

# Economics and Energetics of Rice as Influenced by Pelleted Integrated Nutrient Management under Transplanted Ecosystem

# Manish Kumar Sharma\*, S. K. Nagre, Romendra Dewangan, Pradeep Yadav and Hemant Jangde

**ABSTRACT:** A field experiment was conducted in kharif-2012 at Instructional-cum-Research Farm at Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur (Chhattisgarh) to investigate effect of integrated nutrient management by pelleting techniques to increase growth, yield and nutrient use efficiency in transplanted rice. The pelleted 2.5t FYM +80:50:30 kg N:  $P_2O_5$ :K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> produced highest grain yield, straw yield and harvest index. The treatment received pelleted 2.5t FYM + 80:50:30 kg N:  $P_2O_5$ :K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> gave the highest B: C ratio (2.06), gross returns and net returns. The net gain energy was found maximum in pelleted 2.5t FYM + 80:50:30 kg N:  $P_2O_5$ :K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> while highest grain production efficiency was observed under control treatment followed by pelleted 5t FYM + 50:30:20 kg N:  $P_2O_5$ :K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup>.

Key words: pelleting techniques, B: C ratio, net returns, energetics, grain production efficiency

## INTRODUCTION

Rice (Oryza sativa L.) is the world's most important crop and the primary source of food for more than half of the world's population. Rice accounts for 35 to 75% of the calories consumed by more than 3 billion Asians and is planted to about 154 million hectare annually or on about 11% of the total world's cultivated land. India is second largest producer after China and has an area of over 45.5 million hectares (Gujja and Thiyagarajan, 2012) and production 105.31 million tonnes with productivity 2393 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (Anonymus, 2013). The rice culture system in Chhattisgarh mainly depends on the onset and distribution of monsoonal rains. They can be broadly classified into three categories namely rice growing on upland situation mostly rainfed, medium land rice both in direct dry seeded broadcast "Biasi" and transplanting under protective irrigated conditions or both. In transplanting method, generally field is puddle before transplanting and kept submerged. The submerged rice fields brings a series of physical, chemical and microbiological changes in the soil, which profoundly affects growth of rice plant as well as availability, loss and absorption of nutrients. The role of plant nutrients would be extremely important

from sustainability point of view. With the increasing trend in use of chemical fertilizers, growing ecological concerns, conservation of energy and reduction in the use of organic manures have created considerable interest for the use of organics as a source of plant nutrients with blending of chemical fertilizer as an integrated nutrient management system. Therefore, information needs to be generated with respect to proper dose of organic manures along with inorganic fertilizers, to develop the suitable nutrient management practices for better quality and productivity of rice and to increase nutrient use efficiency. Pellets are nutrient rich source and can be served as a substitute to cut down the cost of fertilizers and organic manures input and to increase the productivity in addition to maintain soil productivity, improve the eco-system and ultimately resulting in improved soil-plant-health in a sustainable agricultural eco-system. The densification process and pellet production is able to convert manure into a compressed form with advantages in transportation, handling and storage (Bhattacharya et al., 1989) and adjusting the nutrient content by adding chemical fertilizers. The small mass of pellet contains all essential major nutrients and micronutrients and releases these

Department of Agronomy, Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur (C.G.) - 491012 \*Author's E-mail: mksharma003@gmail.com nutrients slowly in root zones, making available for long times and reducing their losses in different forms.

