



Response of Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) to Sulphur and Zinc Elements

Gadde Hari Venkata Akhil^{a*} and Victor Debbarma^a

^a Department of Agronomy, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj-211007, Uttar Pradesh, India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/IJECC/2022/v12i1131036

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/89934>

Original Research Article

Received 15 May 2022
Accepted 25 July 2022
Published 27 July 2022

ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted aiming to study the influence of Sulphur and Zinc on growth and yield of chickpea during the Rabi season 2021/22. The treatments were T₁ (20 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 10 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₂ (20 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 15 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₃ (20 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 20 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₄ (30 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 10 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₅ (30 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 15 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₆ (30 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 20 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₇ (40 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 10 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₈ (40 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 15 kg zinc h⁻¹) and T₉ (40 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 20 kg zinc h⁻¹). The findings show that the treatment T₉ recorded highest plant height (44.11 cm), maximum number of nodules/plant (42.40), highest plant dry weight (8.05 g/plant), maximum number of pods/plant (31.53), maximum number of seeds/pod (1.73), highest seed index (237.67 g), highest seed yield (1819.00 kg/ha) and maximum stover yield (3253.67 kg/ha), highest gross returns (130068.00 INR/ha), highest net return (92527.62 INR/ha) and highest benefit cost ratio (2.40) compared to other studied treatments, while the lowest one was realized with T₁ treatment.

Keywords: Economics; growth parameter; chickpea; sulphur; zinc; yield parameter.

1. INTRODUCTION

“Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum*) is the second important pulse crops that belongs to the legume

family. The crop is mainly produced for human consumption, animal feed and as a rotational crop with cereal. Pulse production in India is about 25.72 million tonnes with area of under

*Corresponding author: E-mail: akhilgadde73@gmail.com;

cultivation around 288.3 lakh hectares and pulse production in Uttar Pradesh is 2.62 million tonnes with area of under cultivation around 0.81 lakh hectares" [1]. In India chickpea had a lion share of 49.3% in total pulse production [2], signifying its importance in Indian agriculture production. India produces alone more than 60% of world chickpea production.

"Chickpea is one of the major *rabi* pulse crop which as high digestible dietary protein (17-21 percent). Chickpea is also rich in calcium iron, niacin, vitamin C and B. Its leaves contain maleic acid which is very useful for stomach ailments and blood purification. chickpea is a good source of carbohydrates, minerals, and trace elements. On average dry chickpea kernels contains 56% fat, 47% starch, 23% protein, 6% soluble sugar, 6% crude fiber and 3% ash" [3].

"Sulphur attributed to increase the number of nodules/plants resulting from improved root growth (Lange *et al.*, 1994). Sulphur plays an important role in enhancing the productivity and quality of chickpea. The importance of S in balance plant nutrition is realized with an increasing S deficiency in several areas due to intensive cropping and focus on high yielding varieties. In Gujarat, 17% of soils are deficient in available sulphur" (Golakiya and Shobhana 2000). "Optimization of macro and micro nutrient application will enhance the productivity of chickpea. Sulphur is considered as one of the four major nutrients after N, P and K. It is basically required for synthesis of proteins, especially S-containing amino acid i.e., methionine, cystine and cysteine and as a constituent of vitamins (thiamine and biotin) and other biologically active compounds like lipoic acid, acetyl coenzyme-A, ferredoxin and glutathione. Sulphur element is one of the most necessary nutrients for plant growth performance, where its requirements for plants is the same as of phosphorus. It is a building block of protein as well as it plays an important role in the synthesis of chlorophyll.in other words, without the sulphur optimum level in the soil, the different crops cannot reach their full potential yield and protein content" [4].

Chickpea is mostly grown in rainfed areas and marginal soils with low available zinc (Zn); Zn deficiency induces flower abortion and ovule infertility, leading to low seed set and substantial yield reductions. About 49% of Indian soils are deficient in zinc and response to Zn application has been reported for a number of crops

