



International Journal of Research in Agronomy

E-ISSN: 2618-0618

P-ISSN: 2618-060X

© Agronomy

www.agronomyjournals.com

2024; 7(2): 409-412

Received: 14-11-2023

Accepted: 21-12-2023

Ankam Shashank

Department of Plant Physiology,
BCKV, Mohanpur, Nadia,
West Bengal, India

Subhasis Mondal

Department of Plant Physiology,
BCKV, Mohanpur, Nadia,
West Bengal, India

Dawan Arkini Challam

Department of Plant Physiology,
BCKV, Mohanpur, Nadia,
West Bengal, India

Mittapalli Hemakumar Reddy

Department of Genetics and Plant
Breeding, BCKV, Mohanpur,
Nadia, West Bengal, India

Corresponding Author:

Dawan Arkini Challam

Department of Plant Physiology,
BCKV, Mohanpur, Nadia,
West Bengal, India

Yield responses of groundnut genotypes as influence by boron and zinc

Ankam Shashank, Subhasis Mondal, Dawan Arkini Challam and Mittapalli Hemakumar Reddy

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33545/2618060X.2024.v7.i2f.329>

Abstract

Groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea*) is one of the most important cash crops as it is a low-priced commodity but a valuable source of all the nutrients for human nutrition. The contribution of micronutrients like boron and zinc has their pivotal role in determining the yield of groundnut., therefore the experiment was laid out to venture the effects of boron and zinc on quantity parameters. Six groundnut genotypes (TG 26, TG 51, TG 71, TG 72, BARC 150 and BARC 200) were tried with nine different treatment combinations with three levels of each of boron (boric acid) and zinc (zinc sulphate) [B_0 = no boron, B_L = boric acid @ 0.25% and B_H = boric acid @ 0.5%, Z_0 = no zinc sulphate, Z_L = zinc sulphate @ 0.5% and Z_H = zinc sulphate @ 1%]. All together treatments were: B_0Z_0 (T_1), B_LZ_0 (T_2), B_HZ_0 (T_3), B_0Z_L (T_4), B_LZ_L (T_5), B_HZ_L (T_6), B_0Z_H (T_7), B_LZ_H (T_8) and B_HZ_H (T_9). All yield parameters except the number of productive nodes per plant were substantially influenced by the foliar treatments of boron and zinc. The response of the genotypes to the different treatments was not uniform. TG 26, TG 51 and TG 71 performed substantially better in T_8 (BLZH), T_3 (BHZ0) and T_6 (BHZL), respectively than any other treatments including the control. Hence, with appropriate treatment of boron and zinc yield of groundnut can be enhanced and in some cases quality of the yield also can be augmented.

Keywords: Boron, foliar, groundnut, pods yield, seed yield, zinc

Introduction

Groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea*) also known as monkey-nut or peanut is an annual herb of indeterminate growth habit which has been divided into two sub-species, *hypogaea* and *fastigiata*, each with several botanical varieties. Sub-specific and varietal classifications are mostly based on the location of flowers on the plant, patterns of reproductive nodes on branches, number of trichomes and pod morphology (abd and Gregory, 1994) [8]. Groundnut crop is one of the most important cash crops as it is a low-priced commodity but a valuable source of all the nutrients which include protein, calories, essential fatty acids, vitamins, and minerals for human nutrition (Ojiewo *et al.* 2020) [11].

Micronutrients play a significant role in increasing the yield of pulses and oilseed crops. Boron is one of the essential micronutrients which play a pivotal role in cell division and pod and seed formation (Vitosh *et al.* 1997) [18] which can enhance crop yield. The inadequate supply of B decreased the economic yield of legumes (Raj, 1985) [12]. Pollen germination and pollen tube growth as well as the viability of pollen grains are severely affected by boron deficiency (Dugger, 1973) [3]. Zinc is involved in auxin formation; activation of dehydrogenase enzymes; and stabilization of ribosomal fractions (Obata *et al.* 1999) [10]. It is also required for carbohydrate and nitrogen metabolism, leading to higher yield and yield components. Therefore, deficiency of micronutrients cannot be fulfilled merely by soil application alone and needs to be supplemented through foliar application as it enables plants to absorb the applied nutrients through their leaf surface and thus, may result in the economic use of fertilizer. Foliar absorption is the most effective, and the rate of absorption is generally higher in younger points of branches or stem tips (Helmy and Shaban, 2008) [4].

