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#### Abstract

The present investigation was carried out to ascertain performance of tuberose (Polianthes tuberosa L.) with different spacing during March, 2021 to January, 2022 at College Farm, College of Horticulture, S. D. Agricultural University, Jagudan, Dist. Mehsana, Gujarat. Experiment was comprised of two factors viz. three spacings i.e. $30 \mathrm{~cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}\left(\mathrm{~s}_{1}\right), 45 \mathrm{~cm} \times 20 \mathrm{~cm}$ ( $\mathrm{s}_{2}$ ) and $45 \mathrm{~cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}$ ( $\mathrm{s}_{3}$ ) and five varieties Arka Prajwal ( $\mathrm{v}_{1}$ ), Phule Rajani ( $\mathrm{v}_{2}$ ), Shringar ( $\mathrm{v}_{3}$ ), Mexican Single ( $\mathrm{v}_{4}$ ) and Arka Nirantara ( $\mathrm{v}_{5}$ ). Total 15 treatments were evaluated in present investigation viz., $\mathrm{T}_{1}: 30 \mathrm{~cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Arka Prajwal, $\mathrm{T}_{2}: 30 \mathrm{~cm} \times$ $30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Phule Rajani, $T_{3}: 30 \mathrm{~cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Shringar, $T_{4}: 30 \mathrm{~cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Mexican Single, $T_{5}: 30 \mathrm{~cm} \times$ $30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Arka Nirantara, $\mathrm{T}_{6}: 45 \mathrm{~cm} \times 20 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Arka Prajwal, $\mathrm{T}_{7}: 45 \mathrm{~cm} \times 20 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Phule Rajani, $\mathrm{T}_{8}: 45 \mathrm{~cm}$ x $20 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Shringar, $T_{9}: 45 \mathrm{~cm} \times 20 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Mexican Single, $T_{10}: 45 \mathrm{~cm} \times 20 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Arka Nirantara, $T_{11}: 45$ $\mathrm{cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Arka Prajwal, $\mathrm{T}_{12}: 45 \mathrm{~cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Phule Rajani, $\mathrm{T}_{13}: 45 \mathrm{~cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Shringar, $\mathrm{T}_{14}: 45$ $\mathrm{cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Mexican Single and $\mathrm{T}_{15}: 45 \mathrm{~cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Arka Nirantara. Treatments were evaluated with respect to growth, yield and quality parameters of tuberose. Among various treatments, the highest benefit cost ration and net realization obtained with treatment $\mathrm{T}_{6}: 45 \mathrm{~cm} \times 20 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Arka Prajwal.
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## Introduction

In India, tuberose (Polianthes tuberosa L.) is a popular crop for cut and loose flowers. It is an ornamental bulbous plant belongs to family Asparagaceae and is native of Mexico (Trueblood, 1973) ${ }^{[3]}$. In South India, it is commonly planted for its fragrant white flowers, which are used for garlands and decorations. It is also used for worshipping, offerings in religious functions and on auspicious days (Krishnamoorthy, 2014) ${ }^{[1]}$. The flowers are used for the extraction of valuable essential oil, which is having greater export demand (Martolia and Srivastava, 2012) ${ }^{\text {[2] }}$. For this crop, there are numerous local varieties and cultivars available these days. Certain types may not perform as well in other places with different climates than they do in one. Thus, the varietal evaluation for a certain site enables the producer to choose the variety that will yield the most and be most fit for that specific area. Any crop's ability to be successfully grown is determined by a number of agronomic practices, such as optimal spacing, in addition to the high yielding variety. Thus, in order to cultivate tuberose and produce the best possible quality and number of tuberose flowers, plant spacing is very crucial. Considering the present situation and above facts, the present investigation was undertaken with the objective to determine the optimum spacing for better growth, spike yield and quality of tuberose.

