Productivity of BT and Non BT Cotton (Gossypium hirsutum L.) Cultivars as Influenced by Plant Geometry and Fertilizer Levels
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A B S T R A C T

A field experiment was conducted during 2015-16 and 2016-17 at Hyderabad to assess the performance of two cotton hybrids of which Bt (MRC 7201 BGII) and non-Bt cotton (WGCV-48) in response to plant densities (P1: 18,518 plants ha⁻¹, P2: 55,555 plants ha⁻¹ and P3: 1,48,148 plants ha⁻¹) and nitrogen fertilization (120, 150 and 180 kg ha⁻¹). During 2015 and 2016, MRC 7201 BGII cultivar recorded significantly more plant height (125.0 cm and 141.4 cm), LAI (5.23 and 4.95) and dry matter production (246 g plant⁻¹ and 241 g plant⁻¹), number of sympodial branches plant⁻¹ (42, 40) and kapas yield (3497, 2866 kg ha⁻¹) in comparison to WGCV-48 cultivar, respectively. Plant density P1 (18,518 plants ha⁻¹) at 90 cm x 60 cm spacing recorded significantly more dry matter production (301 g plant⁻¹, 298 g plant⁻¹) over P2 (55,555 plants ha⁻¹) at 60 cm x 30 cm and P3 (1,48,148 plants ha⁻¹) 45 cm x 15 cm spacing during 2015 and 2016 respectively. During 2015 and 2016, among the plant densities, even though the plant density of P1: 18,518 plants ha⁻¹ showed more number of sympodial branches plant⁻¹ (55, 53) and kapas yield plant⁻¹ (149, 122), but the plant density of P2: 55,555 plants ha⁻¹ significantly more kapas yield (3319, 2726 kg ha⁻¹).
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Introduction
Cotton is a natural part of everyday life which serves the mankind from the cradle to the grave. Cotton plays a key role in socio-economic and political affairs of the world (Kairon et al., 2004). Its production, processing and trade generate revenue and sustain livelihoods in many countries. It is the world’s leading source of natural textile fiber and fifth largest oilseeds crop which covers 40% of the global textile need (APTMA, 2012) and 3.3% of edible oil (FAS, 2014), respectively. Cotton is the most important commercial and premier cash crop of India. It plays a prominent role in farming and industrial economy of the country.

With the introduction of Bt cotton hybrids, there has been a significant change in the cotton cultivation scenario of India. Now, around 40 per cent area under cotton is occupied by Bt cotton hybrids. However, the average production is very low when compared to world's average. This is mainly because 70 per cent of cotton area is under rainfed condition.

Cotton (Gossypium hirsutum L.) crop assumes a place of special significance in Indian economy. India is the only country in the world which grows four types of cultivated species of cotton. During the last
decade, a decline in seed cotton yield was observed due to severe incidence of boll worms which resulted in decrease in cotton area. However, after the introduction of Bt cotton which resists the boll worm attack in 2002, the technology has been widely accepted by Indians and the area under cotton increased to 11.64 million ha with a production of 33.4 million bales with productivity of 489 kg ha\(^{-1}\) in 2012-13 (Anonymous, 2013). Now 90 per cent of cotton area was occupied by Bt cotton. By adopting appropriate agronomic practices cotton yield per unit area can be improved. Management decisions like variety selection, planting date, plant density, and nitrogen management have a profound effect on the development and final outcome of the crop.

Till date, there is confusion in the farming community that whether Bt crop needs same plant geometry and nutrient requirement as that of non Bt cotton. Vegetative growth in Bt cotton is restricted due to 100% setting of fruiting bodies on the plant, which requires closer spacing for better yields. Chen et al., (2004) specified the need to develop agronomic management practices as there are changes in vegetative and reproductive characteristics of Bt cotton. Lack of knowledge about important agronomical practices could also be another reason. So, there is a need to identify suitable Bt cotton genotype which gives higher net returns with lower cost of cultivation. Keeping this in view the present study was carried out to find the optimum spacing and nitrogen requirement for Bt and non Bt cotton under rainfed conditions.

