

Effect of de topping and growth regulators on productivity of cotton

ASHOK S. JADHAV*

Cotton Research Scheme, Vasantrao Naik Marathwada Krishi Vidhyapeeth, Parbhani-431402 *Email: asjadhav31@rediffmail.com

ABSTRACT: A field experiment was conducted to study the effect of growth regulators application and de-topping on seed cotton yield and economicsduring *kharif* seasons of 2015-2016, 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 at Cotton Research Scheme, Vasantrao Naik Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth, Parbhani. The experiment was laid out in a randomized block design with three replications and seven treatments. *viz.*, T₁. Spraying of (CC 50 %) SL (cycocil) @ 60ppm at 75 DAS T₂. Spraying of (CC 50 % SL) (cycocil) @ 60ppm at 90 DAS T₃. Spraying of (MC 5 % AS) (*Chamatkar*) @ 250 ppm at 75 DAS T₄. Spraying of (MC 5 % AS) (*Chamatkar*) @ 250 ppm at 90 DAS T5. De topping at 75 DAS T₆. De topping at 90 DAS T₇. Control. Non *Bt* cotton variety NH 615 was sown by dibbling at a spacing of 60 x 15 cm. The pooled data revealed that, De topping at 75 DAS recorded significantly highest seed cotton yield (1050, 1214, 1015 kg/ha) during 2015, 2016, 2017, respectively over rest of the treatments except it was *at par* with T₆ *i.e.* De topping at 90 DAS and T₄ *i.e.* Spraying of (MC @ 250ppm) at 75 DAS. increased cotton yield were observed in mepiquat chloride (50 ppm) sprayed at 90 DAS.

Key words: Bt cotton, De topping, growth regulator, seed cotton yield

Cotton (Gossypium spp) popularly known as "White Gold" and is an important crop for the rural economy of India and livelihood of the Indian farming community. Presently India ranks first in area and second in production of cotton in the world (Anonyous, 2017). Cotton is a crop with an indeterminate growth habit. Though vegetative growth is necessary to support reproductive growth, excessive vegetative growth can be detrimental. It is therefore necessary to control the excessive vegetative growth and divert the photosynthate towards reproductive parts of plant. Farmers apply growth regulators to the foliage in an effort to maintain a balance of vegetative and reproductive growth. The most commonly used growth regulator is mepiquat chloride, which decreases vegetative growth. Mepiquat inhibits a key enzyme in the production of gibberellic acid (Rademacher, 2000). Kolar and Patil (2012) reported that the application of mepiquat chloride @ 50 ppm at 90 DAS recorded significantly more seed cotton yield (1190 kg/ha) as compared to application of cycocil (934.3 kg/ha). De topping is another way to divert the photosynthete towards sink in growing plants

and avoid excess plant growth. De-topping at 30 days after flowering get higher seed cotton yield of 4911 kg/ha in Iran (Mirshekari *et al.*, 2013) The work on de topping and its effect in cotton crop is not common. Therefore, a field experiment was conducted at Cotton Research Scheme, VNMKV, Parbhani with objective to find out the effect of de topping in comparison with growth regulators.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was carried out during *kharif* seasons of 2015 to 2017 at Cotton Research Scheme Farm, Vasantrao Naik Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth, Parbhani. The soil of experimental plot was clayey in texture, low in available nitrogen (173kg/ha) and available phosphorus (10 kg/ha) and very high in available potash (410 kg/ha). The experiment was laid out in a randomized block design with three replications and seven treatments. *viz.* T1. Spraying of CC 50 % SL (cycocil) @ 60ppm at 75 DAS T2. Spraying of CC 50% SL (cycocil) @ 60ppm at 90 DAS T3. Spraying of MC 5 % AS (Chamatkar) @ 250 ppm at 75 DAS T4. Spraying of MC 5 % AS (Chamatkar) @ 250