## Materials and Methods

The current study was conducted from March 2021 to January 2022 at the College Farm, College of Horticulture, Sardarkrushinagar Dantiwada Agricultural University, Jagudan, Dist. Mehsana, Gujarat. Split plot design was used to set up the experiment, which included fifteen treatment combinations of three spacings and five varieties: $30 \mathrm{~cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}\left(\mathrm{~s}_{1}\right), 45 \mathrm{~cm} \times 20$ $\mathrm{cm}\left(\mathrm{s}_{2}\right)$ and $45 \mathrm{~cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}\left(\mathrm{~s}_{3}\right)$ and five varieties Arka Prajwal $\left(\mathrm{v}_{1}\right)$, Phule Rajani $\left(\mathrm{v}_{2}\right)$, Shringar ( $\mathrm{v}_{3}$ ), Mexican Single ( $\mathrm{v}_{4}$ ) and Arka Nirantara ( $\mathrm{v}_{5}$ ). He treatments that were combined
were as follows: $\mathrm{T}_{1}: 30 \mathrm{~cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Arka Prajwal, $\mathrm{T}_{2}: 30$ $\mathrm{cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Phule Rajani, $\mathrm{T}_{3}: 30 \mathrm{~cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Shringar, $\mathrm{T}_{4}: 30 \mathrm{~cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Mexican Single, $\mathrm{T}_{5}: 30 \mathrm{~cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Arka Nirantara, $\mathrm{T}_{6}: 45 \mathrm{~cm} \times 20 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Arka Prajwal, $\mathrm{T}_{7:} 45 \mathrm{~cm}$ x $20 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Phule Rajani, $\mathrm{T}_{8}: 45 \mathrm{~cm} \times 20 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Shringar, $\mathrm{T}_{9}: 45$ $\mathrm{cm} \times 20 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Mexican Single, $\mathrm{T}_{10}: 45 \mathrm{~cm} \times 20 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Arka Nirantara, $T_{11}: 45 \mathrm{~cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Arka Prajwal, $\mathrm{T}_{12}: 45 \mathrm{~cm} x$ $30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Phule Rajani, $\mathrm{T}_{13}: 45 \mathrm{~cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Shringar, $\mathrm{T}_{14}: 45$
$\mathrm{cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Mexican Single and $\mathrm{T}_{15}: 45 \mathrm{~cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Arka Nirantara. In March, bulbs with a diameter of $2.5-3.0 \mathrm{~cm}$ were planted, and irrigation and fertilization were done in accordance with standard recommended package standards. From each treatment, five plants were chosen for observation.

## Results and Discussion

Table 1: Cost of cultivation and gross realization of tuberose
a) Details of fixed cost

| Sr. No. | Particular |  | Labour/quantity | Frequency | Fixed Cost (3 yr) |  | Fixed Cost (For 1 yr) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Cost of Material |  | Labour Cost |  |
| Pre-Planting Operation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| [A] | 1. | Ploughing ( 3 hr x 600 ₹) |  | - | 2 | 3,600 | - | 1,200 |
|  | 2. | Planking ( 3 hr x 600 ₹) | - | 1 | 1,800 | - | 600 |
|  | 3. | FYM @ $20 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{h}$ | - | 1 | 60000 | - | 20000 |
|  | 4. | FYM application | 10 | 1 |  | 10200 | 3400 |
| Bulb |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| [B] | 1. | Transport | - |  | 1,000 | - | 334 |
|  | 2. | COC treatment ( 5 kg ) | 4 | 1 | 3,500 | 1,360 | 11,273 |
|  | 3. | $\mathrm{GA}_{3}$ treatment ( 20 g ) |  |  | 28,960 |  |  |
| [C] | Fertilizer Cost |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1. | Urea ( $\mathrm{N}: 200 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) | 1304 kg urea | - | 7,735 | - | 2,578 |
|  | 2. | SSP (P: $200 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) | 3750kg SSP | - | 31,125 | - | 10,375 |
|  | 3. | MOP (K: $200 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) | 1034 kg MOP | - | 18,713 | - | 6,238 |
|  | 4. | Fertilizer application | 12 | 6 | - | 24,480 | 8,160 |
| [D] | Planting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1. | Bed preparation | 10 | 1 | - | 3,400 | 1,134 |
|  | 2. | Bulb Planting | 15 | 1 | - | 1,700 | 567 |
| [E] | Intercultural Operations |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1. | Weeding | 6 | 45 | - | 91,800 | 30,600 |
|  | 2. | Plant protection | 4 | 15 | - | 22,550 | 7,517 |
| [F] |  | Irrigation | - | - | 60,000 |  | 20,000 |
|  | Total Cost (₹/ha) |  |  |  | 2,16,433 | 1,55,490 | 1,23,976 |

