

Journal of Plantation Crops, 2011, 39 (2): 337-339

Effect of spacing and size of planting material on growth and yield of turmeric grown in coconut plantation

(Manuscript Received: 09-04-09, Revised: 03-11-10, Accepted: 03-05-11)

Keywords: Coconut, intercrop, turmeric, spacing

Turmeric (Curcuma longa L.) is one of the most important spice crops grown in India since ancient times and India enjoys monopoly in the production of turmeric. Growing turmeric in coconut plantation proves profitable without hampering the performance of the main crop (Sharma et al., 1996; Sairam et al., 1997; Nath, 2002). The size of planting material and spacing are the major factors influencing growth and yield of turmeric although not much work on standardisation of these factors has so far been done in West Bengal, particularly when grown as intercrop in coconut garden. Turmeric in West Bengal is generally planted in 22-35 cm apart in each direction. For sowing, the fingers are cut into pieces each of 4-5 cm long. The present investigation was undertaken with the objectives to determine optimum spacing and size of planting material for turmeric when grown as intercrop with coconut.

The experiment was carried out in a 18 years old coconut (cv. E C T) plantation at Horticultural Research Station, Mondouri, Bidhan Chandra Krishi Viswavidyalaya, Nadia during 1999-2000. The soil of the experimental site was gangetic alluvial with sandy loam texture having medium NPK and soil pH 6. The coconut palms were spaced at 7.5 x 7.5 m. The experiment was laid out in split plot design with five spacings i.e., P $(20 \times 15 \text{ cm})$, $P_2(20 \times 20 \text{ cm})$, $P_3(25 \times 20 \text{ cm})$, $P_4(25 \times 10^{-3})$ 25 cm) and P_s (30 x 25 cm) as main plot and two size of planting materials (primary finger) i.e.S1 (20-25 g) and S_2 (30-35 g) as subplot treatments, with three replications. There were ten treatments with all possible combinations. Indofil-M 45 (0.3%) treated rhizomes of required size (cv Suguna) were planted in the middle of April during both the years according to the spacing treatments. Fertilizers were applied @ 125 : 100 : 100 kg NPK / ha. Entire P with ½ K and 1/3 N along with FYM @ 20 t / ha were given as basal application. 1/3N at 45 days after planting (DAP) and 1/3N &1/2 K were applied at 90 DAP followed by earthing up and mulching. The rhizome was harvested at 210 DAP. Scheduled agronomical management practices with fertilizer dose @ 500: 250: 750 g NPK / palm /year were followed in coconut under both intercropped and monocrop plots. Irrigation was given after planting of turmeric. Further need based irrigation was given for intercrops and main crop. Plant protection measures were taken as and when required. The observation on different growth parameters were recorded (180 DAP) from five randomly selected plants per replication. Yield was taken on net plot basis at harvest.

Different growth parameters like plant height and tiller number recorded at 180 DAP in both the years showed variation with the treatments. A decreasing trend in plant height was observed with the increase in spacing. The maximum plant height of 139.45 cm and 141.86 cm were observed in the closest spacing (20 x 15 cm) in the year 1999 and 2000 respectively while the minimum plant height of 127.08 cm and 124.36 cm were recorded in the plants raised under widest spacing (30 x 25 cm) in the respective years. Plant height decreased from 140.66 cm to 125.72 cm (pooled data) with the increase in spacing from 20 x 15 cm to 30 x 25 cm (Table 1). Ponnuswamy and Muthuswami (1981) recorded similar results. At closer spacing the intra row mutual shading takes place, hence competition for light may be the reason for increased plant height. This conforms with the earlier findings of Singh et al. (2000). The bigger seed rhizome (30-35g) significantly increased the plant height upto 143.51 cm, as compared to 121.96 cm recorded in smaller seed rhizome (20-25 g) which is in agreement with the findings of Singh and Kar (1991) and Singh et al. (2000). Maximum height (151.05 cm) was observed in the plants raised from bigger seed rhizome (30-35 g) under closest spacing (20 x 15 cm) followed by combination of same seed size under 20 x 20 cm spacing (149.21 cm) and

Table 1. Effect of spacing and rhizome size on growth parameters of turmeric

Treatment				
	1999	2000	Pooled	
Spacing				
P ₁ (20 x 15cm)	139.45	141.86	140.66	
P ₂ (20 x 20cm)	140.60	133.60	137.10	
P_{3}^{2} (25 x 20cm)	135.50	128.40	131.95	
P ₄ (25 x 25cm)	132.33	124.18	128.25	
P ₅ (30 x 25cm)	127.08	124.36	125.72	
S.Em.(±)	8.814	6.906	4.028	
CD (P=0.05)	NS	NS	NS	
Rhizome size				
S ₁ (20-25 g)	121.37	122.56	121.96	
S ₂ (30-35 g)	148.61	138.40	143.51	
S.Em. (±)	2.712	1.990	1.196	
CD (P=0.05)	8.542	6.268	3.767	

NS = Not significant

minimum height (117.33 cm) was recorded in the plants under widest spacing (30 x 25 cm) with smaller seed rhizome (20 - 25 g) (Table 2).

