

ISSN Print: 2617-4693 ISSN Online: 2617-4707 IJABR 2024; SP-8(6): 700-706 www.biochemjournal.com Received: 14-04-2024 Accepted: 17-05-2024

#### Sandeep Todwal

Research Scholar, Collage of Agriculture, MGU, Sehore, Madhya Pradesh, India

#### UR Khandkar

Professor, Department of Soil Science, Collage of Agriculture, MGU, Sehore, Madhya Pradesh, India

#### JK Kanaujia

Research Scholar, Collage of Agriculture, MGU, Sehore, Madhya Pradesh, India

Corresponding Author: Sandeep Todwal Research Scholar, Collage of Agriculture, MGU, Sehore, Madhya Pradesh, India

## Effect of different levels of N application and foliar spray of zinc on nutrient uptake by crop and available nutrient in soil of hybrid maize

### Sandeep Todwal, UR Khandkar and JK Kanaujia

#### DOI: https://doi.org/10.33545/26174693.2024.v8.i6Si.1402

#### Abstract

A field experiment was conducted during *kharif* seasons of 2020-21and 2021-22 on clayey soil at Mansarover Global University, Sehore (Madhya Pradesh) to study the effect of different levels of N and foliar spray of zinc on nutrient uptake by crop and available nutrient in soil. Results revealed that significantly highest nutrient uptake by crop and available nutrient status of nitrogen, phosphorus, Potash and zinc in soil after harvest of crop was recorded with the application of Nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 1.5% foliar spray of ZnSO4 followed by application of nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 1.0% foliar spray of ZnSO4, nitrogen-120 kg/ha + 1.5% foliar spray of ZnSO4, nitrogen-120 kg/ha + 1.0% foliar spray of ZnSO4, nitrogen-120 kg/ha + 1.0% foliar spray of ZnSO4. The lower nutrient uptake by crop and available status of nitrogen, phosphorus, potash and zinc in soil after harvest of crop was recorded with the application of nitrogen-00 kg/ha + 0.0% foliar spray of ZnSO4 (control) under Sehore region.

Keywords: Maize, nutrient uptake, nitrogen, zinc, phosphorus and potash

#### Introduction

India is the 7th largest producer of maize and ranked 4th position in area in the world. It is referred to as the cereal of the future for its valuable nutritional values in human diet. It is mainly used as feed for animals followed by food for human and industrial use as raw material in food processing, poultry, dairy and ethanol industry. In India, maize is grown in both *Kharif* and *Rabi* Season, But productivity of maize in *Kharif* is less than *Rabi* season, this is due the controlled ecosystems prevailed during the *Rabi* season, Kharif maize represents around 83% of maize area in India, while rabi maize correspond to 17% maize area. It covers total area of 19.65 million hectares with production of 18.9 million tonnes in the world. The area under maize cultivation in India during 2021-22 was 12.56 lakh hectares with production of 31 million metric tonnes and productivity of 1970 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. Maize is the major crop of the Chhindwara district of Madhya Pradesh. Chhindwara is known as Corn City. Corn is grown in entire district due to presence of suitable soil and climate needed for corn to grow. The area under maize cultivation in Chhindwara during 2021-22 was 2.95 lakh hectares with production of 12 lakh metric tonnes and productivity of 4126 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>.

