NPK of RDF	705	123.5	271.5	2.63	87.4
SEm±	0.93	1.02	0.31	0.001	2.77
CD (P = 0.05)	NS	3.32	1.00	0.003	9.03
Genotypes					
V ₁ : CoLk 15466	720	113.8	271.4	2.52	82.3
V ₂ : CoLk 15467	719	108.8	266.3	2.36	78.2
V ₃ : CoP 15436	709	121.4	283.2	2.79	85.7
V ₄ : CoSe 15452	714	118.7	274.8	2.66	84.3
V ₅ : CoSe 15455	718	110.4	264.6	2.47	79.9
V ₆ : CoLk 94184 (check)	652	105.7	259.3	2.28	68.9
SEm±	1.22	2.57	0.43	0.001	1.02
CD (P = 0.05)	3.17	7.26	1.20	0.003	2.89

Table 4. Effect of row spacing, levels of fertilizer and genotypes on uptake of N, P, K and S by sugarcane plant

Treatments	N uptake (Kg ha ⁻¹)	P uptake (Kg ha ⁻¹)	K uptake (Kg ha ⁻¹)	S uptake (Kg ha ⁻¹)
Spacing				
S ₁ : 90 cm	261.4	26.2	276.0	25.3
S ₂ : 120 cm	231.7	23.2	256.6	22.4
SEm±	4.11	0.41	4.98	0.30
CD (P = 0.05)	24.32	2.40	29.48	1.78
Levels of Fertilizer				
F ₁ : 100% NPK of RDF	195.1	19.6	221.8	18.8
F ₂ : 125% NPK of RDF	257.2	25.7	274.5	24.6
F ₃ : 150% NPK of RDF	287.3	28.8	302.6	28.1
SEm±	4.11	0.89	9.39	0.80
CD (P = 0.05)	24.32	2.90	30.6	2.62

Treatments	N uptake (Kg ha ⁻¹)	P uptake (Kg ha ⁻¹)	K uptake (Kg ha ⁻¹)	S uptake (Kg ha ⁻¹)
Genotypes				
V ₁ : CoLk 15466	254.4	25.5	274.0	24.6
V ₂ : CoLk 15467	242.6	24.3	264.1	23.5
V ₃ : CoP 15436	262.1	26.2	280.7	25.3
V ₄ : CoSe 15452	259.1	26.0	279.6	25.4
V ₅ : CoSe 15455	245.1	24.5	266.5	23.7
V ₆ : CoLk 94184 (check)	216.3	21.6	233.1	20.6
SEm±	3.53	0.36	5.21	0.35
CD (<i>P</i> = 0.05)	9.99	1.00	14.75	0.98

*N-Nitrogen, P-Phosphorous, K-Potassium, S-Sulphur.

4. CONCLUSION

90 cm row spacing was proved to be better in case of germination, plant population, number of millable canes, nutrient uptake and cane yield by sugarcane plant. Growers may take advantage of the closer spacing by maximizing plant population and number of millable canes so that they would have a higher yield. It would enable them in minimizing the land requirement for cultivation and getting additional benefits from the rest piece of land. 150% NPK of RDF increased germination per cent, plant population, no. of millables canes and nutrient uptake more than the other levels of fertilizers. Application of fertilizers at different levels could help in reducing the frequent depletion of soil nutrients that arises due to intensive sugarcane cultivation and thus achieving nutrient replenishment to maintain sustainable cane production. Elite sugarcane genotype CoP 15436 was proved to be most superior in terms of growth, nutrient uptake and yield as these traits were influenced more than the check variety and other test genotypes and in addition, may be used as surrogate traits for achieving higher uptake and yield. The overall data indicate that 90 cm row spacing, 150% NPK of RDF (225 Kg N ha⁻¹ : 127.5 Kg P₂O₅ ha⁻¹ : 90 Kg K₂O ha⁻¹) and genotype CoP 15436 proved to be better for the sugarcane growers in terms of growth, nutritional status and yield. Taking the result of current experiment and review of literature into consideration, there is a need for further study on sugarcane under calcareous soil for more than one season across locations to come up with a conclusive recommendation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deep gratitude to Dr. Vipin Kumar, Scientist-cum-Assistant Professor, Department of Soil Science, Dr. Rajendra Prasad Central Agricultural University (RPCAU), Pusa