Materials and Methods

The experiment was conducted during pre-kharif season of 2019 in the district seed farm (D Block farm) of the Bidhan Chandra Krishi Viswavidyalaya at Kalyani, West Bengal. The farm is situated in the New Alluvial Zone of West Bengal and is geographically located at 22.56°N latitude and 88.32°E longitude at an altitude of 9.75m above mean sea level. The soil farm is sandy loam with a pH of 6.9-7.0. Six genotypes namely TG 26, TG 51, TG 71, TG 72, BARC 150 and BARC 200 were taken for the experiment and subjected to nine different treatments which were applied singly either as boric acid or zinc sulphate or in combination with both. This experiment was designed in factorial randomized block design with three replications for evaluation of crop parameters and the mean data in all cases were subjected to statistical analysis using OPSTAT software version 7.1.

Treatment details

T ₁	B ₀ Z ₀	Control.
T ₂	B _L Z ₀	Boric acid @ 0.25%.
T ₃	B _H Z ₀	Boric acid @ 0.5%.
T ₄	B ₀ Z _L	Zinc sulphate @ 0.5%.
T ₅	B _L Z _L	Boric acid @ 0.25% + Zinc sulphate @ 0.5%.
T ₆	B _H Z _L	Boric acid @ 0.5% + Zinc sulphate @ 0.5%.
T ₇	B ₀ Z _H	Zinc sulphate @ 1%.
T ₈	B _L Z _H	Boric acid @ 0.25% + Zinc sulphate @ 1%.
T ₉	B _H Z _H	Boric acid @ 0.5% + Zinc sulphate @ 1%.

Results and Discussions

Number of productive nodes per plant: The number of productive nodes per plant in all the genotypes varied widely with the treatments (Table 1). In TG 26, the best treatment was observed in B_LZ_H (60.67) and lowest in B_HZ_H (32.67); In TG 51, the best treatment was B_HZ₀ (67.00) and lowest in B_HZ_L (32.00); In TG 71, the best treatment was B_HZ_L (88) and lowest in B₀Z_L (56.67); in TG 72, the best treatment was B_HZ₀ (87.33) and lowest in B₀Z_L (44.33); In BARC 150, the best treatment was B_LZ₀ (77.67) and lowest in B_HZ₀ (29.33); In BARC 200, the best treatment was B₀Z_L (65.33) and lowest in B₀Z_H (36.67). The variations among treatments in each of the genotypes were statistically non-significant. The results are similar to the findings of Sowmya and Ganapati (2021) [17] where the application of micronutrients had an impact on producing productive nodes in groundnut in coastal sandy soil.

Table 1: Effect of boron and zinc treatments on the number of productive nodes per plant of different groundnut genotypes

Genotypes→ Treatments↓	TG-26	TG-51	TG-71	TG-72	BARC- 150	BARC- 200
B ₀ Z ₀	52.33	46.67	78	62.33	39.67	47.33
B _L Z ₀	58	41	87	80.33	77.67	56
B _H Z ₀	40	67	79.67	87.33	29.33	56
B ₀ Z _L	39.33	31.67	56.67	44.33	58.33	65.33
B _L Z _L	36	55	60	59.33	43.33	65
B _H Z _L	52.67	32	88	66	69.67	64.67
B ₀ Z _H	58.33	41	71.67	67	55	36.67
B _L Z _H	60.67	36.33	83	64	63.67	65
B _H Z _H	32.67	51	58.67	55.33	61	48.33
CD	N/S	N/S	N/S	N/S	N/S	N/S

Number of pods per plant: The number of pods per plant in all the genotypes were also varied widely with the treatments (Table 2). In TG 26, the best treatment was observed in B_LZ_H (113); in TG 51, the best treatment was B_HZ₀ (95.67); in TG 71,

the best treatment was B_HZ_L (140.33); in TG 72, the best treatment was B_HZ₀ (133.67) and B_LZ₀ (131.33) was also significantly better than the control; in BARC 150, the best treatment was B_LZ₀ (111.33), the other treatments significantly better than the control were B_LZ_H (90), B_HZ_H (89) and B₀Z_H (88.67); in BARC 200, the best treatment was B_HZ_L (103.67). Abdo (2001) [1] reported a similar increase in the number of pods per plant with foliar spray of Zn and B. Maximum number of pods per plant were also observed by Alam *et al.* (2020) [2] in Garden pea with application of zinc.