Maize is not only used for consumption of human but it is also used for the feed and fodder of cattle and raw material for industries. The products prepared from maize are corn cooking oil, corn starch, corn syrup, products needed for distilleries and fermentation. Now days, biofuel can also be made from maize. The hybrid maize crop is highly nutrient responsive crop requires about 120 kg N, 60 kg  $P_2O_5$ , 40 kg  $K_2O$  and 5.25 kg Zinc to produce 5-6 t of grain yield. It has high nutritional value as it contains about 62.3% starch, 11.1% protein, 4.6% oil, 1.8% fibre, 4.3% sugar and 1.3% ash. Maize is a high nutrient demanding crop, which also requires micronutrients along with major elements. Nitrogen is a vital plant nutrient and a major yield determining factor in maize production. Nitrogen is a component of protein and nucleic acids and also mediates the utilization of phosphorus, potassium, and other elements in plants. Recently developed high yielding cultivars of hybrid maize require considerable high amount of nutrient specially nitrogen and zinc. The foliar application of zinc enhances the uptake and accumulation of nitrogen and finally increased grain yield. Nitrogen is one of the important primaries non-metals nutrients which require large quantity for the plant growth and nutrition. Plant normally contains 1-5% weight of this nutrient. Furrow slice soil layer 0-15 cm depth of most soil contains nitrogen in the range of 0.02 to 0.4% by weight.

Nitrogen as the most frequently used macro element has the key role in increasing yield and utilization of potassium, phosphorus and other micro and macro elements in plants (Kisetu et al., 2014) <sup>[114]</sup>. Zinc application as a positive factor for the maximum utilization of nitrogen fertilizer. The optimal rate of zinc foliar spray for achieving significant grain yield response was in the range from 1.0 to 1.5 kg Zn/ha. Grain yield increase was 18% as compared to the treatment fertilized only with NPK. Plants fertilized with 1.0 kg Zn/ha significantly increased both total N uptake and grain yield (Potarzycki et al., 2009) [11]. Zinc exerts a great influence on the fundamental processes of plants, such as nitrogen metabolism, the absorption of nitrogen and the quality of the protein, chlorophyll synthesis and photosynthesis, carbonic anhydrase activity, resistance to biotic and abiotic stresses and protection against oxidative damage (Mousavi, 2011)<sup>[13]</sup>.

### Materials and Methods

An experimental was conducted at Institute Farm, Department of Soil Science & Agril. Chemistry, Faculty of Agriculture Science and Technology, Mansarover Global University, Sehore in Madhya Pradesh during kharif seasons of 2020-21 and 2021-22. The climate of Sehore is warm and temperate where maximum temperature exceeds 42 °C in May and June. The winters are cool and minimum temperature reaches as low as 10 °C in December and January. Occurrence of frost is expected from the last week of December to the first week of February. The soil was sandy clay in texture and slightly alkaline in reaction (pH 7.8) with electric conductivity 0.30 dS/m, low in available N, and medium to low in available P, high in available K and sufficient to low in available zinc. A combination of 16 treatments, viz., Sixteen treatments comprising of nutrient management practices viz., Nitrogen-00 kg/ha + 0.0% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> (Control) (T<sub>1</sub>), Nitrogen-00 kg/ha + 0.5% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> (T<sub>2</sub>), Nitrogen-00 kg/ha + 0.1% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> (T<sub>3</sub>), Nitrogen-00 kg/ha + 0.1.5% foliar spray of  $ZnSO_4$  (T<sub>4</sub>), Nitrogen-60 kg/ha + 0.0% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> (T<sub>5</sub>), Nitrogen-60 kg/ha + 0.5% foliar spray of  $ZnSO_4$  (T<sub>6</sub>), Nitrogen-60 kg/ha + 1.0% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> (T<sub>7</sub>), Nitrogen-60 kg/ha + 1.5% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> (T<sub>8</sub>), Nitrogen-120 kg/ha + 0.0% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> (T<sub>9</sub>), Nitrogen-120 kg/ha + 0.5% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> (T<sub>10</sub>), Nitrogen-120 kg/ha + 1.0% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> (T<sub>11</sub>), Nitrogen-120 kg/ha + 1.5% foliar spray of ZnSO4 (T<sub>12</sub>), Nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 0.0% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> (T<sub>13</sub>), Nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 0.5% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> (T<sub>14</sub>), Nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 1.0% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> (T<sub>15</sub>) and Nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 1.5% foliar spray of  $ZnSO_4$  (T<sub>16</sub>) were evaluated in Factorial CRD design with three replications with gross and net sizes of 5.0 m  $\times$  6.00 m and 4.0 m  $\times$  5.0 m, respectively. Maize 'Hybrid Maize PAC-759' was sown at 60 cm  $\times$  30 cm spacing on July 2020 and June 2021. The recommended dose of fertilizers is as per treatments.