for his valuable and constructive suggestions during the planning and development of this research work. The authors thank Dr. M.C. Manna, Head, Department of Soil Science, Shri Kaushal Kishor, Scientist-cum-Assistant Professor, Department of Agronomy, Dr. Nilanjaya, Scientist-cum-Assistant Professor, Department of Plant Breeding and Genetics, Dr. Navnit Kumar, Scientist-cum-Assistant Professor, Department of Agronomy and Sugarcane Research Institute (SRI), RPCAU, Pusa for providing facilities during the research work and critically reviewing the manuscript.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Bahadar K, Jamal M, Sadiq M, Suleman M, Azim H, Baloch MS. Genetic variation and ecological suitability of new sugarcane genotypes under the agro-climatic conditions of Bannu (NWFP). Pak. Sugar J. 2002;17(3):15-7.
2. Glaz B, Gilbert RA. Sugarcane variety census: Florida 2000. Sugar y Azucar. 2000;95(12):22-9.
3. Barnes AC. Agriculture of the sugar-cane. Agriculture of the sugar-cane; 1953.
4. Srinivasan TR. Varietal response to climate, population dynamics, nutrition and other inputs. In Sugarcane varietal improvement. Coimbatore: Sugarcane Breeding Institute; 1987
5. Asokan S, Murthi AN, Mahadevaswamy M. Effect of nitrogen levels and row spacing on yield, CCS and nitrogen uptake in different sugarcane varieties. Sugar Tech. 2005;7(2):44-7.