Table 2: Effect of boron and zinc treatments on the number of pods per plant of different groundnut genotypes

Genotypes→ Treatments↓	TG-26	TG-51	TG-71	TG-72	BARC- 150	BARC- 200
B ₀ Z ₀	72	73.67	119	104.67	116	71.33
B _L Z ₀	79	78.33	118.67	131.33*	111.33*	82.33
B _H Z ₀	47	95.67*	95	133.67*	51.33	63.33
B ₀ Z _L	83	79.33	68.33	83.67	80.67	81.33
B _L Z _L	85.33	75.67	89.67	104.33	62.33	100
B _H Z _L	73	73	140.33*	111.33	85.33	103.67*
B ₀ Z _H	86.67	61.67	86.67	85.33	88.67	49
B _L Z _H	113*	78	74.33	91	90	88.67
B _H Z _H	44.67	82.33	64.67	111	89	69.33
CD	31.88	20.21	30.23	25.06	32.63	25.79

Single pod weight (g): The single pod weight (g) per plant in all the genotypes were also varied widely with the treatments (Table 3). In TG 26, the best treatment was observed in B_LZ_H (0.889) and lowest in B_LZ_L (0.701); in TG 51, the best treatment was B_HZ_L (0.846) and lowest in B₀Z_H (0.657); in TG 71, the best treatment was B₀Z_L (0.823) and lowest in B₀Z_H (0.607); in TG 72, the best treatment was B_HZ_L (0.780) and was significantly better than the control; in BARC 150, the best treatment was B_LZ₀ (0.905) and lowest in B_HZ_H (0.665); in BARC 200, the best treatment was B₀Z_L (0.988) and lowest in B₀Z₀ (0.746).

Table 3: Effect of boron and zinc treatments on single pod weight (g) of different groundnut genotypes

Genotypes→ Treatments↓	TG-26	TG-51	TG-71	TG-72	BARC- 150	BARC- 200
B ₀ Z ₀	0.821	0.761	0.769	0.602	0.738	0.746
B _L Z ₀	0.718	0.795	0.765	0.697	0.905*	0.884*
B _H Z ₀	0.766	0.833*	0.627	0.694	0.796*	0.834*
B ₀ Z _L	0.750	0.675	0.823*	0.731	0.677	0.786
B _L Z _L	0.701	0.757	0.685	0.653	0.727	0.837*
B _H Z _L	0.779	0.846*	0.736	0.78*	0.768	0.948*
B ₀ Z _H	0.830	0.657	0.607	0.655	0.765	0.988*
B _L Z _H	0.889*	0.670	0.685	0.691	0.685	0.986*
B _H Z _H	0.764	0.726	0.759	0.707	0.665	0.93*
CD	0.076	0.067	0.061	0.057	0.052	0.082

Pod yield per plant (g): The pod yield per plant in all the genotypes also varied widely with the treatments (Table 4): TG-26 between 37.21 and 100.53; TG-51 between 43.64 and 79.96; TG-71 between 49.19 and 94.61; TG-72 between 45.98 and 89.07; BARC-150 between 73.11 and 135.5 and BARC 200 between 62.58 and 118.31. In TG 26, the best treatment was B_LZ_H (100.53); in TG 51, the best treatment was B₀Z_H (79.96); in TG 71, the best treatment was B_HZ_L (94.61); in TG 72, the best treatment was B_HZ₀ (89.07); in BARC 150, the best treatment was B₀Z_H (135.5), the other treatments significantly better than the control were B_LZ₀ (127.51); in BARC 200, the best treatment was B_LZ_L (118.31) and other best treatments were B_HZ_L (111.93) and B_LZ_L (107.93). Application of boron has

been reported to produce an additional pod yield in French bean (Singh and Singh, 1990) [16], black gram and chickpea (Sakal *et al.* 1988) [14].