**Materials and Methods**

These investigations were carried out during *Kharif* 2015-16 and 2016-17 at Agricultural Research Institute, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad situated at an altitude of 542.3 m above mean sea level at 17°19’ N latitude and 78°23’ E longitude. It is in the Southern Telangana agro-climatic zone of Telangana. According to Troll’s climatic classification, it falls under semi-arid tropics (SAT). The experiment was laid out in randomized block design (factorial) replicated thrice with two cultivars (MRC 7201 BG II, WGCV-48) three plant densities (P\(_1\): 18,518 plants ha\(^{-1}\), P\(_2\): 55,555 plants ha\(^{-1}\), P\(_3\): 1,48,148 plants ha\(^{-1}\)) and three nitrogen levels (N\(_1\): 120 kg ha\(^{-1}\), N\(_2\): 150 kg ha\(^{-1}\), N\(_3\): 180 kg ha\(^{-1}\)). The soil of the experimental site was sandy loam in texture, neutral in reaction, low in available nitrogen, phosphorus and high in available potassium. During the crop period rainfall of 375.3 mm was received in 27 rainy days in first year and 740.9 mm in 37 rainy days in second year, respectively as against the decennial average of 616.2 mm received in 37 rainy days for the corresponding period indicating 2016-17 as wet year comparatively.

Field was ploughed once with tractor drawn mould board plough followed by cultivator and later with disc harrow. The land within each plot was leveled in order to maintain uniform irrigation water application. Cotton crop was sown on July 8, 2015 and July 7, 2016 by dibbling seeds in opened holes with a hand hoe at depth of 4 to 5 cm as per the spacing in treatments viz., 90 cm X 60 cm, 60 cm X 30 cm and 45 cm X 15 cm. A uniform dose of 60 kg ha\(^{-1}\) P\(_2\)O\(_5\) as single super phosphate, potassium @ 60 kg ha\(^{-1}\) as muriate of potash was applied to all the treatments of Bt cotton cultivar. Entire dose of phosphorus was applied as basal at the time of sowing. Nitrogen was applied as per the treatments (wherever it was required) in the form of urea (46 % N) in four equal splits (20, 40, 60 and 80 days after sowing (DAS). Similarly, the remaining potassium was applied along with urea in four splits at 20, 40, 60 and 80 days after sowing (DAS) respectively. Whereas, for non Bt cotton cultivar uniform dose of 45
kg ha\textsuperscript{-1} P\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{5} as single super phosphate, potassium @ 45 kg ha\textsuperscript{-1} as muriate of potash was applied to all the treatments. Entire dose of phosphorus was applied as basal at the time of sowing. Nitrogen was applied as per the treatments (wherever it was required) in the form of urea (46 % N) in three equal splits (30, 60 and 90 days after sowing (DAS). Similarly, the remaining potassium was applied along with urea in 3 splits at 30, 60 and 90 days after sowing (DAS) respectively.

Pre emergence herbicide pendimethalin @ 2.5 ml l\textsuperscript{-1} was sprayed to prevent growth of weeds. Post emergence spray of quizalofop ethyl 5% EC @ 2 ml l\textsuperscript{-1} and pyrithiobac sodium 10% EC @ 1 ml l\textsuperscript{-1}. Hand weeding was carried out once at 35 DAS. First irrigation was given immediately after sowing of the crop to ensure proper and uniform germination. Later irrigations were scheduled uniformly by adopting climatological approach \textit{i.e.}, IW/CPE ratio of 0.80 at 5 cm depth.