including chickpea [5-7]. Zinc plays an important role in formation of chlorophyll and growth hormones. Zinc is also an essential plant nutrient for plant growth and development. Zn is recognized as essential component of several enzyme systems having vital roles in the plant metabolism, e.g. carbonic anhydrase for reversible hydration of CO₂ to form HCO₃⁻ for transport and utilization of CO₂ in photosynthesis. It is also responsible for resisting pH changes in cytoplasm. Zn is involved in auxin metabolism like, tryptophan synthesis, tryptamine metabolism. Thus, the present investigation was undertaken with the objective to determine the effect of different levels of Sulphur as well as Zinc on growth and yield of Chickpea.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment was carried out during Rabi season of 2021 at the CRF (Crop Research Farm), Department of Agronomy, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology & Sciences, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh. The crop Research Farm is situated at 25.75 0 N latitude, 87.19 E longitude and at an altitude of 98m above mean sea level. This area is situated on the right side of the river Yamuna and by the opposite side of Prayagraj City. All the facilities required for crop cultivation were available. The experimental plot was sandy loam in texture, nearly neutral in soil reaction (pH 6.9), low in organic carbon (0.112%), available N (278.93 Kg/ha), available P (10.8 Kg/ha) and available K (206.4 Kg/ha). The crop was sown on 16th November 2021 using Pusa-362 variety. The experiment was laid out in Randomized Block Design comprised of 3 replications and total 9 treatments viz. T₁ (20 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 10 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₂ (20 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 15 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₃ (20 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 20 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₄ (30 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 10 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₅ (30 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 15 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₆ (30 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 20 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₇ (40 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 10 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₈ (40 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 15 kg zinc h⁻¹) and T₉ (40 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 20 kg zinc h⁻¹). All nutrients were applied into the soil in the form of Urea, Single super phosphate (SSP) and Muriate of potash (MOP). Entire dose of P and K was applied basal for respective plots, half dose of N (as urea) was applied as basal, one-fourth at 30 days after sowing and remaining one-fourth at the time of flowering. 20,30,40 kg/ha levels of Sulphur and 10,15,20kg/ha Zinc levels were applied along with NPK fertilizers before sowing. The growth parameters were recorded at periodical intervals of 20,40,60,80,100 DAS and at harvest stage

from the randomly selected five plants in each treatment. Statistically analysis was done using. (for example SPSS) for all the parameters in one-way Anova and means were compared at 5% probability level of significant results.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Effect of Sulphur and zinc on growth parameters of chickpea are given in Table 1.

3.1 Plant Height

At 100 DAS, higher plant height (44.11cm) was recorded in the treatment-9 (Sulphur 40kg/ha +zinc 20kg/ha) ($p < 0.05$). However, the treatment-8 (sulphur 40 kg/ha + Zinc 15 kg/ha) (43.75 cm) was found to be statistically at par with treatment-9 (sulphur 40 kg/ha + Zinc 20 kg/ha). The increase in plant height of plants under zinc treatment may be due to its effect in the metabolism of growing plants, which may effectively explain the observed response of zinc application. Favourable responses of zinc application on plant height are similar in findings of Khalil and Prakash [8] and Masih et al., (2020).

3.2 Number of Nodules/Plant

At 100 DAS, higher number of nodules/plant (20.96) was recorded in treatment-9 (sulphur 40

kg/ha + Zinc 20 kg/ha) ($p < 0.05$). However the treatment -8 (Sulphur 40 kg/ha + Zinc 15 kg/ha) (20.50) was found to be statistically at par with the treatment -9 (sulphur 40 kg/ha + Zinc 20 kg/ha). The increase in number of nodules/plant is due to the increase in the availability of sulphur which helps in better nodule formation, increase in nitrogenase enzyme, chlorophyll content etc. and thereby influencing growth components of the crop which is also similar in the findings of Yadav et al., (2017), Kumar et al., (2000) and Singh et al., (2020).

3.3 Dry Matter Accumulation

“At 100 DAS, higher plant dry weight (8.05 g/plant) was recorded in treatment-9 (sulphur 40 kg/ha + Zinc 20 kg/ha) ($p < 0.05$). However, the treatment-8 (sulphur 40 kg/ha + Zinc 15 kg/ha) (7.97 g/plant) was found to be statistically at par with treatment-9 (sulphur 40 kg/ha + Zinc 20 kg/ha). Zinc plays an activator of several enzymes in plants and it is directly involved in the biosynthesis of growth substances such as Auxin thereby producing more plant cells and enhanced dry matter” [9].

3.4 Yield Parameters

Effect of Sulphur and zinc on yield parameters of chickpea are given in Table 2.