Table 4: Effect of boron and zinc treatments on the pod yield per plant (g) of different groundnut genotypes

Genotypes→ Treatments↓	TG-26	TG-51	TG-71	TG-72	BARC- 150	BARC- 200
B ₀ Z ₀	59.58	62.05	80.52	63.14	85.67	87.12
B _L Z ₀	58.46	68.84	82.69	85.77	127.51*	77.81
B _H Z ₀	37.21	79.96*	57.47	89.07*	109.12	62.58
B ₀ Z _L	67.15	55.31	54.37	45.98	81.93	79.86
B _L Z _L	62.29	61.79	56.93	71.52	77.82	107.93*
B _H Z _L	58.32	65.65	94.61*	76.59	101.96	111.93*
B ₀ Z _H	72.88	43.64	49.19	48.79	135.5*	75.91
B _L Z _H	100.53*	56.12	53.99	57.92	73.1	118.31*
B _H Z _H	37.63	66.58	53.18	79.06	98.53	89.37
CD	15.655	12.473	11.438	16.316	26.725	17.623

Number of seeds per plant: The number of seeds per plant in all the genotypes (Table 5) ranged in TG-26 between 52.67 and 126.67; TG-51 between 37.33 and 111; TG-71 between 69.33 and 132; TG-72 between 74.33 and 136.67; BARC-150 between 121.33 and 38.33 and BARC 200 between 55 and 127.33. The variations among treatments in each of the genotypes were statistically significant. In TG 26, the best treatment was observed in B_LZ_H (126.67); in TG 51, the best treatment was B_HZ₀ (111); in TG 71, the best treatment was B_HZ_L (132); in TG 72, the best treatment was B_LZ₀ (136.67) and B_LZ₀ (135) was also significantly better than the control; in BARC 150, the best treatment was B_LZ₀ (121.33) in BARC 200, the best treatment was B_LZ_L (127.33). Kamaleswaran *et al.* (2021) [6] reported a similar increase in the number of seeds per plant while working on different levels of boron.

Table 5: Effect of boron and zinc treatments on the number seeds per plant of different groundnut genotypes

Genotypes→ Treatments↓	TG-26	TG-51	TG-71	TG-72	BARC- 150	BARC- 200
B ₀ Z ₀	78.33	79.33	104.67	97.33	38.33	81.33
B _L Z ₀	63	85	124.33	136.67*	121.33*	95
B _H Z ₀	41.33	111*	83.67	135*	48	76.33
B ₀ Z _L	86	58.33	77.67	74.33	74.33	87.33
B _L Z _L	68.33	74.33	82.67	96.67	55.33	127.33*
B _H Z _L	64.33	57	132*	107	73.33	119.67
B ₀ Z _H	99.67	52.33	69.33	92	91.67*	55
B _L Z _H	126.67*	37.33	73.67	109	80.33	115
B _H Z _H	52.67	73.33	80.13	85.33	78.33	79
CD	40.751	31.193	25.326	28.548	32.843	30.254

Single seed weight (g): The single seed weight (g) per plant in all the genotypes (Table 6) varied widely with the treatments. TG-26 ranged between 0.415 and 0.506; TG-51 between 0.404 and 0.517; TG-71 between 0.379 and 0.449; TG-72 between 0.381 and 0.459; BARC-150 between 0.306 and 0.487 and BARC 200 between 0.401 and 0.483. In TG 26, the best treatment was B_LZ_H (0.506); in TG 51, the best treatment was B_LZ₀ (0.517); in TG 71, the best treatment was B_LZ_H (0.449); in TG 72, the best treatment was B_HZ_L (0.459) was significantly better than the control; in BARC 150, the best treatment was B_LZ₀ (0.487); in BARC 200, the best treatment was B₀Z_L (0.483). Application of ZnSo₄ had a positive impact on seed weight as reported by Ram and Katiyar (2013) [13] in mungbean, Khrogamy and Farnia (2009) [7] in Chickpeas and Shah *et al.* (2016) [15] in Pigeonpea.

