

## Effect of rates and sources of phosphorus on productivity and economics of rice (*Oryza sativa*) as influenced by crop-residue incorporation

S. N. SHARMA\*, R. PRASAD, Y.S. SHIVAY, M.K. DWIVEDI, SANDEEP KUMAR AND D. KUMAR

Division of Agronomy, Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi 110 012

Received: April 2008

### ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted at New Delhi for 3 years during rainy season (*khariif*) of 2001 to 2003 to study the effect of crop-residue incorporation on the relative efficiency of di-ammonium phosphate (DAP) and Mussoorie rock phosphate (MRP) in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). Phosphorus application generally increased the growth and yield parameters, yields as well as gross and net returns of rice. The increase of these parameters was however significant when the rate of P application was increased from 0 to 35 kg P/ha. At 35 kg P/ha MRP in conjunction with phosphate solubilizing bacteria (PSB) was statistically on a par with DAP, increasing the grain yield by 10-17%, P uptake by 26-54%, available P content in soil by 12-99% and net profit by 15-37% over the control. Agronomic efficiency and apparent recovery of DAP were higher than those of MRP at 17.5 kg P/ha, but on a par with those at 35 kg P/ha. Crop-residue incorporation had no significant effect on grain yield but it significantly increased the apparent recovery of applied P and available P content of soil. Thus, the combined application of MRP, PSB and crop residue proved a good practice that can be used as P fertilizer for rice.

**Key words:** Agronomic efficiency, Diammonium phosphate, Gross and net returns, Mussoorie rock phosphate, Phosphorus-solubilizing bacteria, Yield

One reason of lower yield of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) is lower P content in the Indian soil. Motsara (2002) reported that 60% soils are low to medium in available P. Added inorganic P as water soluble phosphate fertilizer undergoes complex exchanges between various soil-P pools. This is especially true in the tropics where many soils have extremely high P fixation capacity. Consequently, large amounts of fertilizer P are needed to attain reasonable crop yields. In Indian context the price of fertilizer-P is the highest amongst the major nutrients. The current cost of 1 kg P varies from Rs 34.4 through diammonium phosphate (DAP) to Rs 38.9–59.5 through single superphosphate compared with Rs 10.5 for 1 kg N through urea and Rs 8.4 for 1 kg K through muriate of potash. These prices are excluding the Government-subsidy component. Owing to the high cost of fertilizer P, the small and marginal farmers in India generally skip P application. The N: P consumption ratio in India is 2.6:1 (FAI, New Delhi, 2006) compared with the desirable ratio of 2:1 for sustainable crop production (Tiwari, 2002). Further, the reason for high cost of phosphorus in India is mainly that the bulk of the phosphate rock for making phosphate fertilizers is imported. However, there are substantial deposits of low-

grade rock phosphate in India, which can partly meet the crop demands of phosphorus. One such deposit is Mussoorie rock phosphate (MRP). Attempts have been made in the past to use finely ground MRP directly into the soil of pH 7.0 and above with the help of phosphate-solubilizing micro-organisms (Bojinova *et al.*, 1997; He *et al.*, 2002) and pyrites (Sharma and Prasad, 1996). Singh *et al.* (1988) reported that under waterlogged condition the crop residues increase the availability of P through the mechanism of chelating and favourable changes in soil pH. The present investigation was therefore undertaken to study the effect of crop residue on the efficiency of DAP and MRP at varying rates of application on the growth, yield and economics of rice and available P content of soil.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was conducted during rainy season (*khariif*) of 2001 to 2003 at the Research Farm of Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi (28° 38' N latitude, 77° 11' E longitude and 228.6 m above mean sea-level). The soil was sandy clay-loam, having 52.5% sand, 21.0% silt and 26.5% clay. It contained 12.0 t/ha organic C, 1.3 t/ha Kjeldahl N, 16.0 kg/ha 0.5 M NaHCO<sub>3</sub>-extractable P and 500 kg/ha 1 N NH<sub>4</sub>OAc-extractable K, and had pH 8.3 at the beginning of the experiment.