Table 1. Effect of studied treatments on growth attributes of Chickpea

Treatments	At Harvest			At 80-100 DAS	
	Plant height (cm)	Nodules/plant	Plant dry weight (g/plant)	Crop growth rate (g/m ² /day)	Relative growth rate (g/g/day)
T ₁	40.61	17.16	7.21	2.05	0.017
T ₂	41.21	17.87	7.34	1.9	0.016
T ₃	41.97	19.11	7.6	2.26	0.013
T ₄	41.79	18.52	7.55	1.97	0.011
T ₅	42.48	19.4	7.66	1.99	0.016
T ₆	43.53	20.17	7.82	1.93	0.016
T ₇	42.96	19.79	7.7	1.93	0.014
T ₈	43.75	20.5	7.97	1.98	0.019
T ₉	44.11	20.96	8.05	1.92	0.023
F test	S	S	S	S	NS
S. EM (±)	0.15	0.15	0.04	0.06	0.00
CD (P=0.05)	0.45	0.44	0.13	0.19	---

T₁ (20 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 10 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₂ (20 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 15 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₃ (20 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 20 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₄ (30 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 10 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₅ (30 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 15 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₆ (30 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 20 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₇ (40 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 10 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₈ (40 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 15 kg zinc h⁻¹) and T₉ (40 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 20 kg zinc h⁻¹)

Table 2. Effects of studied treatments on yield attributes and yield of Chickpea

Treatments	At harvest					
	Pods/plant	Seed/pod	Seed index (g)	Seed yield (kg/ha)	Stover yield (kg/ha)	Harvest index (%)
T ₁	27.30	1.25	191.00	1460.00	2185.67	40.06
T ₂	27.57	1.33	194.33	1486.67	2203.33	40.28
T ₃	28.03	1.42	202.00	1589.33	2315.00	40.72
T ₄	27.67	1.37	197.33	1503.33	2273.67	39.81
T ₅	28.87	1.45	207.33	1654.00	2333.33	41.58
T ₆	29.96	1.54	216.33	1771.67	2833.33	38.54
T ₇	29.70	1.49	211.67	1683.33	2526.33	40.12
T ₈	30.17	1.58	229.33	1793.67	3122.67	36.49
T ₉	31.53	1.73	237.67	1819.00	3253.67	35.86
F test	S	S	S	S	S	S
S. EM (±)	0.24	0.04	3.04	20.24	98.28	0.98
CD (P = 0.05)	0.72	0.11	9.12	60.67	294.64	2.93

T₁ (20 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 10 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₂ (20 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 15 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₃ (20 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 20 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₄ (30 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 10 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₅ (30 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 15 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₆ (30 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 20 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₇ (40 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 10 kg zinc h⁻¹), T₈ (40 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 15 kg zinc h⁻¹) and T₉ (40 kg sulphur h⁻¹ + 20 kg zinc h⁻¹)

3.5 Pods/Plant

At harvest highest number of pods/plant (31.53) was recorded with the treatment-9 (sulphur 40 kg/ha + Zinc 20 kg/ha) ($p < 0.05$) over all the treatments whereas the treatment-1 (sulphur 20 kg/ha + Zinc 10 kg/ha) (27.30) was found to be lowest. The increase in seeds per pod might be due to more availability of zinc nutrition to plant at all the growth stages as stated in the findings of Deb Roy et al., [10].

3.6 Seeds/Pod

At harvest maximum number of seeds/pod (1.73) was recorded with the treatment-9 (sulphur 40 kg/ha + Zinc 20 kg/ha) ($p < 0.05$) over all the treatments. whereas the treatment-1 (sulphur 20 kg/ha + Zinc 10 kg/ha) (1.58) was found to be lowest. There will be a significant increase in number of seeds/pod with application of Sulphur along with the application of recommended dose of fertilizer. This might be due to activation of enzymes by application of Sulphur [11] and Raj et al., (2018).

3.7 Seed Index (g)

At harvest higher seed index (237.67 g) was recorded in treatment-9 (sulphur 40 kg/ha + Zinc 20 kg/ha) ($p < 0.05$) over all the treatments. However, the treatment-8 (sulphur 40 kg/ha +

Zinc 15 kg/ha) (229.33) was found to be statistically at par with treatment-9 (sulphur 40 kg/ha + Zinc 20 kg/ha). The increase in seed index might be due to the application of Sulphur along with the application of recommended dose of fertilizer. This might be due to the application of Sulphur which helps in chlorophyll formation, photosynthetic process, activation of enzymes and grain formation Singh et al., [12].