Table 2. Interaction effect of spacing and rhizome size on growth parameters of turmeric

	Plant height (cm)			
1999	2000	Pooled		
129.24	131.30	130.27		
149.66	152.43	151.05		
123.83	126.13	124.98		
157.36	141.06	149.21		
120.66	116.93	118.80		
150.33	139.86	145.10		
115.33	121.56	118.45		
149.33	126.80	138.06		
116.86	117.33			
136.36	131.86	134.11		
6.043	4.451	2.676		
NS	NS	NS		
	129.24 149.66 123.83 157.36 120.66 150.33 115.33 149.33 116.86 136.36	1999 2000 129.24 131.30 149.66 152.43 123.83 126.13 157.36 141.06 120.66 116.93 150.33 139.86 115.33 121.56 149.33 126.80 116.86 117.33 136.36 131.86 6.043 4.451		

NS = Not significant

Table 3. Effect of spacing and rhizome size on yield of turmeric

11.702

12.85

Treatment Yield per plot (kg/3 m²) Yield per plant (g) Yield per hectare (t) 1999 2000 1999 2000 Pooled 1999 2000 **Pooled** Pooled Spacing P₁ (20 x 15cm) 194.28 191.53 192.90 16.42 16.49 16.46 13.18 13.21 13.19 P, (20 x 20cm) 252.45 17.39 17.07 17.23 13.48 254.78 250.13 14.08 13.78 $P_{2}(25 \times 20 \text{cm})$ 284.88 278.80 281.84 16.05 15.60 15.83 12.83 12.48 12.66 P₄ (25 x 25cm) 308.23 304.98 306.60 14.30 13.98 14.14 11.65 10.97 11.31 P₅ (30 x 25cm) 335.98 326.41 331.20 13.50 13.02 13.27 11.30 9.92 10.61 $S.Em.(\pm)$ 6.083 8.178 5.646 0.695 0.966 0.760 0.823 0.699 0.452 CD (P=0.05) 19.836 26,668 18.411 2.266 NS 2.478 NS 2.281 1.468 Rhizome size 14.48 S₁ (20-25 g) 259.86 257.60 258.73 14.57 14.39 12.00 11.15 11.58 S₂ (30-35 g) 283.14 287.27 16.08 16.29 13.21 12.86 13.04 291.40 16.50 S.Em. (±) 3.715 4.080 2.635 0.382 0.241 0.258 0.538 0.634 0.546

NS = Not significant

CD (P=0.05)

The interaction effect also showed that maximum tiller number (3.36) was produced in the plants raised from bigger seed rhizome (30-35 g) under 25 x 25 cm spacing as compared to minimum tiller number (2.45) with smaller seed rhizome (20-25 g) in combination with closest spacing (20 x 15 cm).

Increasing trend in clump weight or yield per plant was observed with increase in spacing. The clump weight increased from 192.90 to 331.20 g with the increase in spacing from 20 x 15 cm to 30 cm x 25 cm (Table 3). The plants raised from the bigger seed rhizome (30-35 g) produced bigger clump of 287.27 g as compared to 258.73 g with smaller seed rhizome (20-25 g). Among the interactions, maximum clump weight (350.58 g) was recorded in plants raised under widest spacing (30 x 25 cm) coupled with bigger (30-35 g) rhizome (P_sS₂) but minimum clump weight (186.78 g) was recorded in the P₁S₁ (20 x 15 cm, 20-25 g) treatment combination. Interaction of spacing and rhizome size P₂S₂ (20 x20 cm, 30-35g) treatment combination recorded maximum yield of 17.26 kg/3m² as compared to minimum plot yield of $12.34 \text{ kg/3m}^2 \text{ with } P_5 S_1 (30 \text{ x } 25 \text{ cm}, 20-25 \text{ g})$ combination in the respective years. P₂S₂ treatment combination recorded maximum projected yield per hectare of 14.71 t as compared to minimum yield of 9.87 t with P₅S₁ combination (Table 4).

Closer spacing might effect the growth and development of plants due to competition among them for nutrients and other resources available per unit area but under spacing above the optimum, the utilization of the land may be less and thereby the yield might have been reduced Rajput et al. (1982), Philip (1985), Singh and Kar (1991). The plants resulting from large size rhizome are vigorous in take off stage and further in the growing season with better productivity as compared to the smaller rhizome (Singh et al., 2000).