### **Results and Discussion**

Effect of nitrogen levels and foliar spray of zinc on nitrogen uptake by crop: Significantly higher nitrogen uptake by crop was recorded with the application of nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 1.5% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub>, which was statistically at par with the application of nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 1.0% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub>, nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 0.5% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub>. The lower nitrogen uptake by crop was recorded with the application of control plot (Table 1).

# Effect of nitrogen levels and foliar spray of zinc on phosphorus uptake by crop

Significantly higher phosphorus uptake by crop was recorded with the application of nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 1.5% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub>, which was statistically at par with the application of nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 1.0% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub>, nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 0.5% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> (Table 2). The lower phosphorus uptake by crop was recorded with the application of control.

# Effect of nitrogen levels and foliar spray of zinc on potash uptake by crop

Significantly higher potash uptake by crop was recorded with the application of nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 1.5% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub>, which was statistically at par with the application of nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 1.0% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub>, nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 0.5% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub>. Potash uptake by crop was lower recorded of control (Table 3).

# Effect of nitrogen levels and foliar spray of zinc on zinc uptake by crop

Significantly higher zinc uptake by crop was recorded with the application of nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 1.5% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub>, which was statistically at par with the application of nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 1.0% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub>, nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 0.5% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub>. The lower zinc uptake by crop was recorded with the application of control (Table 4).

# Effect of nitrogen levels and foliar spray of zinc on available nitrogen of soil

Significantly higher available nitrogen of soil after harvesting of crop was recorded with the application of nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 1.5% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub>, which was statistically at par with the application of nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 1.0% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub>, nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 0.5% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub>. The lower available nitrogen of soil after harvesting of crop was recorded with the application of control plot (Table 5).

# Effect of nitrogen levels and foliar spray of zinc on available phosphorus of soil

Significantly higher available phosphorus of soil after harvesting of crop was recorded with the application of nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 1.5% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub>, which was statistically at par with the application of nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 1.0% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub>, nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 0.5% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> (Table 6). The lower available phosphorus of soil after harvesting of crop was recorded with the application of control.

# Effect of nitrogen levels and foliar spray of zinc on available potash of soil

Significantly higher available potash of soil after harvesting of crop was recorded with the application of nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 1.5% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub>, which was statistically at par with the application of nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 1.0% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub>, nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 0.5% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub>. The lower available potash of soil after harvesting of crop was recorded of control treatment (Table 7).

Effect of nitrogen levels and foliar spray of zinc on available zinc of soil

Significantly higher available zinc of soil after harvesting of crop was recorded with the application of nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 1.5% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub>, which was statistically at par with the application of nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 1.0% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub>, nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 0.5% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub>. The lower available zinc of soil after harvesting of crop was recorded with the application of control (Table 8).

Table 1: Effect of different levels of N and foliar spray of Z on uptake of N by maize