During crop growing season sucking pest incidence was noticed. Initially at 25 DAS spraying of monocrotophos @ 1.6 ml l\textsuperscript{-1} was done. During later stages, acephate @ 1.5 g l\textsuperscript{-1} and fipronil @ 2 ml l\textsuperscript{-1} were sprayed alternatively against white fly and other sucking pests complex during the crop growth period as and when required. For controlling boll worms in non Bt cultivar, monocrotophos @ 1.6 ml l\textsuperscript{-1} and emamectin benzoate 5 % SG @ 0.5 g l\textsuperscript{-1} was sprayed based on the infestation whenever required.

Leaf area index was measured at square formation, flowering and boll development with leaf area meter (LICOR model LI-3000) and expressed in cm\textsuperscript{2} plant\textsuperscript{-1} (Watson, 1957).

\[
\text{Leaf area plant}^{-1} = \frac{\text{Leaf area index}}{\text{Land area occupied plant}^{-1}}
\]

The cumulative yield of seed cotton from each picking in each treatment from net plot was weighed and expressed in kg ha\textsuperscript{-1}. Data on different characters \textit{viz.}, growth and yield components and yield, were subjected to analysis of variance procedures as outlined for randomized block design, factorial concept (Gomez and Gomez, 1984). Statistical significance was tested by F-value at 0.05 level of probability and critical difference was worked out wherever the effects were significant.
Results and Discussion

Effect of plant densities

The plant height was higher with P2: 60 cm x 30 cm at first picking (131.7 cm, 141.2 cm) in 2015 and 2016 respectively. Morphological changes in plants are induced when plant density is increased mainly because of competition for light when soil fertility and moisture are not limited. Increased plant density results in mutual shading of plants which usually results in stem elongation. The taller plants at higher plant density late in the season might be due to inter plant competition for nutrients and light. Further, the availability of horizontal space for individual plant at closer spacing reduced, due to which intense inter plant competition for nutrient and light suppressed node appearance and plants grew taller in respect of vertical space (Wang et al., 2011).

In 2015 and 2016, the highest LAI was observed in P3: 45 cm x 15 cm (148148 plants ha⁻¹) at boll development (5.06, 6.02) and significantly superior to P2: 60 cm x 30 cm (55555 plants ha⁻¹) and P1: 90 cm x 60 cm (18518 plants ha⁻¹) which recorded the lowest leaf area index values, at boll development (3.98, 3.83) stages respectively in both the years. Per cent increase in maximum LAI at boll development stage for P3 over P2 and P1 were 8, 25 % and 21, 36 % during 2015 and 2016 respectively. Higher values of LAI with higher plant densities may be ascribed to the more plant stand coupled with taller plants achieving more leaves thus having more LAI. These results were supported by the findings of Manjunatha et al., (2010).

In 2015 and 2016, significantly more no. of monopodial branches plant⁻¹ was observed in P1: 90 cm x 60 cm (18518 plants ha⁻¹) (4, 4) and significantly superior to P2: 60 cm x 30 cm (55555 plants ha⁻¹) (3, 3) and P3: 45 cm x 15 cm (148148 plants ha⁻¹) (1, 1) respectively at flowering stage (Table 2). The observations are in confirmity with Reddy and Gopinath (2008) and Jadhav et al., (2015).

In 2015 and 2016, the highest no. of sympodial branches plant⁻¹ was observed in P1: 90 cm x 60 cm (18518 plants ha⁻¹) (55, 53) and significantly superior to P2: 60 cm x 30 cm (55555 plants ha⁻¹) (3, 3) and P3: 45 cm x 15 cm (148148 plants ha⁻¹) (1, 1) respectively at flowering stage (Table 2). The observations are in confirmity with Reddy and Gopinath (2008) and Jadhav et al., (2015).