3.8 Seed Yield (kg/ha)

“At harvest maximum seed index (1819 kg/ha) was recorded in treatment-9 (sulphur 40 kg/ha + Zinc 20 kg/ha) ($p < 0.05$) over all the treatments. However, the treatment-8 (sulphur 40 kg/ha + Zinc 15 kg/ha) (1793.67 kg/ha) was found to be statistically at par with treatment-9 (sulphur 40 kg/ha + Zinc 20 kg/ha). Maximum seed yield might be due to pivotal role of sulphur in regulating the metabolic and enzymatic processes including photosynthesis, respiration and legume rhizobium symbiotic nitrogen fixation which reflected in increased yield. The other reasons may be due to the important role of sulphur in energy transformation, activation of enzymes and also in carbohydrate metabolism. The third reason may be due to optimum availability of available sulphur which consequently resulted in well filled pods resulting in increased seed yield”. These results are in conformity with those of Ghosh and Sarkar [13] and Patel et al., (2006).

3.9 Stover Yield (kg/ha)

At harvest maximum seed index (3253.67 kg/ha) was recorded in treatment-9 of (sulphur 40 kg/ha + Zinc 20 kg/ha) ($p < 0.05$) over all the treatments. However, the treatment-8 (sulphur 40 kg/ha + Zinc 15 kg/ha) (3122.67 kg/ha) was found to be statistically at par with treatment-9 (sulphur 40 kg/ha + Zinc 20 kg/ha). Maximum stover yield obtained may be due to increased metabolic process in plants due to sulphur application through $ZnSO_4$ and SSP. These results are in findings with Khorgamy and Farina, [14] and Teja et al., (2020).

3.10 Harvest Index (%)

Maximum harvest index (41.58%) was recorded in treatment-5 (sulphur 30 kg/ha + Zinc 15 kg/ha) ($p < 0.05$) over all the treatments. However, the treatment-1 (sulphur 20 kg/ha + Zinc 10 kg/ha), treatment-2 (sulphur 20 kg/ha + Zinc 15 kg/ha), treatment-3 (sulphur 20 kg/ha + Zinc 20 kg/ha) treatment-4 (sulphur 30 kg/ha + Zinc 10 kg/ha) and treatment-7 (sulphur 40kg/ha + zinc 10kg/ha) (40.06%, 40.28%, 40.72%, 39.81% and 40.12% respectively) was found to be statistically at par with treatment-5 (sulphur 30 kg/ha + Zinc 15 kg/ha). "Highest harvest index was observed due to cell activities, enhanced cell multiplication and enlargement and luxuriant growth and yield attributes of the crops probably due to more absorption and utilization of available nutrients leading to overall improvement of crop growth reflected to source-sink relationship, which in turn enhanced the yield attributes that ultimately more yield" Kokani et al., [15].

3.10 Economics

3.10.1 Gross returns (INR/ha)

Gross returns (130068.00 INR/ha) were found to be highest in treatment-9 (sulphur 40kg/ha + zinc 20kg/ha) and the minimum gross returns (102200.00 INR/ha) was found in treatment-1 (sulphur 20kg/ha + zinc 10kg/ha) as compared to other treatments.

3.10.2 Net returns (INR/ha)

Net returns (92,527.62 INR/ha) were found to be highest in treatment-9 (sulphur 40kg/ha + zinc 20kg/ha) and the minimum net returns (68509.62 INR/ha) was found to be I treatment-1 (sulphur

20kg/ha + zinc 10kg/ha) as compared to other treatments.

3.10.3 Benefit Cost Ratio (B:C)

Benefit Cost Ratio (2.40) was found to be highest in treatment-9 (sulphur 40kg/ha + zinc 20kg/ha) and the minimum Benefit Cost Ratio (1.97) was found in treatment-1 (sulphur 20kg/ha + zinc 10kg/ha). B:C ratio increased significantly due to successive increasing levels of sulphur along with zinc Singh et al., (2013).

The most limiting nutrients for chickpea production are phosphorus (P), calcium (Ca), sulphur (S), molybdenum (Mo), boron (B) and zinc (Zn), our results being a interesting contribution particularly with sulphur and zinc, and pointing out the edaphic relationships with the productivity of crops in tropical territories [16] (Olivares,2016).

It is interesting to note that the chickpea is a crop that requires less water than corn, so it has potential as a plant that can be grown in this region, since its nutritional value is also valued in the diet [17,18,19,20]. Despite the foregoing, and particularly under humid conditions in the study area, the species by itself cannot guarantee high yields, so it is necessary to accompany its planting with adequate in situ rainwater harvesting practices, which have implicit techniques that, in addition to making better use of rain (because it increases the amount of water available for plants) [18,19,20,21,22], followed by practices that help conserve the soil, with the consequent benefits [18,19].