(Note: Tuberose is generally grown for 3 years but here experiment was carried out for 1 year)
Rate of labour $=340$ ₹ $/$ dayUrea $=5.93$ ₹ $/ \mathrm{kg}$
$\mathrm{SSP}=8.3 ₹ / \mathrm{kg} \quad \mathrm{MOP}=18.09 ₹ / \mathrm{kg}$
Bulb $=5$ ₹/bulb $\quad$ FYM $=1000$ ₹ $/ \mathrm{t}$

Among various treatments, the least total variable cost ( $1,26,857$ ₹ $/ \mathrm{ha}$ ) was found in $\mathrm{T}_{13}(45 \mathrm{~cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Shringar) while highest total variable cost (1,92,665 ₹/ha) was found in treatment $\mathrm{T}_{6}$ ( $45 \mathrm{~cm} \times 20 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Arka Prajwal). Total cost of cultivation for tuberose crop in 1 hectare area was minimum
with (2,50,832 ₹ $/ \mathrm{ha}$ ) $\mathrm{T}_{13}(45 \mathrm{~cm} \mathrm{x} 30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Shringar) treatment. While highest total cost of cultivation $(3,16,641 ₹ / h a)$ for 1 hectare was found with treatment $T_{6}$ (45 $\mathrm{cm} \times 20 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Arka Prajwal).

Table 1b: Details of variable cost

| Treatment | Number of plants / ha | Bulb cost (₹/ha) | Harvesting cost (₹/ha) | Variable cost (₹/ha) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | $1,11,111$ | $1,85,185$ | 5,440 | $1,90,625$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{2}$ | $1,11,111$ | $1,85,185$ | 3,740 | $1,88,925$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{3}$ | $1,11,111$ | $1,85,185$ | 3,400 | $1,88,585$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{4}$ | $1,11,111$ | $1,85,185$ | 3,400 | $1,88,585$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{5}$ | $1,11,111$ | $1,85,185$ | 3,400 | $1,88,585$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{6}$ | $1,11,111$ | $1,85,185$ | 7,480 | $1,92,665$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{7}$ | $1,11,111$ | $1,85,185$ | 4,080 | $1,89,265$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{8}$ | $1,11,111$ | $1,85,185$ | 3,400 | $1,88,585$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{9}$ | $1,11,111$ | $1,85,185$ | 3,740 | $1,88,925$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{10}$ | $1,11,111$ | $1,85,185$ | 3,400 | $1,88,585$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{11}$ | $7,40,74$ | $1,23,457$ | 5,100 | $1,28,557$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{12}$ | $7,40,74$ | $1,23,457$ | 4,080 | $1,27,537$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{13}$ | $7,40,74$ | $1,23,457$ | 3,400 | $1,26,857$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{14}$ | $7,40,74$ | $1,23,457$ | 3,740 | $1,27,197$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{15}$ | $7,40,74$ | $1,23,457$ | 3,400 | $1,26,857$ |

[^0](Note: Bulb cost is divided by 3 as experiment was carried out for 1 year)

Table 1c: Details of total cost

| Treatment | Fixed cost (₹/ha) | Variable cost (₹/ha) | Total cost (₹/ha) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | $1,23,976$ | $1,90,625$ | $3,14,601$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{2}$ | $1,23,976$ | $1,88,925$ | $3,12,901$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{3}$ | $1,23,976$ | $1,88,585$ | $3,12,561$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{4}$ | $1,23,976$ | $1,88,585$ | $3,12,561$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{5}$ | $1,23,976$ | $1,88,585$ | $3,12,561$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{6}$ | $1,23,976$ | $1,92,665$ | $3,16,641$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{7}$ | $1,23,976$ | $1,89,265$ | $3,13,241$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{8}$ | $1,23,976$ | $1,88,585$ | $3,12,561$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{9}$ | $1,23,976$ | $1,88,925$ | $3,12,901$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{10}$ | $1,23,976$ | $1,88,585$ | $3,12,561$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{11}$ | $1,23,976$ | $1,28,557$ | $2,52,532$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{12}$ | $1,23,976$ | $1,27,537$ | $2,51,512$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{13}$ | $1,23,976$ | $1,26,857$ | $2,50,832$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{14}$ | $1,23,976$ | $1,27,197$ | $2,51,172$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{15}$ | $1,23,976$ | $1,26,857$ | $2,50,832$ |