Lender (N. (he hed)	Foliar spray of Z (%)								
Levels of N (kg na <sup>-1</sup> )	Z 0		Z 0.5	Z 1.0	Z 1.5	Mean			
			Uptake of N by	maize at 2020-21					
N 00	53.2	3	61.61	64.92	70.36	62.53			
N 60	82.6	4	97.85	105.26	113.14	99.72			
N 120	125.6	57	133.27	140.49	144.12	135.88			
N 150	149.6	51	153.71	160.18	165.49	157.28			
Mean	102.7	79	111.61	117.71	123.28				
			Ν	Z		$\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{Z}$			
SEm±			1.96	1.96		3.93			
CD at 5%			5.66	5.66		11.31			
			Uptake of N by	maize at 2020-21					
(kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Z 0		Z 0.5	Z 1.0	Z 1.5	Mean			
N 00	38.2	8	42.01	44.86	51.19	44.08			
N 60	67.0	0	77.17	84.06	92.65	80.22			
N 120	99.5	9	106.21	111.82	118.96	109.15			
N 150	123.8	35	129.82	133.30	136.87	130.96			
Mean	82.1	8	88.80	93.51	99.92				
			Ν	Z		$\mathbf{N}  imes \mathbf{Z}$			
SEm±			1.96	1.96		3.92			
CD at 5%	CD at 5%		5.65			11.30			
			Uptake of N by m	aize at Pooled data	·				
(kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Z 0		Z 0.5	Z 1.0	Z 1.5	Mean			
N 00	45.7	6	51.81	54.89	60.77	92.48			
N 60	74.8	2	87.51	94.66	102.90	100.20			
N 120	112.6	53	119.74	126.15	131.54	105.61			
N 150	136.7	73	141.76	146.74	151.18	11.60			
Mean	53.3	1	89.97	122.52	144.10				
			Ν	Z		$\mathbf{N}  imes \mathbf{Z}$			
SEm±			1.38	1.38		2.77			
CD at 5%			3.89	3.89		7.79			

Table	2: Effect	of different	levels of	of N	and f	foliar	sprav	of Z	on u	ptake	of P	bv	maize
Labie	- Direct	or annerene	10,010 0		una i	onui	opiaj		onu	punc	011	0,	man

Louds of N (he heil)	Foliar spray of Z (%)									
Levels of N (kg lia -)	Z 0	Z 0.5	Z 1.0	Z 1.5	Mean					
Uptake of P by maize at 2020-21										
N 00	31.66	35.21	36.77	38.22	35.47					
N 60	44.59	49.64	51.92	53.23	49.90					
N 120	56.92	59.33	61.27	62.32	59.96					
N 150	63.43	64.83	66.75	68.44	65.86					
Mean	49.20	52.26	54.18	55.55						
		Ν	Z		$\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{Z}$					
SEm±		0.80	0.80		1.59					
CD at 5%		2.30	2.30		4.59					
		Uptake of P by	maize at 2020-21							
(kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Z 0	Z 0.5	Z 1.0	Z 1.5	Mean					
N 00	31.82	35.04	36.97	37.92	35.44					
N 60	46.36	49.37	52.27	54.58	50.64					
N 120	57.26	59.20	60.50	62.41	59.84					
N 150	63.94	65.44	67.27	68.68	66.33					
Mean	49.85	52.26	54.25	55.90						
		Ν	Z		$\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{Z}$					
SEm±		0.62	0.62		1.25					
CD at 5%		1.81	1.81		3.62					
		Uptake of P by m	aize at Pooled data							
(kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Z 0	Z 0.5	Z 1.0	Z 1.5	Mean					
N 00	31.74	35.13	36.87	38.07	35.45					
N 60	45.57	49.51	52.09	53.91	50.27					
N 120	57.09	59.26	60.88	62.36	59.90					
N 150	63.68	65.14	67.01	68.56	66.10					
Mean	49.52	52.26	54.22	55.73						
		Ν	Z		$\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{Z}$					
SEm±		0.50	0.50		1.01					
CD at 5%		1.42	1.42		2.84					