1.203

0.759

0.812

NS

NS

NS

8.300

Spacing and size of planting material on growth and yield of intercropped turmeric

Table 4. Interaction effect of spacing and rhizome size on yield of turmeric

Treatment	Yield per plant (g)			Yield per plot (kg/3 m²)			Yield per hectare (t)		
	1999	2000	Pooled	1999	2000	Pooled	1999	2000	Pooled
$\overline{P_1S_1}$	186.26	187.30	186.78	15.62	15.69	15.65	12.49	12.58	12.53
$P_1 S_2$	202.30	195.76	199.03	17.23	17.30	17.26	13.87	13.84	13.85
$P_2 S_1$	236.33	233.90	235.11	16.07	16.07	16.07	13.20	12.50	12.85
$P_2^2S_2^1$	273.23	266.36	269.80	18.71	18.08	18.39	14.96	14.46	14.71
$P_3^2S_1^2$	274.13	269.46	271.80	15.36	14.76	15.06	12.28	11.80	12.04
$P_3^{3}S_2^{1}$	295.63	288.13	291.88	16.74	16.45	16.60	13.39	13.16	13.28
$P_4^3S_1^2$	288.23	288.03	288.13	13.28	13.28	13.28	11.05	10.19	10.62
$P_4^{\dagger}S_2^{\dagger}$	328.23	321.93	325.08	15.32	14.69	15.00	12.25	11.75	12.00
$P_5^{\dagger}S_1^2$	314.33	309.30	311.81	12.52	12.15	12.34	11.01	8.72	9.87
$P_5^3S_2^1$	357.63	343.53	350.58	14.49	13.90	14.20	11.59	11.12	11.35
PxS									
S.Em. (±)	8.308	9.123	5.898	0.856	0.540	0.578	1.204	1.419	1.220
C.D. (P=0.05)	26.170	28.737	NS	NS	1.701	NS	3.794	4.469	3.843

NS = Not significant

References

- Chowdhury, S. and Deka, K.K. 1997. Coconut based inter/mixed cropping under Assam conditions. *J. Plantn. Crops* 25: 106-8.
- Maheswarappa, H.P., Hegde, M.R.; Dhanapal, R. and Biddappa, C.C. 1998. Mixed farming in coconut garden Its impact on soil physical, chemical properties coconut nutrition and yield. *J. Plantn. Crops* **26**: 139-143.
- Marimathu, R., Athmanathan, V. and Mohan, S. 2001. High density multiple species cropping system in coconut garden. *South Indian Hort.* **49**: 34-36.
- Nath, J. C. 2002. Prospects of coconut based high density multistoreyed cropping in Assam. *Indian Coconut J.* **33**: 10-11.
- Philip, J. 1985. Effect of planting density on yield and yield components of turmeric. *Indian Cocoa Arecanut and Spices J*, **8**(4): 93-95.
- Ponnuswamy, V. and Muthuswami, S.1981. Influence of spacing on yield and yield components of turmeric (*Curcuma longa L*). *S. Indian Hort.* **29**(4): 229-230.

- Rajput, S.G., Patil, V.K., Varke, D.C., Ballal, A.L. and Gunjkar. 1982.
 Effect of nitrogen and spacing on the yield of turmeric rhizomes. pp. 83-85.In: *Proc. Nat. Sem. Ginger and Turmeric*, Calicut.
- Sairam, C.V., Gopalasundaram, P. Umamaheswari, L. 1997. Capital requirements for adoption of coconut based intercropping system in Kerala. *Indian Coconut J.* 27(10): 2-4.
- Sharma, R., Prasad, S., Mohan, N.K. and Medhi, G. 1996. Economic feasibility of growing some root and tuber crops under intercropping system in coconut garden. *The Hort. J.* 9(2): 167-170
- Singh, V.B. and Kar, P.L. 1991. Effect of planting materials on the productivity of turmeric variety Laka dong. *Indian Coconut Arecanut and Spices J.* **14**(4):153-154.
- Singh, J., Malik, Y. S., Nehra, B. K. and Partap, P. S. 2000. Effect of size of seed rhizomes and plant spacing on growth and yield of turmeric (*Curcuma longa* L.). *Haryana J. Hort. Sci.* **29**(3 & 4): 258-260.

All India Co-ordinated Research Project on Palms Department of Spices and Plantation crops , Faculty of Horticulture. Bidhan Chandra Krishi Viswavidyalaya, Mohanpur-741252, Nadia, West Bengal D.K. Ghosh, J.K. Hore, A. Bandopadhyay