6. Singh KP, Suman A, Singh PN, Lal M. Yield and soil nutrient balance of a sugarcane plant-ratoon system with conventional and organic nutrient management in sub-tropical India. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems*. 2007;79(3):209-19. Available:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10705-007-9108-4>
7. Humbert RP, Ulrich A. Fertilizer use on sugar crops. *Changing Patterns in Fertilizer Use*. 1968;1:379-401. Available:<https://doi.org/10.2136/1968.changingpatterns.c15>
8. Achuthan M, Charimakkani A, and Rajasekaran S. Studies on the effect of different levels of nitrogen and time of application on yield and quality of early maturing sugarcane varieties. *Bharatiya Sugar Journal*. 1989;14(4):61-68.
9. Liu J, Basnayake J, Jackson PA, Chen X, Zhao J, Zhao P, Yang L, Bai Y, Xia H, Zan F, Qin W. Growth and yield of sugarcane genotypes are strongly correlated across irrigated and rainfed environments. *Field Crops Research*. 2016;196:418-25. Available:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2016.07.022>
10. Tayade AS, Anusha S, Bhaskaran A, Govindraj P. Response of early maturing elite sugarcane genotypes to varied row spacing and fertilizer levels. *Journal of Sugarcane Research*. 2017;7(1):46-51.
11. Al-Mudaris MA. Notes on various parameters recording the speed of seed germination. *Der Tropenlandwirt-Journal of Agriculture in the Tropics and Subtropics*. 1998;99(2):147-54.
12. Subbiah BV, Asija GL. A rapid method for the estimation of nitrogen in soil. *Current Science*. 1956;26:259-60.
13. Olsen SR. Estimation of available phosphorus in soils by extraction with sodium bicarbonate. *US Department of Agriculture*; 1954.
14. Jackson ML. *Soil chemical analysis*, pentice hall of India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, India. 1973;498:151-4.
15. Chesnin L, Yein CH. Turbidiometric method of sulphate sulphur in plant materials. In *Proceedings Soil Science Society America*. 1951;15:149-151.
16. Piper CS. *Soil and Plant Analysis* Hans Publishers Bombay. Asia Edition; 1966.
17. Lindsay WL, Norvell W. Development of a DTPA soil test for zinc, iron, manganese and copper. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*. 1978;42(3):421-8. Available:<https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj1978.03615995004200030009x>
18. Rangaswamy R. *Agricultural statistics*. New Delhi: New Age International (P) Ltd Publishers; 2006.
19. Kumar S, Rai SN, Yadav SP, Singh SC, Bharati YP, Sharma BL. Studies on growth, yield and quality parameter of early sugarcane genotypes with varying fertility levels and row spacing's; 2018.
20. Melkie Z, Takele KB. Effect of nitrogen fertilizer levels and row spacing on yield and yield components of upland rice varieties in Pawe, Northwestern Ethiopia. *J. Nat. Sci. Res*. 2020;10:1-2.
21. Singh AK, Lal ME, Singh SN. Agronomic performance of new sugarcane genotypes under different planting geometries and N levels. *Indian Journal of Sugarcane Technology*. 2011;26(1):6-9.
22. Dev CM, Meena RN, Kumar A, Mahajan G. Earthing up and nitrogen levels in sugarcane ratoon under subtropical Indian condition. *Indian Journal of Sugarcane Technology*. 2011;26(1):1-5.
23. Dev CM, Singh RK, Mahajan G, Yadav MK, Ram US. Effect of date and level of earthing and nitrogen on productivity and nutrient availability in soils of ratoon sugarcane (*Saccharum officinarum*). *Indian Journal of Agronomy*. 2011;56(4):388.
24. Raskar BS, Bhoi PG. Effect of intra-row spacings, fertilizer levels and planting materials on yield and economics of pre-seasonal sugarcane under drip irrigation. *Sugar Tech*. 2003;5(4):305-9. Available:<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02942491>
25. Prasad PH, Naik AB. Effect of varying NPK levels and bio-fertilizers on growth and yield of okra [*Abelmoschus esculentus* (L.) Moench] under sustainable condition. *Trends in Biosciences*. 2013;6(2):167-9.
26. Cheema IA, Ayub M, Jabbar A. Morphological response of spring planted sugarcane to spaced arrangement and nutrient management. *Pakistan Sugar J*. 2002;17(6):62-8.
27. Raskar BS, Bhoi PG. Yield attributes of sugarcane as influenced by intra-row spacings, fertilizer levels and planting materials. *Indian Sugar*. 2003;53(5):327-31. Corpus ID: 133011709
28. Ram D, Verma JP. Effect of level of phosphorus and potash on the

- performance of seed crop of fenugreek (*Trigonella foenum graecum*) Cv. Pusa early bunching. Haryana Journal of Horticultural Sciences. 2001;30(3/4):249-50.
29. Kumar A. Standardization of seed production techniques in fenugreek. M.Sc.(Agri.) Thesis, Uni. of Agric. Sci. Dharwad (India); 2004.
 30. Mehta RS, Patel BS, Meena SS, Meena RS. Influence of nitrogen, phosphorus and bio-fertilizers on growth characters and yield of fenugreek (*Trigonella foenum-graecum* L.). Journal of spices and Aromatic Crops. 2010;19(1/2):23-8.
 31. Kumar N, Kumar V. Production Potential and nitrogen fractionation of sugarcane-based cropping system as influenced by planting materials and nitrogen nutrition. Sugar Tech. 2020;22(4):622-9. Available:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12355-020-00809-y>
 32. Kumar S, Rai SN, Yadav SP, Singh SC, Bharati YP, Sharma BL. Studies on growth, yield and quality parameter of early sugarcane genotypes with varying fertility levels and row spacing; 2018.
 33. Umesh UN, Kumar V, Prasad RK, Singh KD, Singh AP. Effect of integrated use of inorganic and organic materials on the distribution of different forms of nitrogen in soil and their influence on sugarcane yield and nutrient uptake. Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science. 2014;62(3):209-15.

© 2022 Mourya and Kumar; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/89382>