\*Corresponding author (Email: snsharma\_agro@yahoo.com)

[illegible]

increased from 0 to 35 kg P/ha as DAP. MRP was effective @ 35 and 52.5 kg/ha. The number of grains/panicle increased significantly with the application of 17.5 kg P/ha as DAP or 35.0 kg P/ha as MRP. Further increase in rate of P application to 35 kg P/ha as DAP also significantly increased the number of grains/panicle. Incorporation of residue had no significant effect on growth and yield-at-tributing characters of rice.

The grain yield of rice increased significantly when the rate of P application was increased from 0 to 35 kg P/ha either as DAP or MRP during 2001 and 2002, whereas during 2003 DAP at 17.5 kg P/ha also significantly increased it over the control (Table 1). Further increase in the rate of DAP from 17.5 to 35 kg P/ha in 2003 and of MRP from 35 to 52.5 kg P/ha during all the 3 years did not result in additional increase in grain yield of rice. Taking cognizance of the fact that PSB can make native and less-soluble P as in MRP more readily available to the crops (Bojinova *et al.*, 1997; He *et al.*, 2002), the present study was made with the combined application of PSB and MRP and the results show that MRP and DAP were on a par at 35 kg P/ha but not at 17.5 kg P/ha. Its reason is that MRP at lower rate might have not released sufficient quantity of available P to meet the P requirement of crop. The increase in yield attributes due to MRP application was also significant only at higher rate of P application.

Application of 17.5 and 35 kg P/ha as DAP significantly increased the straw yield of rice in the first and last 2 years respectively whereas MRP significantly increased it over the control only at 52.5 kg P/ha, which was similar to that obtained with DAP at 35 kg P/ha (Table 1). Similar trend was observed in plant height and number of tillers/m<sup>2</sup> (Table 1). Thus an increase in plant height and number of tillers/m<sup>2</sup> led to a significant increase in straw yield of rice with 35 kg P/ha as DAP or 52.5 kg P/ha as MRP.

Incorporation of crop residue had no significant effect on the grain yield of rice, but increased the efficiency of MRP. At 17.5, 35 and 52.5 kg P/ha without residue incor-

poration, MRP increased the grain yield of rice over the control by 8.7, 16.8 and 18.2% respectively, whereas with residue incorporation, MRP at 17.5, 35 and 52.5 kg P/ha increased it by 9.4, 16.8 and 22%, respectively. The response equations worked out separately for DAP and MRP with and without residue incorporation revealed that the response of rice to DAP was quadratic without residue incorporation and linear with residue incorporation during the first 2 years and vice-versa in the third year. The response of rice to MRP was linear irrespective of residue-management practices in all the 3 years of study.

Incorporation of crop residue had no significant effect on straw yield of rice; however, residue incorporation significantly increased the efficiency of MRP. For example in 2001 MRP @ 35 and 52.5 kg P/ha increased the straw yield over the control by 4 and 15%, respectively without residue incorporation compared with 10 and 21%, respectively with residue incorporation. Similar trends were obtained during 2002 (Table 2). However, in 2003 the interaction between phosphorus and residue was not significant.

### P uptake

Phosphorus application significantly increased the P uptake by rice in all the 3 years of study (Table 3). During the first year 35 kg P/ha as MRP was on a par with 17.5 kg P/ha as DAP, which significantly increased P uptake by rice over the control. P @ 52.5 kg/ha as MRP was significantly superior to that @ 17.5 kg/ha. During the second year P uptake of rice increased significantly when the rate of P application was increased from 0 to 35 kg P/ha either as DAP or MRP. Further increase in its rate from 35 to 52.5 kg P/ha as MRP did not result in an additional increase in the amount of P uptake by rice. During the third year application of 17.5 kg P/ha either through DAP or MRP significantly increased the P uptake by rice over the control. Further increases in the rate of DAP from 17.5 to 35 kg P/ha did not increase the P uptake over 17.5 kg P/ha, but MRP @ 52.5 kg P/ha proved significantly superior

**Table 2.** Interaction effect of phosphorus (rates and sources) and residue management practices on grain and straw yield of rice.