### Table 3: Effect of different levels of N and foliar spray of Z on uptake of K by maize

Levels of N (leg herl)		Foliar spray of Z (%)										
Levels of N (kg na <sup>-</sup> )	Z 0	Z 0.5	Z 1.0	Z 1.	5	Mean						
· · · · ·	Uptake of K by maize at 2020-21											
N 00	99.12	106.97	112.36	115.4	17	108.48						
N 60	138.22	147.98	154.38	157.3	38	149.48						
N 120	165.58	171.61	175.40	178.2	27	172.71						
N 150	182.91	185.46	188.15	192.3	39	187.23						
Mean	146.46	153.01	157.57	160.8	37							
		Ν	Z			$\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{Z}$						
SEm±		2.67	2.67			5.34						
CD at 5%		7.70	7.70			15.39						
		Uptake of K by	maize at 2020-21			•						
(kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Z 0	Z 0.5	Z 1.0	Z 1.	5	Mean						
N 00	98.81	105.80	111.84	113.1	12	107.39						
N 60	140.72	150.03	155.51	160.8	33	151.77						
N 120	166.65	172.22	175.57	179.4	40	173.46						
N 150	183.11	187.35	189.88	193.9	95	188.57						
Mean	147.32	153.85	158.20	161.8	32							
		Ν	Z			$\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{Z}$						
SEm±		2.41	2.41			4.83						
CD at 5%		6.96	6.96			13.93						
		Uptake of K by m	aize at Pooled data									
(kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Z 0	Z 0.5	Z 1.0	Z 1.	5	Mean						
N 00	98.97	106.39	112.10	114.2	29	107.94						
N 60	139.47	149.01	154.95	159.0	)9	150.63						
N 120	166.12	171.92	175.49	178.8	34	173.09						
N 150	183.01	186.40	189.02	193.1	17	187.90						
Mean	146.89	153.43	157.89	161.3	35							
		Ν	Z			$\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{Z}$						
SEm±		1.80	1.80			3.60						
CD at 5%		3.57	5.05			10.11						

Table 4: Effect of different	levels of N and foliar	spray of Z on u	ptake of Zn by maize
		1 2	1 2

Louds of N (he holl)		Foliar spray of Z (%)								
Levels of N (kg na <sup>+</sup> )	Z 0	Z 0.5	Z 1.0	Z 1.5	Mean					
Uptake of Zn by maize at 2020-21										
N 00	148.47	176.45	192.14	208.51	181.39					
N 60	253.15	298.93	327.03	352.31	307.85					
N 120	391.87	428.24	455.31	486.82	440.56					
N 150	509.41	535.98	567.23	592.10	551.18					
Mean	325.72	359.90	385.43	409.94						
		Ν	Z		$\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{Z}$					
SEm±		9.75	9.75		19.50					
CD at 5%		28.09	28.09		56.18					
		Uptake of Zn by	maize at 2020-21							
(kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Z 0	Z 0.5	Z 1.0	Z 1.5	Mean					
N 00	144.64	169.93	186.10	198.05	174.67					
N 60	254.48	292.72	320.58	352.99	305.20					
N 120	393.40	422.10	455.77	481.34	438.15					
N 150	504.41	530.18 558.39		587.50	545.11					
Mean	324.23	353.73	380.21	404.97						
		Ν	Z		$\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{Z}$					
SEm±		8.51	8.51		17.02					
CD at 5%		24.51	24.51		49.03					
		Uptake of Zn by m	aize at Pooled data		-					
(kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Z 0	Z 0.5	Z 1.0	Z 1.5	Mean					
N 00	146.55	173.19	189.12	203.28	178.03					
N 60	253.82	295.83	323.80	352.65	306.52					
N 120	392.63	425.17	455.54	484.08	439.36					
N 150	506.91	533.08	562.81	589.80	548.15					
Mean	324.98	356.81	382.82	407.45						
		Ν	Z		$\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{Z}$					
SEm±		6.47	6.47		12.94					
CD at 5%		12.84	18.16		36.33					

Table 5: Effect of different levels of N and foliar spray of Z on available nitrogen in soil after harvest of crop

