*Original Research Article*

# Performance of Groundnut under Broad Bed Furrow Method in Buldana District of Maharashtra


## ABSTRACT

The Cluster Frontline Demonstrations (CFLDs) on groundnut were carried out by Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Jalgaon Jamod, Buldana district of Maharashtra during the summer season of 2015-16 to 2016-17 in fields of 50 farmers' ~~in~~ at different villages of Buldana district. Farmers were randomly selected. ~~from adopted villages for carried out frontline demonstration.~~ The result of the present study showed that sowing irrigated groundnut crop on broad bed furrows in demo plots recorded higher yield over to conventional farmers farming practices. The average pod yield in broad bed furrow seed drill sowing method was ~~23.79~~2.38 ~~t~~q/ha. The technological gap ranged ~~found~~ ~~1.26~~0.13 ~~t~~q/ha to ~~3.17~~0.32 ~~t~~q/ha. The technology index varied from 4.85 percent to 12.19 percent with an average of 8.52 per-cent over study period, which ~~showing~~ showed the effectiveness of technological interventions. ~~The economics of improved production practices under frontline demonstration was estimated based prevailing market prices, t~~The average highest gross return of CFLDs plots was Rs 57,548/- per hectare i.e. more than 26 percent higher ~~at demonstration~~ compared to the conventional practices and average the benefit-cost-ratio ~~(2.24~~) was 2.24~~recorded~~. Groundnut productivity was considerably increased by conducting cluster frontline demonstration of better variety with intervention methods using proven technologies in farmers' fields and improving the livelihood of the farming community.



**KEYWORDS:** Groundnut, Broad bed furrow technology, FLD, Technology gap, Extension gap, Technology Index and Economic return




## INTRODUCTION

'India is one of the major oilseeds producer and importer of edible oils. With regards to vegetable oil economy, India ranks fourth in the world after USA, China ~~& Brazil~~and Brazil. Groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea L.*) is one of the most important oilseed crop~~s~~ in India. Groundnut contributes nearly 65% to the

vegetable oil produced in India and holds the key to the fluctuating fortunes of vegetable oil industry. Low crop yields under rainfed conditions are due to recurring drought stress, high soil temperature, widespread soil degradation and desertification, and poor management. Soil-related constraints that exacerbate drought stress include crusting and compaction, low water infiltration rate, low water retention capacity, high surface runoff, and high losses due to soil evaporation' (Rattan Lal, 2008). 'Among the various land surface management practices like raised and sunken bed, ridge and furrow developed for Vertisols, broad bed and furrow (BBF) system is very promising in controlling surface runoff, reducing the soil loss through erosion and increasing infiltration' (Singh et al., 1999). The BBF landform management system essentially reduces runoff water velocity and consequently increases the time that water can infiltrate and reduces sediment losses. In addition, during the periods of heavy rainfall the furrow allows excess water to safely drain away from the plots and thus avoiding water congestion to the crop (Kampen, 1982). It points that that the ~~the~~ productivity of groundnut in Buldana is comparatively low, mainly due to unavailability of suitable varieties as well as the lack of improved production technologies, especially sowing method and nutrient management. The present study was conducted to observe the role of the planting method in groundnut. The raised bed system of planting was compared ~~t~~to the flat bed method prevalent in the district.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

In order to increase the production and productivity of groundnut crop, Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Jalgaon Jamod, Buldana district, Maharashtra introduced the technology for sowing of groundnut crop on broad bed furrow in demo plots in that region while control plots crop were grown according to commonly accepted agricultural ????.The trial was carried out in summer season in 2015-16 and 2016-17 in farmers fields in Jalgaon Jamod and Sangrampur tahsil, Buldana district of Maharashtra. Each year different areas were chosen for the study. Before the FLD trail implemented, the farmers were trained by experts and KVK's scientists on use of broad bed furrow machines. In demonstration quality seeds of an improved variety of groundnut crop i.e. TAG-25, seed treatment, recommended dose of fertilizers, Rhizobium, PSB bio-fertilizer and crop protection management techniques demonstrated in the farmer's field through frontline demonstration at various locations. The raised bed planted every year on was done at five fields of one acre each. A tractor drawn bed planter was used to planting groundnut in broad bed furrow technique (Figure??). Irrigation was done by sprinklers at different stages of groundnut. Crop yield was collected based on actual yield per hectare basis. ~~Growing~~ Production cost and gross return were calculated on prevalent market prices. The conventional practices were maintained in case of local checks. All major agricultural operations were carried out under the

**Comment [U1]:** Please describe from where this technology was introduced with appropriate reference.

**Comment [U2]:** It is difficult to understand/know for a reader the commonly accepted agricultural practice for groundnut in Maharastra.