#### MATERIAL AND METHODS

The experiment was conducted during *kharif*-2012, at Instructional-cum-Research Farm, Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur (Chhattisgarh) India. The experimental site lies between 21°16'N latitude and 81°26'E longitude with an altitude of 289.56 meters above the mean sea level. The soil of experimental farm was neutral in pH (7.65), low in nitrogen (201 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), medium in phosphorus (19.6 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and high in potassium (282 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). The test variety used was MTU 1010 and experiment was carried out in RBD design with thirteen treatments in three replications. The treatments were T<sub>1</sub>: Conventional 100:60:40 kg N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>2</sub> : Conventional 2.5t FYM + 80:50:30 kg N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>2</sub>: Conventional 2.5t FYM + 60:40:20 kg N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:  $K_2O$  ha<sup>-1</sup>,  $T_4$ : Conventional 5t FYM + 50:30:20 kg N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>: K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>5</sub>: Conventional 1t PM + 50:30:20 kg N:  $P_2O_5$ : K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>6</sub>: Conventional 2.5t FYM + 0.5t PM + 50:30:20 kg N:  $P_2O_5$ :K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>7</sub> : Pelleted 100:60:40 kg N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>: K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>8</sub>: Pelleted 2.5t FYM + 80:50:30 kg N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>: K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>9</sub>: Pelleted 2.5t FYM + 60:40:20 kg N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>: K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>10</sub>: Pelleted 5t FYM + 50:30:20 kg N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>: K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>11</sub>: Pelleted 1t PM + 50:30:20 kg N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>: K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>12</sub>: Pelleted 2.5t FYM +  $0.5t PM+50:30:20 kg N: P_2O_5: K_2O ha^{-1} and T_{13}: Control.$ The nutrients were supplied with fertilizers- urea, DAP, SSP and MOP and organic manures- FYM and poultry manure in different combinations as per the treatments. The nitrogen application was splitted into three parts, one third nitrogen was applied as basal and rest were applied at tillering and panicle initiation stages, while full dose of phosphorus and potassium were given as basal dose. The fertilizers and manures were broadcasted in conventional treatments while placed in pelleted form in pelleted treatments. The observations were recorded at fifteen days interval after 15 DAT-60 DAT and at harvest for growth parameters and after harvest the yield was recorded separately and computed by the help of statistical analysis.

Cost of cultivation for each treatment was calculated separately. Gross return (Rs. ha<sup>-1</sup>) was obtained by converting the harvest into monetary terms of the prevailing market rate during the course of studies for every treatment. Net return was obtained by deducting cost of cultivation from gross return. The benefit: cost ratio was calculated with the help of following formula:

$$Benefit : cost ratio = \frac{Net return(Rs.ha^{-1})}{Total cost of cultivation(Rs.ha^{-1})}$$

Energy inputs were calculated and estimated in Mega Joule (MJ) ha<sup>-1</sup> with reference to the standard values prescribed by Mittal *et al.* (1985). The standard energy coefficient for seed and straw of rice was multiplied with their respective yields and summed up to obtain the total energy output. The energy input for rice was calculated by adding the respective values under rice crops. Grain production efficiency, energy output–input ratio, was calculated as per the following formula:

Grain production efficienty =  $\frac{Total \, produce(q)}{Energy \, input \, (MJ \times 10^{-3})}$ 

 $Energy output input ratio = \frac{Energy output}{Energy input}$ 

#### **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

Effect of pelleted integrated nutrient management on growth parameters: Among the conventional and pelleted treatments, highest plant height (fig 1) was recorded under pelleted 2.5t FYM + 80:50:30 kg N:  $P_2O_5$ : K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>8</sub>) at all stages, except at 15 DAT. At 15 DAT, the treatment conventional 100:60:40 kg N:  $P_2O_5$ : K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>1</sub>) produced highest plant height. However, control treatment recorded lowest plant height at all the stages of crop growth. The observations revealed that after 15 DAT to crop harvest, pelleted 2.5t FYM + 80:50:30 kg N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>: K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>o</sub>) produced highest number of tillers hill<sup>-1</sup>, while control treatment produced lowest number of tillers hill<sup>-1</sup>. The highest leaf area index was noticed under pelleted 2.5t FYM + 80:50:30 kg N:  $P_2O_2$ : K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>2</sub>) treatment from 30 DAT to harvesting, while at 15 DAT, conventional 100:60:40 kg N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> produced highest leaf area index. The control treatment produced lowest leaf area index at all intervals of crop growth. The highest dry matter accumulation recorded under conventional 100:60:40 kg N:  $P_2O_5$ :  $K_2O$  ha<sup>-1</sup> ( $T_1$ ) at 15 DAT thereafter pelleted  $2.5t FYM + 80:50:30 \text{ kg N}: P_2O_5: K_2O \text{ ha}^{-1}(T_8) \text{ produced}$ highest dry matter accumulation. The control treatment produced least dry matter accumulation at all stages of crop growth.