During the both years of investigation, significantly more no. of monopodial branches plant⁻¹ was observed in P1: 90 cm x 60 cm (18518 plants ha⁻¹) (4, 4) and significantly superior to P2: 60 cm x 30 cm (55555 plants ha⁻¹) (3, 3) and P3: 45 cm x 15 cm (148148 plants ha⁻¹) (1, 1) respectively at flowering stage (Table 2). The observations are in confirmity with Reddy and Gopinath (2008) and Jadhav et al., (2015).
**Table 1** Plant height (cm), LAI, dry matter (g plant\(^{-1}\)) production cotton as influenced by cultivars, plant densities and nitrogen levels

| Treatments               | Plant height (cm) | LAI | Dry matter (g plant\(^{-1}\)) |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-----|-------------------------------|
|                          | Boll development  | 1st picking | 1st picking |
|                          | 2015   | 2016   | 2015   | 2016   | 2015   | 2016   |
| **Factor 1 (Cultivars)** |                    |       |       |       |       |       |
| V\(_1\) (MRC 7201 BGII)  | 125.0             | 141.4 | 5.23  | 4.95  | 246    | 241    |
| V\(_2\) (WGCV-48)       | 120.0             | 131.1 | 3.90  | 4.60  | 231    | 219    |
| S.Em±                    | 1.7               | 2.0   | 0.13  | 0.09  | 4.0    | 7.3    |
| CD (P=0.05)              | 4.8               | 5.7   | 0.38  | 0.27  | 11.6   | 21.1   |
| **Factor 2 (Plant densities)** |                    |       |       |       |       |       |
| P\(_1\) (90 cmX60 cm)    | 120.3             | 132.8 | 3.98  | 3.83  | 301    | 298    |
| P\(_2\) (60 cmX30 cm)    | 131.2             | 141.2 | 4.64  | 4.48  | 231    | 233    |
| P\(_3\) (45 cmX15 cm)    | 116.0             | 134.6 | 5.06  | 6.02  | 184    | 160    |
| S.Em±                    | 2.0               | 2.4   | 0.16  | 0.11  | 5.0    | 9.0    |
| CD (P=0.05)              | 5.9               | 7.0   | 0.47  | 0.33  | 14.2   | 25.8   |
| **Factor 3 (Nitrogen levels)** |                    |       |       |       |       |       |
| N\(_1\) (120 kg N ha\(^{-1}\)) | 121.3           | 138.8 | 4.37  | 4.74  | 244    | 241    |
| N\(_2\) (150 kg N ha\(^{-1}\)) | 121.9           | 132.4 | 4.53  | 4.82  | 237    | 226    |
| N\(_3\) (180 kg N ha\(^{-1}\)) | 124.4           | 137.4 | 4.79  | 4.77  | 235    | 223    |
| S.Em±                    | 2.0               | 2.4   | 0.16  | 0.11  | 5.0    | 9.0    |
| CD (P=0.05)              | NS                | NS    | NS    | NS    | NS     | NS     |

CD (P=0.05)
Table 2: Monopodial, sympodial branches and seed cotton yield (kg ha\(^{-1}\)) of cotton as influenced by cultivars, Plant densities and nitrogen levels