**Comment [U3]:** Please name the areas.

**Comment [U4]:** What was the check variety with which the improved TAG-25 variety will be compared?

**Comment [U5]:** Please describe the fertilizer doses and its method of application in the field along with rate of Rhizobium, PSB bio fertilizer and crop protection techniques.

**Comment [U6]:** Please mention the number of farmers with land area cultivated for front line demonstration and the local practice. Have you followed any experimental design, if not, please justify.

**Comment [U7]:** Please convert it to ha.

**Comment [U8]:** Please check the sentence.

**Comment [U9]:** Please specify.

**Comment [U10]:** Do you think only per hectare yield is sufficient to recommend the superiority of furrow bed method of planting over conventional practice?

**Comment [U11]:** Please mention the market price.

supervision of KVK scientist by regular visits. The yield increase in demonstrations over farmers' practice was calculated by using the following formula:

Extension Gap (q/ha) = Demonstration Yield – Check Yield

Technology Gap (q/ha) = Potential Yield – Demonstration Yield

Technology Index (%) = Technology Gap / Potential Yield X 100

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Groundnut yield

The difference in groundnut ~~pot~~ pod yield ~~with~~ in a broad bed furrow and conventional sowing is ~~justified~~ shown in Table~~-~~1. Results ~~from~~ 50 frontline demonstrations conducted on 20 ha area in farmer fields between 2015-16 and 2016-17 showed that the ~~average~~ higher pod ~~(2.3.79 tq/ha) yield~~yield (2.379 t/ha) of groundnut ~~was recorded~~ in FLDs ~~over the average farmer~~than farmer's practice ~~pod yield~~ (1.8~~-~~96 tq/ha) ~~recorded~~. ~~Due to~~Through the introduction of improved ~~TAG-25~~ variety ~~with~~ and appropriate production technology, the pod yield of groundnut ~~may be raised~~ could be increased by ~~by~~ 25.78 % ~~above the pod yield achieved~~compare to ~~by~~ local agricultural methods of groundnut cultivation. Jat and Katiyar (2015), Pawar et al., (2017) and Undhad et al., (2019) all ~~found~~ reported similar results.

### Technology Gap

Technology gap refers to the difference between the potential yield of the variety and the demonstration yield. Farmers will eventually stop using old kinds in favour of new technology as a result of new technologies. The technology gap of 0.1~~-~~26 and 0.3~~-~~17 ~~qt~~/ha in 2015-16 and 2016-17, respectively (Table 1). The average technological gap was observed to be 2.32 q/ha. The technological gap observed can be attributed to the difference in soil fertility status and weather conditions i.e. irrigation and temperature ~~can be traced~~. Therefore, variety wise location specific recommendation seems necessary to minimize the technology gap for yield level in different situations.

### Extension Gap

The extensions gap referred to the difference between demonstrated yield and yield under existing agricultural practice. An extension gap of ~~4.46~~0.45 and ~~5.19~~0.52 tq/ha was observed in 2015-16 and 2016-17, respectively (Table 1). The average extension gap was recorded in the demonstration as ~~4.83~~0.48 ~~qt~~/ha emphasizing the need to train the farmers through various means to adopt improved groundnut production technologies to ~~reverse~~ reduce this large extension gap ~~trend~~. The increasing use of

**Comment [U12]:** Does it mean anything to a reader outside Maharasthtra/India?

**Comment [U13]:** Please convert it to MT.

**Comment [AV14]:** Transfer this to MM

**Comment [U15]:** Please rewrite .

the latest production technologies with high-yielding varieties will subsequently change this alarming trend of the galloping extension gap.

**Technology Index**

The technology index referred to the relationship between the technology gap and the potential yield expressed as a percentage. The technology index shows the feasibility and performance of the demonstrated technology in the farmers' field. The lower value of the technology index shows the effectiveness of a good performance of technological interventions. In the present demonstration, the technology index fluctuated between 4.85 to 12.19 percent (Table 1). The average technology index was recorded at 8.92 percent in the groundnut crop during the three consecutive years of FLD programmes The technology index can be reduced through the ~~correct~~ appropriate application of demonstrated technical interventions to increase the yield performance of groundnut crop. The findings of this study are consistent with those of Jat and Katiyar (2015) and Pawar et al., (2017).

**Economic Return**

The economic analysis of broad bed furrow technique of seed drill in groundnut under frontline demonstration and framers control plots are shown in Table 2. ~~Table 2~~It shows that the average total return of both cluster of FLDs and the farmers' control plots are Rs 57,548/- and Rs 33,471/- per hectare respectively i.e. more than 72 per cent higher in the demonstration compared to the farmers' practices. Jat and Katiyar (2015), Pawar *et al*., (2017) and Undhad *et al*., (2019) all ~~found~~ reported similar findings.