Table 2: Effect of treatments on economics and benefit cost ratio (B:C ratio)

| Treatment | Yield (kg/ha) | Gross income (₹/ha) | Total cost of cultivation ( $\mathbf{\%} / \mathbf{h a}$ ) | Net income (₹/ha) | B: C ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | 26564.81 | 1062592.59 | 321433.30 | 741159.29 | 3.31 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ | 19321.30 | 772851.85 | 319733.30 | 453118.55 | 2.42 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{3}$ | 18145.14 | 725805.56 | 319393.30 | 406412.25 | 2.27 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{4}$ | 17714.24 | 708569.44 | 319393.30 | 389176.14 | 2.22 |
| T5 | 23565.05 | 942601.85 | 319393.30 | 623208.55 | 2.95 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{6}$ | 30377.51 | 1215100.53 | 323473.30 | 891627.23 | 3.76 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{7}$ | 19609.52 | 784380.95 | 320073.30 | 464307.65 | 2.45 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{8}$ | 19635.45 | 785417.99 | 319393.30 | 466024.69 | 2.46 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{9}$ | 21512.17 | 860486.77 | 319733.30 | 540753.47 | 2.69 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{10}$ | 25265.61 | 1010624.34 | 319393.30 | 691231.04 | 3.16 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{11}$ | 17325.93 | 693037.04 | 259364.91 | 433672.13 | 2.67 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{12}$ | 12165.12 | 486604.94 | 258344.91 | 228260.03 | 1.88 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{13}$ | 12514.81 | 500592.59 | 257664.91 | 242927.69 | 1.94 |
| T14 | 11855.25 | 474209.88 | 258004.91 | 216204.97 | 1.84 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{15}$ | 18721.30 | 748851.85 | 257664.91 | 491186.95 | 2.91 |

Data (Table 2) pertaining to the economics of treatments shows that maximum gross income ( 323473.30 ₹) was observed with treatment $\mathrm{T}_{6}(45 \mathrm{~cm} \times 20 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Arka Prajwal) followed by $T_{1}(30 \mathrm{~cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Arka Prajwal) and minimum ( 474209.88 ₹) in the treatment $\mathrm{T}_{14}(45 \mathrm{~cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}$ + Mexican Single). Similarly, maximum net income ( 891627.23 ₹) was observed with treatment $\mathrm{T}_{6}(45 \mathrm{~cm} \times 20$ $\mathrm{cm}+$ Arka Prajwal) followed by $\mathrm{T}_{1}(30 \mathrm{~cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Arka Prajwal) and minimum ( 216204.97 ₹) in the treatment $\mathrm{T}_{14}$ (45 $\mathrm{cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Mexican Single). On the other hand highest benefit cost ratio (3.76) also observed with treatment $\mathrm{T}_{6}$ (45 $\mathrm{cm} \times 20 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Arka Prajwal) followed by $\mathrm{T}_{1}(30 \mathrm{~cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Arka Prajwal) and minimum (1.84) in the treatment $\mathrm{T}_{14}$ (45 $\mathrm{cm} \times 30 \mathrm{~cm}+$ Mexican Single).

## Conclusion

From the present study, it could be concluded that planting of variety Arka Prajwal under spacing $45 \mathrm{~cm} \times 20 \mathrm{~cm}$ spacing was found most beneficial in terms economics and benefit cost ratio as compared to other varieties and spacings under study.
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[^0]:    Price of bulb = 5 ₹/bulb