Certain environmental characteristics of the region under study determine that there are high temperatures during the day and cooler (lower) temperatures at night, which, for a species such as the chickpea, is extremely important for the production of dry matter, since there are temperatures within the optimum during the day for photosynthesis, and on the other hand, low temperatures at night reduce respiratory rates and consequently the production of dry matter is more efficient [23,24,25], this added to the edaphic factors studied in this research can have a direct effect on yield, as reported by studies focused on the influence of soil conditions on productivity in environments such as the one in our study [26,16].

Table 3. Effects of studied treatments on Economics of production of Chickpea

Treatments	Cost of cultivation (INR/ha)	Gross returns (INR/ha)	Net returns (INR/ha)	(B:C) ratio
T ₁	33,690.38	1,02,200.00	68,509.62	2.03
T ₂	34,990.38	1,04,020.00	69,020.62	1.97
T ₃	36,290.38	1,11,253.10	74,962.72	2.06
T ₄	34,764.38	1,05,233.10	70,468.72	2.02
T ₅	36,064.38	1,15,780.00	79,715.62	2.21
T ₆	37,364.38	1,24,016.90	86,652.52	2.31
T ₇	35,840.38	1,17,833.10	81,992.72	2.28
T ₈	37,140.38	1,25,556.90	88,416.52	2.38
T ₉	38,440.38	1,30,068.00	92,527.62	2.40

4. CONCLUSION

Based on experimental findings it was concluded that Treatment combination of Sulphur 40 kg/ha and Zinc 20 kg/ha recorded maximum plant height, plant dry weight, number of nodules/plant, number of pods/plant, number of seeds/pod, seed index, seed yield, stover yield, gross return, highest net return and benefit: cost ratio which may be more preferable for farmers since it is economically more profitable and hence, can be recommended to the farmers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I express my sincere gratitude to my advisor Dr. (Mr.) VICTOR DEBBERMA for constant support, guidance and for his valuable suggestions for improving the quality of this work. I am indebted to Dr. Umesha C, Prof. (Dr) Joy Dawson who has been a constant source of inspiration and all the faculty members of Department of Agronomy, SHUATS, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh (U.P), India for providing necessary facilities, for their cooperation, encouragement and support.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

- Department of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare Government of India Annual Report 2021-22.
Available:www.agricoop.nic.in.
- International Crop Research Institute for the Semi Arid Tropics (ICRISAT) annual report; 2021.
Available:http://www.icrisat.org
- Goa Y. Evaluation of chick pea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) varieties for yield performance and adaptability to Southern Ethiopia. Evaluation. 2014;4(17).
- Ghazi DA, EL-Sherpiny MA, Elmahdy SM. Response of red cabbage plants grown on salt affected soil to different compost sources with foliar application of some antioxidants under soil addition of sulfur. Asian Journal of Plant and Soil Sciences. 2022;7(1):313-322.
- Golakiya BA, Parmar KB, Sakarvadia HL, Shobhana HK. Balanced Nutrient Management of chickpea in India. Balanced Fertilization for Sustaining Crop Productivity. 2006;25(35.8):305.
- Olivares B. Tropical conditions of seasonal rain in the dry-land agriculture of Carabobo, Venezuela. La Granja. Journal of Life Sciences. 27(1):86-102.
Available:http://doi.org/10.17163/lgr.n27.2018.07
- Yadav SS. Growth and yield of chickpea as influenced by phosphorus and Sulphur fertilization. Haryana J. Agron. 2004; 20(1/2):10-12.
- Khalil K, Ved P. Effect of rhizobial inoculation on growth, yield, nutrient uptake and economics of chickpea in relation to zinc and molybdenum. Journal of Food Legumes. 2014;27(3):261-263.
- Aboyeji C, Dunsin O, Adekiya AO, Chinedum C, Suleiman KO, Okunlola FO, Olofintoye TA. Zinc sulphate and boron-based foliar fertilizer effect on growth, yield, minerals, and heavy metal composition of chickpea grown on an