| Treatments        | Grain yield (t/ha) |      | Straw yield (t/ha) |      |      |      |
|-------------------|--------------------|------|--------------------|------|------|------|
|                   | 2003               |      | 2001               |      | 2002 |      |
|                   | NR                 | RI   | NR                 | RI   | NR   | RI   |
| <i>Phosphorus</i> |                    |      |                    |      |      |      |
| Control           | 4.83               | 5.01 | 7.01               | 7.04 | 9.75 | 6.89 |
| 17.5 as DAP       | 5.60               | 5.55 | 7.64               | 8.20 | 7.20 | 7.34 |
| 17.5 as MRP       | 5.25               | 5.48 | 7.18               | 7.27 | 6.90 | 7.15 |
| 35.0 as DAP       | 5.71               | 5.67 | 7.67               | 7.67 | 7.46 | 7.67 |
| 35.0 as MRP       | 5.64               | 5.82 | 7.28               | 7.71 | 7.24 | 7.57 |
| 52.5 as MRP       | 5.71               | 6.12 | 8.05               | 8.50 | 7.17 | 7.82 |
| SEm±              | 0.29               |      | 0.31               |      | 0.32 |      |
| CD (P=0.05)       | 0.86               |      | 0.89               |      | 0.91 |      |

to 17.5 kg P/ha in P uptake by rice. The effect of P application was higher on P uptake of rice than those on grain and straw yields owing to the positive effect of P application on P concentrations in grain and straw of rice.

#### **Agronomic efficiency and apparent recovery of P**

Agronomic efficiency of DAP was higher than that of MRP; however, the difference between these two sources narrowed down during the third year (2003) of the study (Table 4). An increase in the rate of P application decreased the agronomic efficiency of DAP, but increased that of rock phosphate up to 35 kg P/ha. Incorporation of crop residue also increased the agronomic efficiency of MRP except at 35 kg P/ha in 2001. Singh and Sharma (2000) also reported an increase in agronomic efficiency of nitrogen due to incorporation of residue in rice crop.

Apparent recovery of phosphorus was higher in DAP

than in MRP at 17.5 kg P/ha, but the reverse position was observed at 35 kg P/ha (Table 5). This happened because the apparent recovery of DAP decreased with increase in the rate of P application, but that of MRP increased when the rate of P application increased from 17.5 to 35 kg P/ha. Further increase in the rate of P application from 35 to 52.5 kg/ha as MRP decreased the apparent recovery of P. Incorporation of crop residue increased it in both DAP as well as MRP except, DAP at 17.5 kg P/ha in 2001. Singh and Sharma (2000) also reported positive effects of residue incorporation on apparent recovery of N in rice.

#### **Available P content in soil**

Available P content in soil increased significantly with increase in the rate of both DAP and MRP (Table 5). Residue incorporation also increased the available P content in the soil in all the 3 years of study. It had adverse effect on

**Table 3.** Effect of rates and sources of phosphorus on P uptake (kg/ha) of rice as influenced by residue incorporation

| Phosphorus          | 2001 |             |      | 2002 |             |      | 2003 |            |      |
|---------------------|------|-------------|------|------|-------------|------|------|------------|------|
|                     | NR   | RI          | Mean | NR   | RI          | Mean | NR   | RI         | Mean |
| Control             | 10.3 | 11.2        | 10.8 | 8.2  | 9.4         | 8.1  | 9.0  | 9.3        | 9.1  |
| 17.5 kg P/ha as DAP | 13.1 | 13.9        | 13.5 | 10.9 | 12.2        | 11.6 | 11.4 | 12.1       | 11.7 |
| 17.5 kg P/ha as MRP | 11.1 | 13.0        | 12.0 | 8.4  | 10.8        | 9.6  | 10.6 | 12.0       | 11.3 |
| 35 kg P/ha as DAP   | 12.2 | 15.0        | 13.6 | 10.4 | 12.5        | 11.4 | 11.6 | 13.1       | 12.3 |
| 35 kg P/ha as MRP   | 13.5 | 15.3        | 14.4 | 11.0 | 14.0        | 12.5 | 11.6 | 13.2       | 12.4 |
| 52.5 kg P/ha as MRP | 13.4 | 16.7        | 15.1 | 10.8 | 14.3        | 12.6 | 12.0 | 13.9       | 12.9 |
| Mean                | 12.3 | 14.2        |      | 10.0 | 11.9        |      | 11.0 | 12.3       |      |
|                     | SEm± | CD (P=0.05) |      | SEm± | CD (P=0.05) |      | SEm± | CD(P=0.05) |      |
| Phosphorus (P)      | 0.86 | 2.43        |      | 0.84 | 2.37        |      | 0.90 | 2.54       |      |
| Residue (R)         | 0.53 | 1.85        |      | 0.28 | 0.98        |      | 0.30 | 1.05       |      |
| P x R               | 1.22 | 3.44        |      | 1.19 | 3.36        |      | 1.27 | 3.58       |      |