**Benefit cost ratio**

Benefit-to-Cost ratio was also worked out for farmers' practice and demonstration plots as given in Table 2. The B:C ratio as reported in Table 2 was greater BBF plots (2.24) than in the conventional method (1.68) of sowing of groundnut. ~~This is due to the reduction in the primary tillage operation method as well as increased production.~~ Please make it more clear.

**Comment [U16]:** This abbreviated form should be used in the parenthesis when you used the words Broad Bed Furrow for the first time in this manuscript.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the results obtained in the present study, groundnut productivity was considerably boosted as a result of conducting cluster frontline demonstrations of better variety with intervention methods of proven

technologies in the farmers' field, resulting in greater farmer revenue and improved farming community livelihoods. However, 40 to 50% savings in irrigation water were recorded with broad bed furrow method of groundnut in compared to flood irrigation of controlled plots. The results showed that broad bed furrow technology has great potential to increase water productivity of groundnut. Farmers were inspired by cluster frontline demonstrations in groundnut crop and they planned to use this technology for many years.

**Comment [U17]:** How can you conclude like this without showing any data in support of this findings in Results and Discussion section.

## REFERENCES


Jitendra Joshi & Atul Kumar Shrivastava 2017: Modification and performance evaluation of tractor drawn raised bed seed drill under vertisol. *International J. of Agri. Sci. and Res.* **7** (3):385-394.

Jat, A. S. and Katiyar, A. K. 2015. Impact of frontline demonstrations on productivity and profitability of groundnut. *International J. of Basic and Applied Agri. Res.*, 13: 321-325.

Kampen, J., 1982. An approach to improved productivity on deep Vertisols. Information Bulletin No. 11, International Crop Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics, Patancheru, A.P., India.

Khambalkar, V.P., N.N. Waghmare, A.V. Gajakos, D.S. Karale, U.S. Kankal 2014: Performance of broad bed planter in winter season of dryland crops. *International Agri. Engg.J.*, **23** (1): 14-22.

Directorate of Economics and Statistics (DAC & FW). 2017. Pocket Book of Agriculture. Pp: 148-153

Mandal, K.G., Hati, K.M., Bandyopadhyay, K.K. and Tripathi, A.K. 2013. Land surface modification and crop diversification for enhancing productivity of a Vertisol. *International J. Plant Production*. **7**(3): 455-472.

Pawar, Y., Malve, S. H. and Patel, G. J. 2017. Assessing yield gap analysis of groundnut through cluster frontline demonstration in Banaskantha district of Gujarat. *Gujarat J. of Ext. Edu.*, Special Issue: 32-35.

Rattan Lal, R., 2008. Managing soil water to improve rainfedagriculture in India. *J. of Sustainable Agri.* **32** (1), 51-75.

Saha, A., Samanta, S. and Bhale, V.M. 2016. Land Configuration and nutrient management for increased productivity of organic guar gum in rainfed condition. *New Agriculturist*, **27**(1):33-36

Undhad, S. V., Prajapati, V. S., Sharma, P. S., Jadav, N. B. and Parmar, A. R. (2019). Role of cluster frontline demonstrations in enhancement of groundnut production. *J of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, **8** (4): 1862-63.

**Table 1 : ~~Grain~~ Pod yield and gap analysis of front line demonstration on Ground-nut**

| Year | Area (ha) | No. of farmers | Yield tq/ha | | | % increase over farmer practices | Technology gap (q/ha) | Extension Gap | Technology Index |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Potential | FLD plots | Farmer practices | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 10 | 25 | 26 | 24.74 | 20.28 | 22.14 | 1.26 | 4.46 | 4.85 |
| 2016-2017 | 10 | 25 | 26 | 22.83 | 17.64 | 29.42 | 3.17 | 5.19 | 12.19 |
| | | | **Mean** | **23.79** | **18.96** | **25.78** | **2.22** | **4.83** | **8.52** |

**Table : 2 Economics analysis of demonstrated plots and farmers practices of Ground-nut**

| Year | Av. Cost of Inputs (Rs/ha) | | Av. Gross return (Rs/ha) | | Average net return (Rs/ha) | | B:C ratio | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Demo. Plots | farmers practices | Demo. Plots | farmers practices | Demo. Plots | farmers practices | Demo. Plots | farmers practices |
| 2015-2016 | 46994 | 47718 | 99665 | 81688 | 52671 | 33969 | 2.12 | 1.71 |
| 2016-2017 | 46066 | 50700 | 108490 | 83682 | 62424 | 32973 | 2.36 | 1.65 |
| **Mean** | **46530** | **49209** | **104078** | **82685** | **57548** | **33471** | **2.24** | **1.68** |
| ~~**Mean**~~ | ~~**46530**~~ | ~~**49209**~~ | ~~**104078**~~ | ~~**82685**~~ | ~~**57548**~~ | ~~**33471**~~ | ~~**2.24**~~ | ~~**1.68**~~ |

Formatted Table