- alfisol. International Journal of Agronomy; 2019.
10. Deb Roy P, Narwa RP, Malik RS, Saha BN, Kumar S. Impact of zinc application methods on chickpea productivity and grain zinc fortification. Journal of Environmental Biology. 2013;35:851-854.
 11. Mitra AK, Banerjee K, Pal AK. Effect of different levels of phosphorus and Sulphur on yield attributes, seed yield, protein content of seed and economics of chickpea. Res. Crops. 2006;7(2):404-405.
 12. Singh S, Saini SS, Singh BP. Effect of irrigation, sulphur and seed inoculation on growth, yield and sulphur uptake of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum*) under late sown conditions. Indian J. Agron. 2004;49(1):57-59.
 13. Ghosh GK, Sarkar AK. Efficiency of phosphogypsum as source of sulphur for chickpea (*Cicer arietinum*) in an acid soil. Indian J. Agric. Sci. 2000;70(6):403-403.
 14. Khorgamy A, Farina A. Effect of phosphorus and zinc fertilization on yield and yield components of chickpea cultivars. African Crop Science Conference Proceedings. 2009;9:205-208.
 15. Kokani JM, Shah KA, Tandel BM, Bhimani GJ. Effect of FYM, phosphorus and sulphur on yield of summer black gram and post-harvest nutrient status of soil. The Bioscan an International Quarterly Journal of Life Sciences. 2015;10(1):379-383.
 16. Olivares BO, Calero J, Rey JC, Lobo D, Landa BB, Gómez JA. Correlation of banana productivity levels and soil morphological properties using regularized optimal scaling regression. Catena. 2022;208:105718.
Available:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2021.105718
 17. Bertorelli M, Olivares BO. Population fluctuation of *Spodoptera frugiperda* (J. E. Smith) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) in sorghum cultivation in Southern Anzoátegui, Venezuela. Journal of Agriculture University of Puerto Rico. 2020;104(1):1-16.
Available:https://doi.org/10.46429/jaupr.v104i1.18283
 18. Olivares B, Hernández R, Arias A, Molina JC, Pereira Y. Zonificación agroclimática del cultivo de maíz para la sostenibilidad de la producción agrícola en Carabobo, Venezuela. Revista Universitaria de Geografía. 2018;27(2):139-159.
Available:https://n9.cl/i0upn
 19. Olivares B, Hernández R, Coelho R, Molina JC, Pereira Y. Análisis espacial del índice hídrico: un avance en la adopción de decisiones sostenibles en los territorios agrícolas de Carabobo, Venezuela. Revista Geográfica de América Central. 2018;60(1):277-299.
Available:https://doi.org/10.15359/rgac.60-1.10
 20. Olivares B, Hernández R, Coelho R, Molina JC, Pereira Y. Analysis of climate types: Main strategies for sustainable decisions in agricultural areas of Carabobo, Venezuela. Scientia Agropecuaria. 2018;9(3):359–369.
Available:https://doi.org/10.17268/sci.agropecu.2018.03.07
 21. Olivares B, Parra R, Cortez A. Characterization of precipitation patterns in Anzoátegui state, Venezuela. Ería. 2017;3(3):353-365.
Available:https://doi.org/10.17811/er.3.2017.353-365
 22. Olivares B, Cortez A, Parra R, Lobo D, Rodríguez MF, Rey JC. Evaluation of agricultural vulnerability to drought weather in different locations of Venezuela. Rev. Fac. Agron. (LUZ) 2017;34(1):103-129.
Available:https://n9.cl/d827w
 23. Olivares B, Hernández R. Regional analysis of homogeneous precipitation areas in Carabobo, Venezuela. Revista Lasallista de Investigación. 2019;16(2):90-105.
Available:https://doi.org/10.22507/rli.v16n2a9
 24. Casana S, Olivares B. Evolution and trend of surface temperature and windspeed (1994 - 2014) at the Parque Nacional Doñana, Spain. Rev. Fac. Agron. (LUZ). 2020;37(1):1-25.
 25. Olivares B, Paredes F, Rey J, Lobo D, Galvis-Causil S. The relationship between the normalized difference vegetation index, rainfall, and potential evapotranspiration in a banana plantation of Venezuela. SAINS TANAH - Journal of Soil Science and Agroclimatology. 2021;18(1):58-64.

- Available:<http://dx.doi.org/10.20961/stjssa.v18i1.50379>
26. Olivares B, Araya-Alman M, Acevedo-Opazo C, et al. Relationship between soil properties and banana productivity in the two main cultivation areas in Venezuela. *J Soil Sci Plant Nutr.* 2020;20(3): 2512-2524.
Available:<https://doi.org/10.1007/s42729-020-00317-8>

© 2022 Akhil and Debbarma; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

*The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/89934>*