

Impact of Integrated Crop Management Practices on Tomato Yield and Economics in Anantapur District, Andhra Pradesh

ABSTRACT

Integrated crop management (ICM) demonstrations were done in 20 farmers' fields in the Krishi Vigyan Kendra operated mandals of Anantapur and Satya Sai districts in Andhra Pradesh state during the *Kharif* seasons of 2022-23 with the goal of increasing tomato yield at field level. According to the data, ICM practices produced a mean yield of 59.7 t/ha, which is 6.23% higher than farmers' practice (56.2 t/ha). The increment in yield of tomato crop under ICM practices was due to use of improved hybrid of Arka Samrat coupled with ICM module developed by Dr YSR Horticultural University. ICM practices resulted in a higher economic benefit and adoption of ICM practices resulted in higher benefit-cost ratio (3.80) than the farmers' practice with private hybrids (3.48). Tomato productivity per unit area could be increased by applying scientifically sound, long-term management practices. In light of the preceding discussion, ICM demonstrations were carried out methodically and scientifically on farmers' fields to illustrate the worth of better practices and persuade the farming community of the possibility for enhanced tomato production management technologies to be used in the future.

Key words: *Tomato, ICM, Farmer practice, Yield, Economics*

1. INTRODUCTION

Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum*) is the most important solanaceous vegetable crop farmed worldwide next to potato due to its high production potential, high nutritional value and wide ecological amplitude. Tomato also known as 'Protective Food' are widely planted as an annual plant. It contains minerals, vitamins and organic acids, which are beneficial for health. Tomatoes are also rich in lycopene, minerals, vitamins A, B and C [1,2]. The global tomato production in 2020 is approximately 186.82 million tons, with an area of 5.05 million ha with a productivity of 36.98 tons/ha [3]. More than half of the world's tomato production (56.71%) is concentrated in four countries. China is the world's largest producer of tomatoes (31.81%), accounting for about one-third of global production, followed by India (10.39%), the United States (7.36%) and Turkey (7.12%) [4]. India is the world second leader of tomato production with an area of 0.81 million ha producing 20.57 million tons with productivity of 25.34 tons/ha [3]. The major Tomato producing states in the country are Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Karnataka, Gujarat, Odisha, West Bengal, Chhattisgarh, Bihar, Telangana, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, Haryana and Himachal Pradesh. These states account for about 90% of the total production of the country [5]. These production statistics can vary from year to year due to factors like weather conditions, crop pest and diseases and market demand. Andhra Pradesh is producing about 12% of tomatoes in the country and is the second leading producer of tomato involving a production of 2450.67 thousand tons from an area of 58400 ha with a productivity of 42 t/ha [6]. In Andhra Pradesh, Anantapur district occupies the second place in production next to Chittoor district, with an area of 2659 ha with a production of 26.59 thousand metric tons with productivity of 10 t/ha, which is far below the average productivity of the state [7]. The factors for low productivity in tomato may be due to lack of knowledge on improved genotypes, production practices, outbreak of pest and diseases related to climate change, labor shortage, cultivation under rainfed conditions and high cost of production. Integrated crop management (ICM) seeks to achieve economic, environmental and social balance in crop production. The ICM employs various crop management strategies and technology to boost crop yields, prevent environmental harm and ensure crop production sustainability. The ICM is a knowledge-based, whole-systems approach that emphasizes the need of knowing local ecosystems and adjusting management strategies to better suit these ecosystems [8]. ICM is particularly ideal for small farmers because it strives to decrease dependence on purchased inputs and make the most of indigenous technical knowledge and land use methods. In light of the aforementioned information, frontline demonstrations of ICM practices in tomato were conducted in farmers' fields in an effort to persuade farmers to implement improved practices into their farming systems.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study was conducted at Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK) Kalyandurg in Anantapur district of Andhra Pradesh state in farmers fields during *Kharif* 2022-23 with objective to popularize improved technologies for productivity enhancement of tomato yield through ICM. Ten FLDs each were conducted during both the years in farmer's field of KVK operated mandals. To diffuse tomato productivity enhancement technologies on campus and off campus trainings were conducted. Package of practices was followed as per the information provided by Dr YSR Horticultural University. All the improved practices (ICM) were demonstrated with the following technologies are depreciated in Table 1 (Dr YSRHU 2021). Arka Samrat was the improved hybrid used in ICM practice. Private hybrids were used as a farmers practice, need based management practices were followed by the farmers after incidence of pest and disease. Data on yield attributes like number of fruits per plant, fruit length, fruit diameter, fruit weight and yield per plant were recorded at the time of first harvest. Yield data for the improved practice and farmers practice were recorded at the time of multiple harvests and the % yield gain in demonstrations over farmers practice was computed using the method proposed by Yadav *et al.* [9].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 FRUIT AND YIELD CHARACTERS