Table 6: Effect of boron and zinc treatments on the single seed weight (g) of different groundnut genotypes

Genotypes→ Treatments↓	TG-26	TG-51	TG-71	TG-72	BARC- 150	BARC- 200
B ₀ Z ₀	0.448	0.469	0.43	0.387	0.383	0.409
B _L Z ₀	0.479	0.517*	0.401	0.432	0.487	0.472
B _H Z ₀	0.415	0.472	0.379	0.437	0.324	0.445
B ₀ Z _L	0.462	0.462	0.438	0.404	0.397	0.483*
B _L Z _L	0.505	0.455	0.412	0.381	0.385	0.47
B _H Z _L	0.476	0.446	0.44	0.459*	0.318	0.467
B ₀ Z _H	0.442	0.404	0.397	0.425	0.485	0.401
B _L Z _H	0.506*	0.487	0.449*	0.455	0.441	0.458
B _H Z _H	0.448	0.468	0.424	0.441	0.306	0.426
CD	0.047	0.042	0.046	0.042	0.067	0.05

Seed yield per plant (g): The seed yield per plant in all the genotypes also found to varied widely with the treatments (Table 7): TG-26 between 18.31 and 64.27; TG-51 between 21.52 and 53.08; TG-71 between 28.25 and 58.38; TG-72 between 30.74 and 57.47; BARC-150 between 21.36 and 57.63 and BARC 200 between 24.56 and 59.33. In TG 26, the best treatment was B_LZ_H (64.27); in TG 51, the best treatment was B_HZ₀ (53.08); in TG 71, the best treatment was B_HZ_L (58.38); in TG 72, the best treatment was B_HZ₀ (57.47) and B_LZ₀ (56.04) was also significantly better than the control; in BARC 150, the best treatment was B_LZ₀ (57.63); in BARC 200, the best treatment was B_LZ_L (59.33). Krishna *et al.* (2022) [9] also reported an increase in seed yield increased with the intervention of boron and zinc. Application of boron also markedly increases the yield and quality of oil seed crops (Sakal *et al.* 1988) [14] where the application of 2.0 and 2.5 kg B ha⁻¹ resulted in an increase in grain yield of black gram and chickpea by 33 and 38% respectively.

Table 7: Effect of boron and zinc treatments on the seed yield per plant (g) of different groundnut genotypes

Genotypes→ Treatments↓	TG-26	TG-51	TG-71	TG-72	BARC- 150	BARC- 200
B ₀ Z ₀	39.57	43.33	47.18	37.96	32.02	36
B _L Z ₀	29.05	28.70	49.77	56.04*	57.63*	45.02
B _H Z ₀	18.31	53.08*	34.27	57.47*	23.67	34.32
B ₀ Z _L	20.51	34.37	34.41	30.74	31.53	42.14
B _L Z _L	23.62	35.79	33.77	38.01	21.36	59.33*
B _H Z _L	33.13	29.16	58.38*	47.22	35.45	55.94*
B ₀ Z _H	44.95	24.37	28.25	39.78	45.23*	24.56
B _L Z _H	64.27*	21.52	31.66	50.70	35.89	53.73*
B _H Z _H	20.07	39.14	34.61	36.87	25.96	35.52
CD	10.90	8.96	10.87	13.71	11.27	14.29

Conclusion

All crop parameters except number of productive nodes per plant were substantially influenced by the foliar treatments of boron (boric acid) and zinc (zinc sulphate). The response of the genotypes to the different boron and zinc treatments was not uniform. TG 26, TG 51 and TG 71 performed substantially better in T₈ (BLZH), T₃ (BHZ0) and T₆ (BHZL), respectively than any other treatments including the control. In case of TG 72, T₃ (BHZ0) and T₂ (BLZ0) were better than control and at par with each other. In case of BARC150, the best treatment was T₂ (BLZ0), though T₇ (B0ZH) was also better than the control. In case of BARC 200, T₅ (BLZL) was the best treatment, though T₆ (BHZL) and T₈ (BLZH) were at par with it and statistically better than the control. The better-performing treatments improved pod or seed yield by improving one or more than one yield parameters. The variations among treatments in each of the

genotypes were mostly statistically significant indicating substantial effect – positive or negative – of foliar application of boron (boric acid) and zinc (zinc sulphate). Finally, it can be concluded that, with appropriate treatment of boron and zinc, the yield of groundnut can be enhanced.