Levels of N (he heil)		Foliar spray of Z (%)								
Levels of N (kg na <sup>-</sup> )	Z	Z 0	Z 0.5	Z 1.0	Z 1.5	Mean				
Available N at 2020-21										
N 00	22	21.33 221.87		222.29	222.4	5 221.99				
N 60	223	3.38	223.41	223.63	224.0	3 223.61				
N 120	224	4.52	225.08	226.13	226.3	2 225.51				
N 150	22	7.18	227.22	227.38	228.0	8 227.46				
Mean	224	4.10	224.40	224.86	225.2	2				
			Ν	Z		$\mathbf{N}  imes \mathbf{Z}$				
SEm±			0.42	0.42		0.83				
CD at 5%			1.20	1.20		2.40				
			Available N	at 2020-21						
(kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Z	2.0	Z 0.5	Z 1.0	Z 1.5	5 Mean				
N 00	22	1.51	221.90	222.32	222.5	8 222.08				
N 60	223	3.48	223.70	224.06	224.5	5 224.44				
N 120	22:	5.14	226.16	226.16	226.3	8 224.90				
N 150	22	.21 227.25		227.41	228.1	3 225.29				
Mean	224	4.18	224.44	224.90	225.2	9				
			Ν	Z		$\mathbf{N}  imes \mathbf{Z}$				
SEm±			0.41	0.41		0.82				
CD at 5%			1.19	1.19		2.38				
			Available N a	t Pooled data						
(kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Z	2 O	Z 0.5	Z 1.0	Z 1.5	5 Mean				
N 00	22	1.42	221.89	222.31	222.5	2 222.03				
N 60	223	3.41	223.45	223.67	224.0	5 223.64				
N 120	224	4.53	225.11	226.14	226.3	5 225.53				
N 150	22	7.19	227.23	227.40	228.1	1 227.48				
Mean	224	4.14	224.42	224.88	225.2	6				
			Ν	Z		N×Z				
SEm±			0.29	0.29		0.58				
CD at 5%			0.82	0.82		1.64				

Louds of N (leg ho:1)		Foliar spray of Z (%)								
Levels of N (kg na <sup>-</sup> )	Z	0	Z 0.5	Z 1.0	Z 1.5	Mean				
Available P at 2020-21										
N 00	12	.11	12.18	12.19	12.21	12.18				
N 60	12.	.24	12.27	12.29	12.31	12.28				
N 120	12	.33	12.37	12.41	12.45	12.39				
N 150	12	.50	12.51	12.59	12.62	12.56				
Mean	12	.30	12.33	12.37	12.40					
			Ν	Z		$\mathbf{N}  imes \mathbf{Z}$				
SEm±			0.02	0.02		0.04				
CD at 5%			0.06	0.06		0.11				
			Available P	' at 2020-21						
(kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Z	0	Z 0.5	Z 1.0	Z 1.5	Mean				
N 00	12	.14	12.19	12.22	12.23	12.19				
N 60	12	.26	12.28	12.30	12.32	12.29				
N 120	12.35		12.39	12.44	12.47	12.41				
N 150	12	12.53 12.55 12.6		12.62	12.67	12.59				
Mean	12	.32	12.35	12.39	12.42					
			Ν	Z		$\mathbf{N}  imes \mathbf{Z}$				
SEm±	SEm±		0.02	0.02		0.04				
CD at 5%			0.06	0.06		0.12				
			Available Pa	t Pooled data						
(kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Z	0	Z 0.5	Z 1.0	Z 1.5	Mean				
N 00	12	.13	12.19	12.21	12.22	12.18				
N 60	12	.28	12.30	12.32	12.34	12.28				
N 120	12	.34	12.38	12.43	12.46	12.40				
N 150	12	.51	12.53	12.61	12.65	12.57				
Mean	12	.31	12.34	12.38	12.41					
			Ν	Z		$\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{Z}$				
SEm±			0.014	0.014		0.028				
CD at 5%			0.040	0.040		0.080				

Table 7: Effect of different levels of N and foliar spray of Z on available K in soil after harvest of maize