The data on fruit and yield characters present in the table 2 shows that highest fruit number per plant was resulted from the ICM practices during both the years as well as on pooled data. As per the pooled data, ICM practices recorded (77 fruits) 11.6% more fruits than farmers practice (69 fruits). ICM practices had much influence in increasing of average fruit length (5.5cm), average fruit diameter (4.82 cm) and average fruit yield (161.3g) over the farmers practice (Table 2). The average fruit weight is one of the important yield contributing parameters of tomato which ultimately determines the total yield of the crop. The increase in fruit length and fruit diameter has resulted in increase in fruit weight of tomato. The ICM practices in tomato have recorded 7.9% and 6.8% higher average yield per plant over farmers practice in the year 2022-23 and 2023-24, respectively. The average tomato yield recorded was 57.3 t/ha in 2022-23, 62.1 t/ha in 2023-24 and 59.7 t/ha when pooled over the years. On an average, the yield of tomato under study was comparatively higher in ICM practice and the yield was about 5.72% higher in 2022-23 and 6.70% higher in 2023-24 over farmers practice. The increase in yield in ICM practice can be attributable to more fruits per plant and increased fruit weight. Many of the workers reported improvement in yield attributing characters and yield due to ICM practice were observed in tomato [10], watermelon [11], sesame [12] and blackgram [13].

3.2 Economics

Economic indicators *i.e.* cost of cultivation, gross returns, net returns and B:C ratio of demonstrated ICM practices were presented in Table 3. The cost of cultivation was slighter higher in farmers practice over the demo practice during both the years. Farmers adopting ICM practices could save Rs. 3,250/- and Rs. 3,900/- during the year 2022-23 and 2023-24, respectively. Year-to-year variability in cultivation costs can be explained by differences in the local social and economic conditions. The higher cost of production in farmers practice might be due to indiscriminate use of chemical fertilizers and pesticides. Similar observation of cost saving through ICM practices was also observed by Singh 2017. The gross return calculated was presented in the table 3 and it was noticed that ICM practice registered higher gross returns during the second year as compared to first year, which might be attributed due to high yield during second year of study. The average gross returns from the pooled data recorded was Rs. 4,77,600/ha as compared to Rs. 4,49,600 in farmers practice. The ICM practices registered an increase of 6.22 % gross returns over farmers practice. The pooled data on net returns also showed the superiority of ICM practices over farmers practice. It was also noticed that net returns recorded under ICM practices (Rs.3,52,125/-) was 9.85% higher than farmers practice. Economic analysis of the yield performance revealed that benefit cost ratio of demonstration plots was observed to be higher than control plot *i.e.*, farmer practice. The cumulative effect of

technological interventions over two years, revealed an average benefit cost ratio of 3.80 in demonstration plots compared to 3.48 in control plots. Similar observation of increased economic benefit by adopting ICM practices was also reported by Rathod *et al.*[14] and Choudhary *et al.* [15]

Conclusions

From the study it can be concluded that, performance of tomato under ICM practices had showed higher gap in yield attributes and yield than farmers practice. Yield improvement of tomato with ICM was achieved with the combined effects of ICM module as prescribed by the Dr YSR Horticultural University. The influence of ICM module from tillage to harvesting had worked systematically on increasing the yield, input use efficiency and economic benefit. Farmers practice of tomato production demands higher cost of production than ICM due to repeated sprayings for pest and disease. It can be concluded that, under present circumstances adopting of ICM practices in tomato cultivation could achieve the higher economic benefit than farmers practice that will encourage more farmers to shift to adoption of ICM practices not only in tomato but also in major vegetable and fruit crops in Ananthapur and Satya Sai districts of Andhra Pradesh.

REFERENCES

1. Mane R, Sridevi O, Salimath PM, Deshpande SK, Khot AB. Performance and stability of different tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum*) genotypes. *The Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 2010;80(10):48-51.
2. Nazir S, Javed MA, Jamil MW, Habib I, Iqbal MZ. Synergistic Effects of Mosaic and Leaf Curl Viruses on Growth in Glass-House Tomato Plants. *Asian Research Journal of Agriculture*. 2018; 8(3): 1-5.
3. Government of India. "Horticulture Statistics At a Glance - 2021", Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, Department of Agriculture, Cooperation & Farmer Welfare, Horticulture Statistics Division. 2021. Accessed on 06 December 2023. Available: https://agriwelfare.gov.in/Documents/Horticultural_Statistics_at_Glance_2021.pdf.
4. GIUCĂ AD. Trends on the tomato market in Romania in the period 2010-2021. *Scientific Papers Series Management, Economic Engineering in Agriculture & Rural Development*. 2023;23(3):312-322.
5. Indian Horticulture database. National Horticulture Board, Ministry of Agriculture, GOI 2019. Accessed on 06 December 2023. Available: <https://www.nhb.gov.in/statistics/Reports/Tomato-for-October-2019.pdf>
6. Agricultural Statistics at a Glance. Directorate of Economics and Statistics. 2022. Accessed on 06 December 2023. Available: <https://desagri.gov.in/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/Agricultural-Statistics-at-a-Glance-2022.pdf>
7. Ribka D, Mahendran K, Lavanya SM, Senthilnathan S. An explorative study on usage pattern of pesticides among tomato growing farmers in Anantapur district of Andhra Pradesh. *International Journal of Chemical Studies* 2020; SP-8(6): 50-53.
8. Hussain M, Ul-Allah S, Farooq S. Integrated crop management in sustainable agriculture. *Agriculture*. 2023;13(5):954.
9. Yadav DB, Kamboj BR, Garg RB. Increasing the productivity and profitability of sunflower through front line demonstrations in irrigated agro-ecosystem of eastern Haryana. *Haryana journal of Agronomy*. 2004;20(1&2):33-35.
10. Singh AK. Integrated Crop, Nutrient and Pest Management for Improving Tomato, Brinjal and Chilli Productivity in Acid Soils. *International Journal of Plant Protection*. 2017;10(1):106-110.
11. Chaitanya V, Kumar JH, Rao PJM, Madhushekar BR, Prasad YG. Effect of Integrated Crop Management Practices on Yield and Economics of Watermelon (*Citrullus lanatus* L.). *The Bioscan*. 2023;16(1):1-4.
12. Jyothi GL, Mallikarjun M, Reddy K, Babu SL, Tejaswini V, Naik D. Enhancing Sesame Productivity and Profitability with Cluster Front Line Demonstrations in Andhra Pradesh's Nellore District, India. *International Journal of Plant & Soil Science*. 2023;35(21):1178-83.
13. Reddy K, Mallikarjun M, Jyothi GL, Tejaswini V, Babu SL, Naik D. Impact of Cluster Front Line Demonstrations on Productivity, Profitability and Yield Gap of Blackgram in Nellore District of Andhra Pradesh, India. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology*. 2023;41(10):61-6.
14. Rathod A, Bindhu KG, Vanishree S, Ahamed Z, Ambrish KV, Umesh Babu DS. Integrated crop management practices to rate the performance of tomato under the major tomato