Acknowledgement

The authors are grateful to the Department of Plant Physiology, BCKV, Mohanpur, Nadia, West Bengal, India for providing the necessary facilities and support to carry out this study.

Competing interests

The authors have declared that no competing interests exist

References

1. Abdo FA. The response of two mungbean cultivars to zinc, manganese and boron I. Morphological, physiological and anatomical aspects. Bull Fac Agric Cairo Univ. 2001;52(3):445-466.
2. Alam I, Paul AK, Sultana S, Bithy PA. Effect of Zinc and Molybdenum on the Growth and Yield of Garden Pea (*Pisum sativum* L.). Int J Bio-resource Stress Manage. 2020;11(4):425-431.
3. Dugger WM. Functional aspects of boron in plants; c1973. p. 112-129.
4. Helmy AM, Shaban KA. Response of peanuts to K fertilization and foliar spraying with zinc and boron under sandy soil conditions. J Agril Res. 2008;35(2):343-362.
5. Iqtidar A, Rahman S. Effect of boron on the protein and amino acid composition of wheat grain. J Agric Sci. 1984;103(1):75-80.
6. Kamaleshwaran R, Elayaraja D, Dhanasekaran K, Jawahar S. Effect of different levels and source of boron fertilizers on the growth and yield of groundnut in coastal saline soil. Int J Bot Stud. 202;6:1265-1269.
7. Khorgamy A, Farina A. Effect of phosphorus and zinc fertilisation on yield and yield components of chick pea cultivars. African Crop Science Conference Proceedings. 2009;9:205-208.
8. Krapovickas A, Gregory WC. Taxonomia del genero *Arachis* (Leguminosae). Bonplandia; c1994. p. 1-186.
9. Krishna BM, Sai Kumar H, Priyanka G, Naik MV, Umesha C. Influence of boron and zinc on growth and yield of green gram (*Vigna radiata* L.). The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2022;11(3):1674-1678.
10. Obata H, Kawamura S, Senoo K, Tanaka A. Changes in the level of protein and activity of Cu/Zn superoxide dismutase in zinc deficient rice plant, *Oryza sativa* L. Soil Sci Plant Nutr. 1999;45:891-896.
11. Ojiewo CO, Janila P, Mathur PB, Pandey MK, Desmae H, Okori P, *et al.* Advances in Crop Improvement and Delivery Research for Nutritional Quality and Health Benefits of Groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). Front Plant Sci. 2020;11:1-15.
12. Raj S. An Introduction to physiology of field crops. New Delhi: Oxford and IBH Publishing Co; c1985. p. 94-97.
13. Ram S, Katiyar TPS. Effect of sulphur and zinc on the seed yield and protein content of summer mungbean under arid climate. Int J Sci Nature. 2013;4(3):563-566.
14. Sakal R, Sinha RB, Singh AP. Effect of Boron application on Black gram and Chickpea, Production in Calcareous soil. Fertilizer News. 1988;33:27-30.
15. Shah KA, Gurjar R, Parmarand HC, Sonani VV. Effect of sulphur and zinc fertilization on yield and quality of pigeonpea in sandy loam soil. Green Farming. 2016;7(2):495-497.
16. Singh BP, Singh B. Response of French bean to phosphorus and boron in acid alfisols in Meghalaya. J Indian Soc Soil Sci. 1990;38:769-771.
17. Sowmya S, Ganapathy M. Influence of different micronutrients on growth and yield of groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea*) in coastal sandy soils. Res Crops. 2021;22(2):251-255.
18. Vitosh ML, Wameke DD, Lucas RE. Boron. Extension Soil and Management Fertilizer, Mishigan State University; c1997. p. E-486.