NR = No residue; RI = Residue incorporation

**Table 4.** Effect of rates and sources of phosphorus on agronomic efficiency and apparent recovery of phosphorus in rice as influenced by residue incorporation

| Phosphorus                           | 2001 |      |      | 2002 |      |      | 2003 |      |      |
|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
|                                      | NR   | RI   | Mean | NR   | RI   | Mean | NR   | RI   | Mean |
| Agronomic efficiency (kg grain/kg P) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 17.5 kg P/ha as DAP                  | 30.3 | 13.1 | 21.7 | 21.7 | 18.3 | 20.0 | 44.0 | 30.8 | 22.0 |
| 17.5 kg P/ha as MRP                  | 10.8 | 19.4 | 15.1 | 2.9  | 9.7  | 6.3  | 24.0 | 26.8 | 25.4 |
| 35 kg P/ha as DAP                    | 12.8 | 19.7 | 16.2 | 18.3 | 18.3 | 18.3 | 25.1 | 18.9 | 22.0 |
| 35 kg P/ha as MRP                    | 19.4 | 14.0 | 16.7 | 12.0 | 16.8 | 14.4 | 23.1 | 23.1 | 23.1 |
| 52.5 kg P/ha as MRP                  | 14.3 | 19.2 | 16.8 | 11.8 | 11.2 | 11.5 | 16.8 | 21.1 | 19.0 |
| Mean                                 | 17.5 | 17.1 |      | 13.3 | 14.9 |      | 26.6 | 24.1 |      |
| Apparent recovery (%)                |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 17.5 kg P/ha as DAP                  | 16.0 | 15.4 | 15.7 | 15.4 | 16.0 | 15.7 | 13.7 | 16.0 | 14.8 |
| 17.5 kg P/ha as MRP                  | 4.6  | 10.3 | 7.4  | 2.7  | 8.0  | 5.3  | 9.1  | 15.4 | 12.3 |
| 35 kg P/ha as DAP                    | 5.4  | 10.8 | 8.1  | 6.3  | 8.9  | 7.6  | 7.4  | 10.8 | 9.1  |
| 35 kg P/ha as MRP                    | 9.1  | 11.7 | 10.4 | 8.0  | 13.1 | 10.5 | 7.4  | 11.1 | 9.3  |
| 52.5 kg P/ha as MRP                  | 5.9  | 10.5 | 8.2  | 4.9  | 9.3  | 7.1  | 5.7  | 8.8  | 7.2  |
| Mean                                 | 8.2  | 11.7 |      | 7.5  | 11.1 |      | 8.7  | 12.4 |      |

NR = No residue; RI = Residue incorporation

**Table 5.** Effect of rates and sources of phosphorus on available P content (kg/ha) in soil after rice harvest

| Phosphorus          | 2001 |             |      | 2002 |             |      | 2003 |             |      |
|---------------------|------|-------------|------|------|-------------|------|------|-------------|------|
|                     | NR   | RI          | Mean | NR   | RI          | Mean | NR   | RI          | Mean |
| Control             | 14.8 | 16.7        | 15.7 | 14.4 | 15.0        | 14.7 | 11.9 | 12.6        | 12.2 |
| 17.5 kg P/ha as DAP | 16.8 | 17.1        | 16.9 | 17.4 | 19.8        | 18.6 | 21.7 | 24.4        | 23.0 |
| 17.5 kg P/ha as MRP | 16.6 | 16.9        | 16.8 | 17.0 | 18.1        | 17.5 | 21.2 | 23.9        | 22.0 |
| 35 kg P/ha as DAP   | 16.8 | 18.4        | 17.6 | 19.2 | 21.5        | 20.3 | 22.7 | 24.6        | 23.0 |
| 35 kg P/ha as MRP   | 17.0 | 18.2        | 17.6 | 19.3 | 20.7        | 19.9 | 22.9 | 25.7        | 24.0 |
| 52.5 kg P/ha as MRP | 18.7 | 21.8        | 20.2 | 19.3 | 20.9        | 20.1 | 23.5 | 27.8        | 25.6 |
| Mean                | 16.8 | 18.2        |      | 17.8 | 19.2        |      | 20.6 | 23.0        |      |
|                     | SEm± | CD (P=0.05) |      | SEm± | CD (P=0.05) |      | SEm± | CD (P=0.05) |      |
| Phosphorus (P)      | 0.74 | 2.08        |      | 0.46 | 1.29        |      | 0.31 | 0.88        |      |
| Residue (R)         | 0.29 | 1.00        |      | 0.24 | 0.82        |      | 0.16 | 0.58        |      |
| P x R               | 1.04 | 2.94        |      | 0.65 | 1.83        |      | 0.44 | 1.24        |      |