Levels of N (les herl)		Foliar spray of Z (%)								
Levels of N (kg na <sup>-</sup> )	Z	0	Z 0.5	Z 1.0	Z 1.5	Mean				
Available K at 2020-21										
N 00	431.	.49	433.07	434.40	435.98	433.74				
N 60	436.	.50	437.76	438.01	440.53	438.20				
N 120	441.	.90	443.25	444.74	445.38	443.82				
N 150	446.	.03	447.78	448.20	449.82	447.96				
Mean	438.	.98	440.96	441.34	442.93					
			Ν	Z		$\mathbf{N}  imes \mathbf{Z}$				
SEm±			1.29	1.29		2.58				
CD at 5%			3.72	3.72		7.44				
			Available F	K at 2020-21						
(kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Z	0	Z 0.5	Z 1.0	Z 1.5	Mean				
N 00	430.	.56	432.40	433.33	436.98	433.32				
N 60	437.	.98	439.33	440.04	442.87	440.05				
N 120	443.	.66	444.92	446.74	447.72	445.75				
N 150	448.	.70	450.78	451.87	453.15	451.12				
Mean	440.	.22	441.86	443.99	445.18					
			Ν	Z		$\mathbf{N}  imes \mathbf{Z}$				
SEm±		1.15		1.15		2.30				
CD at 5%			3.32	3.32		6.64				
			Available K a	t Pooled data						
(kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Z	0	Z 0.5	Z 1.0	Z 1.5	Mean				
N 00	431.	.03	432.74	433.87	436.48	433.53				
N 60	437.	.24	438.54	439.03	441.70	439.13				
N 120	442.	.78	444.08	445.74	446.55	444.79				
N 150	447.	.37	449.28	450.03	451.49	449.54				
Mean	440.	.23	441.86	443.00	445.18					
			Ν	Z		$\mathbf{N}  imes \mathbf{Z}$				
SEm±			0.86	0.86		1.73				
CD at 5%			2.42	2.42		4.85				

$\mathbf{I}_{1} = \mathbf{I}_{1} = \mathbf{f} \mathbf{N} \left( \mathbf{I}_{1} = \mathbf{I}_{1} = \mathbf{I} \right)$	Foliar spray of Z (%)									
Levels of N (kg ha <sup>-</sup> )	Z	0	Z 0.5	Z 1.0	Z 1.5	Mean				
Available Zn at 2020-21										
N 00	0.8	343	0.921	0.924	0.927	0.904				
N 60	0.9	931	0.933	0.936	0.938	0.935				
N 120	0.9	941	0.944	0.949	0.955	0.947				
N 150	0.9	964	0.968	0.974	0.987	0.973				
Mean	0.9	920	0.942	0.946	0.952					
			Ν	Z		$\mathbf{N}  imes \mathbf{Z}$				
SEm±			0.003	0.003		0.006				
CD at 5%			0.009	0.009		0.018				
			Available Z	n at 2020-21						
(kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Z	0	Z 0.5	Z 1.0	Z 1.5	Mean				
N 00	0.8	373	0.924	0.928	0.931	0.914				
N 60	0.9	935	0.938	0.940	0.943	0.939				
N 120	0.9	946	0.948	0.951	0.954	0.950				
N 150	0.9	962	0.969	0.970	0.984	0.971				
Mean	0.9	929	0.945	0.947	0.953					
			Ν	Z		$\mathbf{N}  imes \mathbf{Z}$				
SEm±	SEm±		0.002	0.002		0.004				
CD at 5%	0.006 0.006			0.013						
			Available Zn a	at Pooled data						
(kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Z	0	Z 0.5	Z 1.0	Z 1.5	Mean				
N 00	0.8	358	0.922	0.926	0.929	0.909				
N 60	0.9	933	0.936	0.938	0.941	0.937				
N 120	0.9	943	0.946	0.950	0.954	0.948				
N 150	0.9	963	0.969	0.972	0.986	0.972				
Mean	0.9	924	0.943	0.946	0.952					
			Ν	Z		$\mathbf{N}  imes \mathbf{Z}$				
SEm±			0.001	0.001		0.003				
CD at 5%			0.005	0.005		0.010				

### Conclusion

Based on the pooled results of two-year experimentation, it is concluded that higher nutrient uptake by crop and maintained nutrient status of nitrogen, phosphorus, potash and zinc along with efficient nutrient management in *kharif* maize can be achieved by either nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 1.5% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> or nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 1.0% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> or nitrogen-150 kg/ha + 0.5% foliar spray of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> according to availability of labourers under bhopal region.