Table 1. Yield and Yield attributes of cotton as influenced by different treatments

| Treatment | Seed Cotton Yield (kg ha-1) | | | | Boll weight (g) | | | | No. of bolls | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--|
| | 2015 -16 | 2016- 17 | 2017- 18 | Pooled mean | 2015- 16 | 2016- 17 | 2017- 18 | Pooled mean | 2015- 16 | 2016- 17 | 2017- 18 | Pooled mean | |
| T1. Spraying of CC 50 % SL@ 60 ppm at 75 DAS | 814 | 1069 | 903 | 938 | 2.56 | 2.77 | 2.57 | 2.60 | 15.2 | 34.0 | 16.8 | 22.0 | |
| T2. Spraying of CC 50 % SL@ 60 ppm at 90DAS | 819 | 988 | 870 | 893 | 2.53 | 2.77 | 2.81 | 2.72 | 16.3 | 34.3 | 19.6 | 23.4 | |
| T3. Spraying of MC 5% AS @ 250 ppm at 75 DAS | 851 | 1100 | 1004 | 985 | 2.63 | 2.87 | 2.63 | 2.74 | 17.7 | 33.6 | 20.4 | 23.9 | |
| T4. Spraying of MC 5% AS @ 250 ppm at 90 DAS | 886 | 930 | 980 | 932 | 2.66 | 2.87 | 2.56 | 2.73 | 18.5 | 36.6 | 19.4 | 24.8 | |
| T5. De-topping at 75 DAS | 1050 | 1214 | 1015 | 1093 | 2.56 | 2.97 | 3.10 | 2.91 | 20.4 | 35.3 | 24.2 | 26.6 | |
| T6. De-topping at 90 DAS | 1021 | 1094 | 1011 | 1052 | 2.40 | 2.67 | 3.00 | 2.75 | 20.1 | 34.0 | 23.6 | 25.9 | |
| T7. Control | 681 | 947 | 732 | 787 | 2.76 | 2.77 | 2.71 | 2.72 | 15.0 | 25.3 | 16.5 | 18.9 | |
| SE+ | 56 | 43 | 30 | 45 | 0.20 | 0.18 | 0.13 | 0.16 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 1.5 | |
| CD@5% | 172 | 133 | 92 | 131 | N.S. | N.S. | 0.33 | N.S. | 2.4 | 5.5 | 3.1 | 4.3 | |
| Mean | 879 | 1049 | 910 | 946 | 2.59 | 2.80 | 2.74 | 2.75 | 17.5 | 36.1 | 20.5 | 25.6 | |

CC - Chlormequat chloride MC- Mepiquate chloride

Table 3. Gross and Net monetary returns and B:C ratio as influenced by different treatments

| Treatment | GMR (Rs.) | | | | | NMR (I | B:C Ratio | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|
| | 2015- 16 | 2016- 17 | 2017- 18 | Pooled mean | 2015- 16 | 2016- 17 | 2017- 18 | Pooled mean | 2015- 16 | 2016- 17 | 2017- 18 | Pooled mean |
| T1. Spraying of CC 50 % | 35816 | 58795 | 45150 | 45587 | 12396 | 30893 | 17712 | 20333 | 1.52 | 2.10 | 1.64 | 1.75 |
| SL@ 60 ppm at 75 DAS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| T2. Spraying of CC 50 $\%$ | 36036 | 54340 | 43500 | 44625 | 12591 | 27086 | 16359 | 18678 | 1.54 | 1.99 | 1.60 | 1.71 |
| SL@ 60 ppm at 90DAS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| T3. Spraying of MC 5% | 37444 | 60500 | 50200 | 49381 | 13084 | 31595 | 21098 | 21925 | 1.58 | 2.09 | 1.72 | 1.80 |
| AS@ 250 ppm at 75 DAS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| T4. Spraying of MC 5% | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AS@250 ppm at 90 DAS | 38984 | 51150 | 49000 | 46378 | 14449 | 23605 | 20114 | 19389 | 1.59 | 1.85 | 1.69 | 1.71 |
| T5. De-topping at 75 DAS | 46200 | 66770 | 50750 | 54573 | 21457 | 37565 | 22161 | 27061 | 1.86 | 2.28 | 1.77 | 1.97 |
| T6. De-topping at 90 DAS | 44924 | 60170 | 50550 | 51881 | 20326 | 31925 | 21997 | 24749 | 1.83 | 2.12 | 1.77 | 1.90 |
| T7. Control | 29964 | 52085 | 36600 | 39549 | 7634 | 25581 | 11126 | 14781 | 1.34 | 1.96 | 1.43 | 1.58 |
| SE+ | 3292 | 3872 | 3345 | 3210 | 768 | 1091 | 839 | 1270 | _ | _ | _ | _ |
| CD@5% | 9122 | 8296 | 9802 | 8620 | 2363 | 3357 | 2520 | 3908 | _ | _ | _ | |
| GM | 38481 | 57687 | 46535 | 47567 | 14562 | 29750 | 18652 | 20988 | | | | |