**Effect on grain and straw yield:** The pelleted 2.5t FYM + 80:50:30 kg N:  $P_2O_5$ :  $K_2O$  ha<sup>-1</sup> ( $T_8$ ) produced the significantly highest grain yield (Fig 2), which was at par to that pelleted 100:60:40 kg N:  $P_2O_5$ :  $K_2O$  ha<sup>-1</sup>

 $(T_7)$  and pelleted 5t FYM + 50:30:20 kg N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>: K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> ( $T_{10}$ ). The increase in grain yield was mainly associated with significant increase in effective tillers hill-1, filled spikelets hill-1 and test weight. The higher grain yield may be due to the application of organic source of nutrients in combination with inorganic sources of nutrients, resulted in greater availability of essential nutrients to plant, improvement to soil environment which facilitated in better root proliferation leading to higher absorption of water and nutrients and their translocation from source to sink (Ebaid et al., 2007), ultimately resulting in higher yield. The blending of nitrogen with FYM helps in continuous supply of the nutrients, reduced nutrients loss and enhanced nutrient use efficiency and yield as reported by Pandey and Nandeha (2004), Sarawgi and Sarawgi (2004) and Jha et al. (2006). The treatment, pelleted 2.5t FYM+ 80:50:30 kg N:P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>2</sub>) produced significantly higher straw yield as compared to others, however, it was comparable to that obtained under treatment pelleted 100:60:40 kg  $N:P_2O_1:K_2O_1^{-1}(T_2)$ , pelleted 2.5t FYM + 60:40:20 kg  $N:P_2O_5:K_2O$  ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>0</sub>), pelleted 5t FYM + 50:30:20 kg  $N:P_2O_5:K_2O$  ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>10</sub>), pelleted 2.5t FYM + 0.5t PM + 50:30:20 kg N:P,O,:K,O ha-1 (T,), conventional 2.5t FYM + 80:50:30 kg N:P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>2</sub>) and conventional 100:60:40 kg N:P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>1</sub>). The treatment pelleted 2.5t FYM + 80:50:30 kg N:P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O  $ha^{-1}$  (T<sub>s</sub>) recorded significantly higher harvest index

than control treatment  $(T_{13})$ , which recorded lowest harvest index, all the treatments were found to similar to the highest performing harvest index treatment. Rizwan et al. (2003) found that harvest index is less sensitive to N fertilizer timing and splitting.

Economics: Effect of different treatments cannot be assessed without the gross and net profit from that treatment. The economics of conventional and pelleted integrated nutrient management treatments have been presented in Table 1. Among the conventional and pelleted integrated nutrient management, the maximum input cost was involved under the treatment of pelleted 100:60:40 kg  $N:P_2O_5:K_2O$  ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>7</sub>) followed by pelleted 2.5t FYM +  $80:50:30 \text{ kg N:P_O_s:K_O ha^{-1}(T_s), conventional}$  $100:60:40 \text{ kg N:P}_{2}O_{5}:K_{2}O \text{ ha}^{-1}(T_{1})$  and conventional 2.5t FYM + 80:50:30 kg N:P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>2</sub>). The pelleted 80:50:30 kg N:P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>2</sub>) resulted in highest gross return (Rs. 77505.00 ha<sup>-1</sup>) followed by pelleted 100:60:40 kg N:P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>7</sub>) (Rs. 69465.00 ha<sup>-1</sup>), pelleted 5t FYM + 50:30:20 kg N:P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>10</sub>) (Rs. 68755.00 ha<sup>-1</sup>) and conventional 2.5t FYM +  $80:50:30 \text{ kg N:P_O_E:K_O ha^{-1}}$  (T\_) (Rs. 66655.00 ha^{-1}). The highest net return (Rs.52157.28 ha-1) was recorded under pelleted 2.5t FYM + 80:50:30 kg N:P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>o</sub>) followed by pelleted 100:60:40 kg N:P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O  $ha^{-1}(T_{7})$  (Rs. 44095.28  $ha^{-1}$ ), pelleted 5t FYM + 50:30:20 kg N:P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>10</sub>) (Rs. 43836.88 ha<sup>-1</sup>) and conventional 2.5t FYM + 80:50:30 kg N:P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup>