NR = No residue; RI = Residue incorporation

the efficiency of DAP and MRP for increasing the available P content in soil in 2001, but increased the efficiency of both in the second and third years. The reason may be that residue might have resulted in immobilization of a part of applied P and decreased the efficiency of both the sources of P. In 2002 mineralization of residue P and solubilization effect of residue on applied P might have led to positive effect of crop residue on the efficiency of both DAP and MRP. Sharma and Aggarwal (2006) reported that the solubilizing effect of crop residue was due to higher carbonic acid concentration in the residue-incorporated plots.

### Economics

Cost of rice cultivation ranged from Rs 24,425 to Rs 29,240. Application of DAP at 17.5 and 35 kg P/ha increased the cost of rice by 2.8 and 5.4% respectively, whereas MRP at 17.5, 35 and 52.5 kg P/ha increased it by 2.8, 3.5 and 5.1% respectively (Table 1). Incorporation of crop residue increased the cost of rice cultivation by 11%. Application of DAP at 17.5 and 35 kg P/ha significantly increased the net returns of rice over the control, whereas MRP at 17.5 kg P/ha had no significant effect on it. At 35 kg P/ha DAP and MRP were on a par and significantly increased the net returns of rice over the control by 23 and 26% respectively. Further increase in the rate of MRP from 35 to 52.5 kg P/ha did not give additional increase in the net returns of rice. Residue incorporation reduced the net returns of rice by 8.3%.

It was concluded that MRP with PSB and crop residue

can be used as P fertilizer to increase the productivity of rice and improve the P status of soil.

### REFERENCES

- Bojinova, D., Velkova, R., Grancharov, I. and Zhelev, S. 1997. The bioconversion of Tunisian phosphorite using *Aspergillus niger*. *Nutrient. Cycling in Agroecosystems* **47**: 227–232.
- FAI, New Delhi. 2006. Fertilizer Statistics (2005–2006). The Fertilizer Association of India, New Delhi, India.
- He, Z.H., Bian, W. and Zhu, J. 2002. Screening and identification of microorganisms capable of utilizing phosphate absorbed by goethite. *Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis* **33**: 647–663.
- Motsara, M.R. 2002. Available nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium status of Indian soils as depicted by soil fertility maps. *Fertilizer News* **47**(8): 15–21.
- Sharma, J.P. and Aggarwal, B. 2006. Dissolution of rock phosphate by chemical and biological means. *Indian Farming* **59**(1): 31–34.
- Sharma S.N. and Prasad R. 1996. Mussoorie rock phosphate-pyrite mixture as phosphate fertilizer. *Fertilizer Research* **45**:187–191.
- Singh, M. and Sharma, S.N. 2000. Effect of crop residue management and nitrogen rates on productivity and nutrient uptake of rice-wheat cropping system. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences* **70**(12): 835–839.
- Singh, Y., Singh, B., Makina, M.S. and Meelu, O.P. 1988. Effect of organic manure, crop residues and green manures (*Sesbania aculeata*) on nitrogen and phosphorus transformations in a sandy loam soil at field capacity and waterlogged conditions. *Biology and Fertility of Soils* **7**: 1368–1381.
- Tiwari, K.N. 2002. Nutrient management: issues and strategies. *Fertilizer News* **47**(8): 23–49.