| Treatments                      | Monopodial branches (No. plant\(^{-1}\)) | Sympodial branches (No. plant\(^{-1}\)) | Seed cotton yield (kg ha\(^{-1}\)) |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
|                                 | Flowering 2015 | 2016 | 1\(^{st}\) picking 2015 | 2016 | 2015 | 2016 |
| Factor 1 (Cultivars)            |                          |      |                          |      |      |      |
| V\(_1\) (MRC 7201 BGII)        | 2                  | 2    | 42               | 40   | 3497 | 2866 |
| V\(_2\) (WGCV-48)              | 3                  | 3    | 35               | 34   | 2510 | 2078 |
| S.Em±                          | 0.06               | 0.06 | 0.44             | 0.33 | 74   | 49   |
| CD (P=0.05)                    | 0.18               | 0.16 | 1.25             | 0.96 | 214  | 141  |
| Factor 2 (Plant densities)     |                          |      |                          |      |      |      |
| P\(_1\) (90 cmX60 cm)          | 4                  | 3    | 55               | 53   | 2738 | 2309 |
| P\(_2\) (60 cmX30 cm)          | 3                  | 3    | 39               | 38   | 3319 | 2726 |
| P\(_3\) (45 cmX15 cm)          | 1                  | 1    | 21               | 20   | 2954 | 2381 |
| S.Em±                          | 0.08               | 0.07 | 0.53             | 0.41 | 91   | 60   |
| CD (P=0.05)                    | 0.22               | 0.20 | 1.53             | 1.18 | 261  | 173  |
| Factor 3 (Nitrogen levels)     |                          |      |                          |      |      |      |
| N\(_1\) (120 kg N ha\(^{-1}\)) | 3                  | 2    | 38               | 37   | 2946 | 2383 |
| N\(_2\) (150 kg N ha\(^{-1}\)) | 3                  | 2    | 38               | 37   | 2962 | 2528 |
| N\(_3\) (180 kg N ha\(^{-1}\)) | 3                  | 3    | 39               | 37   | 3102 | 2505 |
| S.Em±                          | 0.08               | 0.07 | 0.53             | 0.41 | 91   | 60   |
| CD (P=0.05)                    | NS                 | NS   | NS               | NS   | NS   | NS   |
The increase in number of sympodia in wider intra spacing and inter row spacing P\textsubscript{1}: 90 cm x 60 cm (18518 plants ha\textsuperscript{-1}) was mainly due to availability of adequate amount of nutrients, moisture and light interception for optimum growth and development leading to production of more number of sympodia.

Availability of space for lateral expanding of branches and chance to enhance auxiliary buds of plant as compared to closer plant and row spacing recorded more competition for space, light and nutrient. These observations are in conformity with Bhalerao et al., (2008) and Kalaichelvi (2008).

Significantly higher seed cotton yield (3319 and 2726 kg ha\textsuperscript{-1}) was obtained in P\textsubscript{2}: 60 cm x 30 cm (55555 plants ha\textsuperscript{-1}) over P\textsubscript{3}: 45 cm x 15 cm (148148 plants ha\textsuperscript{-1}) and P\textsubscript{1}: 90 cm x 60 cm (18518 plants ha\textsuperscript{-1}), while P\textsubscript{3} (2954 and 2381 kg ha\textsuperscript{-1}) and P\textsubscript{1} (2738 and 2309 kg ha\textsuperscript{-1}) are comparable and on par with each other (Table 2). The per cent increase of seed cotton yield in P\textsubscript{2} 11, 13 % and 17, 15 % during 2015 and 2016 over P\textsubscript{3} and P\textsubscript{1} respectively.

The ultimate seed cotton yield is the manifestation of yield contributing characters. These yield attributing characters were significantly affected by different plant populations. Even though, the boll number, boll weight and seed cotton yield plant\textsuperscript{-1} were significantly higher with wider spacing, it could not compensate for the loss in number of plants ha\textsuperscript{-1} and number of bolls m\textsuperscript{2}, thus recorded lower seed cotton yield ha\textsuperscript{-1} when compared to high density planting.

Higher plant density at closer spacing recorded significantly higher seed cotton yield than lower plant density at wider spacing due to significantly more number of bolls m\textsuperscript{2} and higher plant stand ha\textsuperscript{-1} (Kalaichelvi, 2009, Krishnaveni et al., (2010), Manjunatha et al., (2010) and Brar et al., 2013).

**Effect of Bt gene**

In 2015, higher plant height was observed in MRC 7201 BGII cultivar (125.0 cm) which was significantly superior to WGCV-48 (Table 1). In 2016, maximum plant height (141.4 cm) was recorded with MRC 7201 BGII cultivar at first picking stages and was significantly superior to WGCV-48, which recorded the lowest plant height at first picking (131.1 cm). The probable reason for this might be the variation in the genetic constitution of the cultivars which has responded better in plant height. These results were in closer conformity with the findings of Manjunatha et al., (2010) and Gangaiah et al., (2013).