Economics of rice as influenced by conventional and pelleted integrated nutrient management										
Trea	tment	Fixed cost (Rs. ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Variable cost (Rs. ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Total cost (Rs. ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Gross return (Rs. ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Net return (Rs. ha <sup>-1</sup> )	B:C ratio			
T <sub>1</sub> Con	ventional 100:60:40 kg N: P2O5:K2O ha-1	20647.00	4422.72	25069.72	65960.00	40890.28	1.63			
T <sub>2</sub> Con K <sub>2</sub> O	ventional 2.5t FYM + 80:50:30 kg N: $P_2O_5$ : ha <sup>-1</sup>	20647.00	4400.72	25047.72	66655.00	41607.28	1.66			
T <sub>3</sub> Con K <sub>2</sub> O	ventional 2.5t FYM + 60:40:20 kg N: $P_2O_5$ : ha <sup>-1</sup>	20647.00	3628.83	24275.83	60560.00	36284.17	1.49			
T <sub>4</sub> Con K <sub>2</sub> O	ventional 5t FYM + 50:30:20 kg N: $P_2O_5$ : ha <sup>-1</sup>	20647.00	3971.12	24618.12	63320.00	38701.88	1.57			
T <sub>5</sub> Con K <sub>2</sub> O	ventional 1t PM + 50:30:20 kg N: $P_2O_5$ : ha <sup>-1</sup>	20647.00	2921.12	23568.12	58650.00	35081.88	1.49			
T <sub>6</sub> Con N: P	ventional 2.5t FYM + 0.5t PM + 50:30:20 kg 2 <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> :K <sub>2</sub> O ha <sup>-1</sup>	20647.00	3446.12	24093.12	61650.00	37557.88	1.56			
T <sub>7</sub> Pelle	eted 100:60:40 kg N: P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> :K <sub>2</sub> O ha <sup>-1</sup>	20647.00	4722.72	25369.72	69465.00	44095.28	1.74			
T <sub>8</sub> Pelle	eted 2.5t FYM + 80:50:30 kg N: P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> :K <sub>2</sub> O ha <sup>-1</sup>	20647.00	4700.72	25347.72	77505.00	52157.28	2.06			
T <sub>9</sub> Pelle	eted 2.5t FYM + 60:40:20 kg N: P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> :K <sub>2</sub> O ha <sup>-1</sup>	20647.00	3928.83	24575.83	67170.00	42594.17	1.73			
T <sub>10</sub> Pelle	eted 5t FYM + 50:30:20 kg N: P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> :K <sub>2</sub> O ha <sup>-1</sup>	20647.00	4271.12	24918.12	68755.00	43836.88	1.76			
T <sub>11</sub> Pelle	eted 1t PM + 50:30:20 kg N: P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> :K <sub>2</sub> O ha <sup>-1</sup>	20647.00	3221.12	23868.12	60875.00	37006.88	1.55			
$T_{12}$ Pelle $P_2O_5$	eted 2.5t FYM + 0.5t PM+50:30:20 kg N: ;:K <sub>2</sub> O ha <sup>-1</sup>	20647.00	3746.12	24393.12	63910.00	39516.88	1.62			
T <sub>13</sub> Con	trol	20647.00	520.00	21167.00	36050.00	14883.00	0.70			