Cotton Price Rs. Qt-1 = 4500/-(2015-16) Rs. Qt-1 = 5500/-(2016-17) Rs. Qt-1 = 5000/-(2017-18)

ppm at 90 DAS T5. De-topping at 75 DAS T6.De-topping at 90 DAS T7.Control.Sowing of cotton variety NH 615 was done by dibbling the seed at spacing 60 x 15 cm (1.11 lakh) with fertilizer 120:60:60 kg NPK ha-1 was applied. Spraying of growth regulators was undertaken with the help of knapsack sprayer whereas, de-topping was done with secator. The data on seed cotton yield was recorded on the basis of net plot area and the crop

was picked in three pickings in each treatment. The data were analysed by the analysis of variance method as suggested by Gomez and Gomez (2010).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Effect on yield (kg/ha) and yield attributes of cotton

The data on seed cotton yield (kg/ha), boll

90 Jadhav

weight (g) and bolls/plant are presented in Table 1. There was significant difference between treatments on yield and yield components.

The pooled data on seed cotton yield (kg/ha) indicates that, among the different treatments, T_5 *i.e.* De topping at 75 DAS recorded significantly highest seed cotton yield (1050, 1214, 1015 kg/ha) during 2015, 2016, 2017, respectively over rest of the treatments except it was *at par* with T_6 *i.e.* De topping at 90 DAS and T_3 *i.e.* Spraying of MC @ 250ppm at 75 DAS. Beneficial effect on seed cotton yield was in conformity with the findings of Virdia (2011). De topping at 75 DAS recorded significantly highest boll weight (g) and boll number over rest of the treatments except it was *at par* with T_6 *i.e.* De topping at 90 DAS and T_3 *i.e.* spraying of MC @ 250ppm at 75 DAS during all the years of experiment.

Effect on gross and net monetary returns

The data on gross and net monetary returns are presented in Table 2. The pooled data indicates that, among the different treatments, T_5 *i.e.* De topping at 75 DAS recorded significantly highest gross monetary returns (Rs. 46200, 66770, 50750) and net monetary returns (Rs. 21457, 37565, 22161) during 2015, 2016, 2017, respectively over rest of the treatments except it was $at \ par \ with \ T_6 \ i.e.$ De topping at 90 DAS and T_4 i.e. spraying of MC@ 250ppm at 75 DAS.

CONCLUSION

For highest seed cotton yield and higher economic returns De topping at 75 DAS or spraying of mepiquate chloride (5% AS) @ 250 ppm (25 ml/10 l. water) at 75 DAS is

recommended for *hirsutum* cotton under high density planting system $(60 \times 15 \text{ cm})$.

REFERENCES

- **Anonymous, 2017.** "Annual report" All India Coordinated Cotton improvement project, Coimbatore, **1**: 1-5.
- Gomez, K.A. and Gomez, A.A. 2010. Statistical Procedures for Agricultural Research. 2ndEdn., John Wiley and Sons, New York.pp.13-175.
- Kolar, P. and Patil., B.C. 2012. Plant growth regulators and its influence on yield, morphophysiological and biochemical parameters in hybrid cotton (Gossypium hirsutum L.) Indian J. Plant Physiol., 10:187-90.
- Mirshekari, B. and Meshkinshar, B. 2013. Response of cotton cultivars to de topping and plant growth regulators. *Seed and Pl. Prod. Jour.*, **292**: 97-108.
- Rademacher, W. 2000. Growth Retardants: Effects on Gibberellin Biosynthesis and Other Metabolic Pathways. *Ann. Rev. Plant Physiol. Plant Mol. Biol.* 51:501-31.
- **Virdia, H.M. 2011.** Effect of topping on growth and yield of hybrid cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.). *Adv. Res. J. Crop Improve.*, **2**: 21-23.

Received for publication: October 28, 2020 Accepted for publication: November 29, 2020