In 2015 and 2016, maximum LAI was observed in MRC 7201 BGII cultivar at boll development (5.23, 4.95) and significantly superior to WGCV-48 cultivar at boll development (3.90, 4.60) respectively (Table 1). The reduction in maximum LAI for WGCV-48 cultivar was 22 and 7 % over MRC 7201 BGII cultivar during 2015 and 2016 respectively at boll development stage. The increased LAI in MRC 7201 BGII cultivar might be due to increased plant height. These results were in close agreement with the findings of Manjunatha et al., (2010).

MRC 7201 BGII cultivar was significantly superior in dry matter plant\textsuperscript{-1} at first picking (246, 241 g plant\textsuperscript{-1}) to WGCV-48 (Table 1). The per cent increase in dry matter production of MRC 7201 BGII over WGCV-48 was 5, 9 % during 2015 and 2016 respectively at first picking.

Higher dry matter production per plant pertaining to MRC 7201 BGII cultivar may be attributed to the improvement in the assimilation of photosynthates and their accumulation in leaves, stem and reproductive parts at various stages of crop growth. These
results were in close agreement with findings of Manjunatha et al., (2010) and Shukla et al., (2013).

WGCV-48 cultivar was significantly superior in no. of monopodial branches plant\(^{-1}\) (3, 3) to MRC 7201 BGII cultivar (2, 2) during both years respectively at flowering stage (Table 2). The probable reason of this might be the variation in the genetic constitution of the cultivars which has responded higher number of monopodial branches plant\(^{-1}\) in WGCV-48 cultivar then MRC 7201 BGII cultivar. These results are in closer conformity with the findings of Aruna et al., (2016).

WGCV-48 cultivar was significantly superior in no. of sympodial branches plant\(^{-1}\) for MRC 7201 BGII cultivar (2, 2) during both years respectively at flowering stage (Table 2). The probable reason of this might be the variation in the genetic constitution of the cultivars which has responded higher number of sympodial branches plant\(^{-1}\) in WGCV-48 cultivar then MRC 7201 BGII cultivar. These results are in closer conformity with the findings of Aruna et al., (2016).

Effect of nitrogen levels

Nitrogen levels did not show any significant influence on plant height, LAI, dry matter production, no. of monopodial branches plant\(^{-1}\), no. of sympodial branches plant\(^{-1}\) and kapas yield (kg ha\(^{-1}\)) at all growth stages of cotton crop during 2015 and 2016 (Tables 1 and 2). These results were substantiated by the findings of Aruna (2016) and Sankaranarayanan et al., (2011).

Interaction effect

Interactions between cultivars and plant densities, plant densities and nitrogen levels, cultivars and nitrogen levels, and cultivars, plant densities and nitrogen levels were not found statistically significant at any stage of the crop growth during both years for plant height, LAI, dry matter production, no. of monopodial branches plant\(^{-1}\), no. of sympodial branches plant\(^{-1}\) and kapas yield (kg ha\(^{-1}\)).

During 2015 and 2016, MRC 7201 BG II cultivar recorded significant more plant height, LAI, number of monopodial branches plant\(^{-1}\), number of sympodial branches plant\(^{-1}\) and kapas yield in comparison to WGCV-48 cultivar, respectively. Plant density P\(_1\) (18,518 plants ha\(^{-1}\)) at 90 cm x 60 cm spacing
recorded significantly more dry matter production over P_3 (55,555 plants ha^{-1}) at 60 cm x 30 cm and P_3 (1,48,148 plants ha^{-1}) 45 cm x 15 cm spacing during 2015 and 2016 respectively. During 2015 and 2016, among the plant densities, even though the plant density of P_1: 18,518 plants ha^{-1} showed more number of sympodial branches plant^{-1} and kapas yield plant^{-1} but the plant density of P_2: 55,555 plants ha^{-1} significantly more kapas yield.
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