Table 1

Table 2 Energetic of rice as influenced by conventional and pelleted integrated nutrient management practices											
Treatment	Energy input (MJ X 10 <sup>-3</sup> )	Energy output (MJ X 10 <sup>-3</sup> )		Net gain energy (MJ X 10 <sup>-3</sup> )	Energy output-input ratio		Grain production efficiency				
		Grain	Straw		Grain	Straw	(Q.MJ X 10 <sup>-3</sup> )				
T <sub>1</sub>	9.70	69.97	80.75	150.72	7.21	8.32	4.91				
T <sub>2</sub>	9.17	70.71	81.63	152.32	7.71	8.90	5.25				
T <sub>3</sub>	7.89	64.09	75.75	139.84	8.12	9.60	5.53				
$T_4$	8.03	67.33	75.87	143.21	8.38	9.45	5.70				
T <sub>5</sub>	7.63	62.03	73.75	135.78	8.13	9.67	5.53				
T <sub>6</sub>	7.83	64.97	80.00	144.97	8.30	10.20	5.64				
T <sub>7</sub>	9.73	73.65	85.50	159.15	7.57	8.79	5.15				
T <sub>8</sub>	9.20	82.76	89.13	171.88	9.00	9.69	6.12				
T <sub>9</sub>	7.93	68.50	80.25	148.75	8.64	10.10	5.88				
T <sub>10</sub>	8.06	73.06	82.87	155.93	9.06	10.30	6.17				
T <sub>11</sub>	7.66	64.53	75.00	139.53	8.42	9.79	5.73				
T <sub>12</sub>	7.87	67.62	80.13	147.75	8.59	10.20	5.84				
T <sub>13</sub>	3.37	37.63	50.63	88.26	11.2	15.00	7.59				

Τ, Conventional 100:60:40 kg N: P2O5:K2O ha-1

T<sub>2</sub> Conventional 2.5t FYM + 80:50:30 kg N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup>

Τ, Conventional 2.5t FYM + 60:40:20 kg N: P2O5:K2O ha-1

 $T_4$ Conventional 5t FYM + 50:30:20 kg N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup>

 $T_5$ Conventional 1t PM + 50:30:20 kg N: P2O5:K2O ha-1

Conventional 2.5t FYM + 0.5t PM + 50:30:20 kg N: T\_6 P,O5:K,O ha-1

Pelleted 100:60:40 kg N: P2O5:K2O ha-1 T<sub>7</sub>

Pelleted 2.5t FYM + 80:50:30 kg N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> T<sub>s</sub>

T<sub>o</sub> Pelleted 2.5t FYM + 60:40:20 kg N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup>

Pelleted 5t FYM + 50:30:20 kg N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> T<sub>10</sub>

T<sub>11</sub> Pelleted 1t PM + 50:30:20 kg N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup>

T\_12 Pelleted 2.5t FYM + 0.5t PM+50:30:20 kg N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup>

Control T<sub>13</sub>



Figure 1: Growth parameters as influenced by pelleted and conventional integrated nutrient management



Figure 2: Grain yield and straw yield as influenced by pelleted and conventional integrated nutrient management

(T<sub>2</sub>) (Rs. 41607.28 ha<sup>-1</sup>). The pelleted 2.5t FYM + 80:50:30 kg N:P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>8</sub>) recorded higher B:C ratio (2.06) followed by pelleted 5t FYM + 50:30:20 kg N:P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>10</sub>) 1.76. The lowest value of total input cost (Rs. 22267.00 ha<sup>-1</sup>), gross return (Rs. 36050.00 ha<sup>-1</sup>), net return (Rs. 14883.00 ha<sup>-1</sup>) and B: C ratio (0.70) was recorded under control treatment (T<sub>13</sub>). Saha and Mondal (2006) reported that maximum net returns and benefit: cost ratio were found under 75% RDF + pelleted form of organic manure.