growing areas of Lingasugur Taluk. The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2022;SP 11(3):1460-1462.

15. Choudhary AK, Varatharajan T, ROHULLAH R, Bana RS, Pooniya V, Dass A, Kumar A, Harish MN. Integrated crop management technology for enhanced productivity, resource-use efficiency and soil health in legumes—A review. The Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2020;90(10):1839-1849.

Table 1: Details of variety and technology demonstrated (ICM).

Tomato - Arka Samrat:High yielding F₁ hybrid developed by crossing IIHR-2835 X IIHR-2832. First F₁ Hybrid with triple disease resistance to ToLCV, BW and early blight. Fruits oblate to high round, large (90-110g), deep red and firm. Suitable for fresh market.

ICM Package Includes:

1. Deep summer Ploughing
2. Application of Neem cake @200kg per acre.
3. Soil application of Azospirillum, Phoshobacteria, and Potash mobilizing bacteria @ 5 Kg/ha.
4. Seed treatment with Imidachloprid 8g/kg.
5. Two rows of maize/jowar as boarder crop.
6. Marigold as trap crop (1:16).
7. Installation of Yellow & blue sticky traps- for sucking pest management (20 per acre).
8. Removal and destruction of virus affected plants
9. Neem oil 10,000 ppm @ 2ml/L alternating with the chemical sprays
10. Imidacloprid 40% + Fipronil 40%WG (Police)– 40 to 50 g/acre.Cyantraniliprole - 240 ml/ acre & Acetamiprid – 40 to50 g/acre (Dr YSRHU-2021)

Table 2: Fruit and Yield Characters of Tomato as influenced by ICM Practices.

| Plant characters | 2022-23 | | 2023-24 | | Pooled data | |
|------------------------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------|-------------|-------|
| | ICM | FP | ICM | FP | ICM | FP |
| No of fruits per plant | 72 | 63 | 82 | 75 | 77 | 69 |
| Fruit length (cm) | 5.48 | 4.97 | 5.32 | 5.23 | 5.4 | 5.1 |
| Fruit diameter (cm) | 4.79 | 4.38 | 4.85 | 4.78 | 4.82 | 4.58 |
| Fruit weight (g) | 162.2 | 140.8 | 160.4 | 144.8 | 161.3 | 142.8 |
| Yield per plant (kg) | 4.77 | 4.42 | 4.85 | 4.54 | 4.81 | 4.48 |
| Yield (t/ha) | 57.3 | 54.2 | 62.1 | 58.2 | 59.7 | 56.2 |
| % increase in yield | 5.72 | | 6.70 | | 6.23 | |

Table 3: Economics of Tomato production as influenced by ICM Practices.

| Economic Parameters | 2022-23 | | 2023-24 | | Pooled data | |
|-----------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|-------------|----------|
| | ICM | FP | ICM | FP | ICM | FP |
| Cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) | 1,22,350 | 1,25,600 | 1,28,600 | 1,32,500 | 1,25,475 | 1,29,050 |
| Gross Returns (Rs/ha) | 4,58,400 | 4,33,600 | 4,96,800 | 4,65,600 | 4,77,600 | 4,49,600 |
| Net Returns (Rs/ha) | 3,36,050 | 3,08,000 | 3,68,200 | 3,33,100 | 3,52,125 | 3,20,550 |
| B:C Ratio | 3.75 | 3.45 | 3.86 | 3.51 | 3.80 | 3.48 |