### Reference

- 1. Zaremanesh H, Nasiri B, Amiri A. The effect of vermi compost biological fertilizer on corn yield. J Mater Environ Sci. 2017;8:154-159.
- Stewart ZPE, Paparozzi T, Wortmann CS, Jha PK, Shapiro CA. Effect of Foliar Micronutrients (B, Mn, Fe, Zn) on Maize Grain Yield, Micronutrient Recovery, Uptake, and Partitioning. Plants (Basel). 2021;10(3):528.
- 3. Singh B, Singh J, Singh G, Kaur G. Effects of long term application of inorganic and organic fertilizers on soil organic carbon and physical properties in maize-wheat rotation. Indian J Agron. 2015;5(2):220-238.
- 4. Sharma L, Ram B, Meena DS. Effect of integrated nutrient management on productivity, profitability, nutrient uptake and soil fertility in rainfed maize (*Zea mays*). Indian J Agron. 2016;56(4):373-376.
- 5. Rasool S, Kanth RH, Hamid S, Alie BA, Raja W, Dar ZA. Effect of integrated nutrient management on yield and yield attributes of sweet corn (*Zea mays* L. saccharata) under wet temperate conditions of western Himalayas (India). Am J Exp. Agric. 2016;13(2):01-09.
- 6. Ravali CH, Rao KJ, Rao M, Suresh K. Effect of different levels of zeolite and nitrogen on grain yield

and nutrient uptake of maize grown in red soil. Int. J Curr. Microbiol. Appl. Sci. 2019;8(6):248-258.

- Saleem I, Javid S, Bibi F, Ehsan S, Niaz A, Ahmad ZA. Biofortification of Maize Grain with Zinc and Iron by Using Fertilizing Approach. J Agric. Ecol. Res. Int. 2016;7:01-06.
- 8. Patel UJ, Deshmukh SP, Khadadiya MB, Rathva RS, Mori MB. Effect of different levels and split application of nitrogen with and without foliar spray of urea on nutrient uptake and economics of sweet corn. Pharma Innov. J. 2022;11(2):1170-1174.
- Oyebamiji KJ, Awodun MA, Ayeni LS, Olojugba MR, Osundare OT. Comparative effect of bio-fertilizer types on growth and yield of selected maize cultivars in alfisols. FUW Trends Sci. Technol J. 2018;3(28):1015-1019.
- Palai JB, Jena J, Lenka SK. Growth, yield and nutrient uptake of maize as affected by zinc application: A Review. Indian J Pure Appl. Biosci. 2020;8(2):332-339.
- 11. Potarzycki J, Grzebisz W. Effect of zinc foliar application on grain yield of maize and its yielding components. Plant Soil Environ. 2009;55(12):519-527.
- 12. Masih A, Swaroop N, Upadhyay Y, Prajapati VK, Sinha P, Sahu DP. Effects of integrated nutrient management on growth and yield attributes of maize (*Zea mays* L.) Var. Kirtiman Saurabh. Int. J Chem. Stud. 2018;6(1):1168-1171.
- Mousavi SR. Zinc in crop production and interaction with phosphorus. Aust. J Basic Appl. Sci. 2011;5:1503-1509.
- 14. Kisetu E, Lily S, Temba WJ, Rwebangila AP. Effect of nitrogen and phosphorus on performance of maize planted at the varying soil depths. Int. J Agric. Policy Res. 2014;2:90-97.