**Energetic:** The energy input and output, energy input: output ratio and grain production efficiency are presented in Table 2, indicating great variation in these parameters. The lowest energy input was observed under control treatment  $(T_{13})$ , while highest energy input was found under pelleted 100:60:40 kg  $N:P_2O_5:K_2O$  ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>7</sub>) followed by conventional 100:60:40 kg N:P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>1</sub>). The total energy output was found highest under pelleted 2.5t FYM +  $80:50:30 \text{ kg N}: P_2O_5: K_2O \text{ ha}^{-1}(T_s)$  followed by pelleted 100:60:40 kg N:  $P_2O_5$ : K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>7</sub>) treatment. The highest total energy output was mainly due to increased grain and straw yield. The lowest total energy output was observed under control treatment  $(T_{12})$ . The maximum grain production efficiency was recorded under control treatment  $(T_{13})$  followed by pelleted 5t FYM + 50:30:20 kg N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>: K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>10</sub>) and pelleted 2.5t FYM + 80:50:30 kg N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>: K<sub>2</sub>O  $ha^{-1}(T_s)$ . The minimum grain production efficiency was found under conventional 100:60:40 kg N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:  $K_2O$  ha<sup>-1</sup>( $T_1$ ) treatment.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Authors are acknowledged to major advisor, Dr. (Major) G.K. Shrivastava and HOD, Department of Agronomy, college of Agriculture, Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Raipur, Chhattisgarh (India) for providing guidance in conducting the experiment.

## REFERENCES

- Anonymous, (2013), Annual Report 2012-13. Department of Agriculture and cooperation, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India, New Delhi. pp. 4.
- Bhattacharya, S.C., Sett, S. and Shrestha, R.M. (1989), State of the art of biomass densification, energy sources, division energy technology. *Energy Sources* **11**(3): 161-186.
- Ebaid, R.A. and El-Rafaee, I.S. (2007), Utilization of rice husk as an organic fertilizer to improve productivity and water use efficiency in rice fields. *African Crop Science Conference Proceedings* **8**: 1923-1928.
- Gujja, B. and Thiyagarajan, T.M., (2012), Knowledge and practice SRI (system of rice intensification), reducing agriculture foot print and ensuring food security. Hyderabad. pp. 12.
- Jha, S.K., Dewangan, Y.K. and Tripathi, R.S. (2006), Effect of integrated nutrient management on yield and quality of scented rice in Chhattisgarh. *In:* National symposium on conservation and management of agro-resources in accelerating the food production for 21<sup>st</sup> century. IGAU, Raipur, India. 14-15<sup>th</sup> December, 2006. pp. 248-250.
- Mittal, N.K., Mittal, J.P. and Dhawan, K.C. (1985), Research digest on energy requirement in agriculture sector (1971-1982). *ICAR/ AICRP/ ERAS*. **85**(1): 159-163.

- Pandey, T.D. and Nandeha, K.L. (2004), Response of scented rice (*Oryza sativa*) varieties to FYM and chemical fertilizers in Bastar Plateau. *In:* International Symposium on rainfed rice ecosystems: perspective and potential. IGAU, Raipur, India. 11-13<sup>th</sup> Oct., 2004. pp. 105.
- Rizwan, M., Maqsood, M., Rafiq, M., Saeed, M. and Zahid, M. (2003), Maize (*Zea mays* L.) response to split nitrogen. *Int. J. Agric. Biol.*, 5(1): 19-21.
- Saha, M. and Mondal, S.S. (2006), Influence of integrated nutrient supply on growth, productivity and quality of baby corn (*Zea mays*) in Indo-gangetic Plains. *Indian Journal of Agronomy* **51**(3): 201-205.
- Sarawgi, S.K. and Sarawgi, A.K. (2004), Effect of blending of N with or without FYM on semi-dwarf, medium to long slender scented rice varieties in lowland alfisols of Chhattisgarh. *In:* International Symposium on rainfed rice ecosystems: perspective and potential. IGAU, Raipur, India. 11-13<sup>th</sup> Oct., 2004. pp. 159-160.