

E-ISSN: 2278-4136 P-ISSN: 2349-8234 JPP 2019; 8(3): 2753-2756 Received: 04-03-2019 Accepted: 06-04-2019

#### Sathisha GS

Research Scholar, Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, UAS, Raichur, Karnataka, India

#### **BK Desai**

Professor, Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, UAS, Raichur, Karnataka, India

#### Satyanarayana Rao

Professor, Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, UAS, Raichur, Karnataka, India

#### Latha HS

Assistant Professor, Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, UAS, Raichur, Karnataka, India

#### Yogesh LN

Assistant Professor, Department of Genetics and Plant breeding, Agricultural Research Station, Hagari, UAS, Raichur, Karnataka, India

Correspondence Sathisha GS Research Scholar, Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, UAS, Raichur, Karnataka, India

# Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry

Available online at www.phytojournal.com



## Effect of agronomic fortification of zinc and iron on growth parameters and yield of foxtail millet [Setaria italica (L.)] genotypes

### Sathisha GS, BK Desai, Satyanarayana Rao, Latha HS and Yogesh LN

#### Abstract

A field experiment was conducted at ARS, Hagari on medium black soil during *rabi*-2017 to study the effect of agronomic fortification with zinc and iron on growth parameters and yield of foxtail millet [*Setaria italica* (L.)] genotypes. The experiment was laid on split plot design consisting of three genotypes in the main plot and seven different levels of micronutrients application in sub plot. The genotypes recorded non-significant difference with respect to the growth parameters and yield. Among the micronutrients application the treatment  $M_7$ : RDF + Soil application of ZnSO4 at 15 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and FeSO4 at 10 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> + Foliar application of 0.5% ZnSO4 and FeSO4 each 30 DAS recorded significantly higher number of tillers plant<sup>-1</sup> (4.21), leaf area (41.26, 83.47 and 27.82 cm<sup>2</sup> plant<sup>-1</sup> at 30, 60 and at harvest, respectively), grain yield (2272 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), stover yield (9298 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and harvest index (19.63 %). In interaction effect G<sub>3</sub>: Sia-2644 and M<sub>7</sub>: RDF + Soil application of ZnSO4 @ 15 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> & FeSO4 @ 10 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> + Foliar application of 0.5% ZnSO4 and FeSO4 each 30 DAS recorded significantly higher number of tillers plant<sup>-1</sup> (4.32), leaf area (41.75, 85.23 and 30.19 cm<sup>2</sup> plant<sup>-1</sup> at 30, 60 and at harvest, respectively), total dry matter accumulation (2.48, 11.28 and 30.52 g plant<sup>-1</sup> at 30, 60 and at harvest, respectively), total dry matter accumulation (2.48, 11.28 and 30.52 g plant<sup>-1</sup> at 30, 60 and at harvest, respectively), total dry matter accumulation (2.48, 11.28 and 30.52 g plant<sup>-1</sup> at 30, 60 and at harvest, respectively), total dry matter accumulation (2.48, 11.28 and 30.52 g plant<sup>-1</sup> at 30, 60 and at harvest, respectively), grain yield (2321 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), stover yield (9363 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and harvest index (19.85 %).

Keywords: Foxtail millet, agronomic fortification, zinc, iron, foliar application

#### Introduction

Foxtail millet (Setaria italica L.) is an annual grass grown for human food. It is the secondmost widely planted species of millet and the most important in East Asia. This is extensively grown in the arid and semi-arid regions of Asia and Africa and as well as in some other economically developed countries of the world. Foxtail millet is a warm season crop, typically planted in late spring and due to its early maturity and efficient use of available water makes it suitable for raising in dry areas. Foxtail millet is adapted to well-drained soils, but remained as under-utilized food crop. In recent years foxtail millet has a promising role to play in enhancing nutritional and food security. Nutritional composition of foxtail millet is proteins (12.3 g), carbohydrates (60.9 g), fat (4.3 g), crude fibre (8.0 g), calcium (31 mg), minerals (3.3g) and thiamine (0.59 mg) per 100 g edible portion (Gopalan et al., 2007)<sup>[5]</sup>. Deficiency of zinc and iron are well-documented public health issue and an important soil constraint in production of crops. Moreover, there is a close geographical overlap between soil deficiency and human deficiency of Zn and Fe, indicating high requirements for increasing concentrations of these nutrients in food crops. Usually, millets are cultivated under rainfed condition in India. Generally black soils of North Karnataka are deficient in Zn and Fe due to its low solubility in soils is the major reason for appearance of deficiency in crop plants. Breeding of new genotypes having high Zn and Fe concentration (genetic bio fortification) is the most cost-effective strategy to address the problem; but, this strategy needs long time. A quick and alternative approach is therefore required for fortification of food crops with Zn and Fe in the short term. In this regard, a fertilizer strategy (agronomic fortification) gives an effective way for fortification of food crops including foxtail millet. Biofortification is a process of minerals and vitamins in food staples eaten widely by the poor may be increased either through conventional plant breeding or through use of transgenic techniques (Howarth and Welch, 2010)<sup>[6]</sup>. Agronomic fortification provides Zn and Fe to plants by seed treatment, soil and application of Zn and Fe to make sure success of breeding efforts for increasing Zn and Fe concentration in seeds. Important complementary approach to the on-going breeding programme is fertilizer strategy and it is a rapid solution to the problem.

#### Material and methods

The experiment was conducted at Agricultural Research Station, Hagari which is situated between 15° 14' N latitude and 77° 07' E longitude with an altitude of 414 meters above the mean sea level and is located in Zone-3 of Karnataka. The experiment was laid out in split plot design and comprised of two factors for study viz., Main plot treatments: genotypes (G) comprised viz., G1: HN-7 (low in Fe and Zn), G2: HN-46 (medium in Fe and high in Zn), G<sub>3</sub>: Sia-2644 (high in Fe and medium in Zn). Subplot treatments: micronutrients application (M) comprised viz., M1: Control (RDF), M2: RDF + Seed treatment with 0.5% ZnSO<sub>4</sub> & FeSO<sub>4</sub> each, M<sub>3</sub>: RDF + Soil application of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> @ 15 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and FeSO<sub>4</sub> @ 10 kg ha-1, M4: RDF + Foliar application of 0.5% ZnSO4 and FeSO4 each at 30 DAS, M<sub>5</sub>: RDF + Seed treatment with 0.5% ZnSO<sub>4</sub> & FeSO<sub>4</sub> each + Soil application of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> @ 15 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and FeSO<sub>4</sub> @ 10 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, M<sub>6</sub>: RDF + Seed treatment with 0.5% ZnSO<sub>4</sub> & FeSO<sub>4</sub> each + Foliar application of 0.5% ZnSO<sub>4</sub> and FeSO<sub>4</sub> each at 30 DAS, M<sub>7</sub>: RDF + Soil application of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> @ 15 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and FeSO<sub>4</sub> @ 10 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> + Foliar application of 0.5% ZnSO<sub>4</sub> and FeSO<sub>4</sub> each at 30 DAS. The gross plot size was 3.0 m  $\times$  3.0 m and net plot size was 1.8 m  $\times$  2.6 m. The spacing given was 30 cm  $\times$  10 cm. The soil of the experimental site belongs to medium deep black soil and clay texture, neutral in soil reaction (7.50) and low in electrical conductivity (0.25 dSm<sup>-1</sup>). The organic carbon content was 0.72 per cent and low in available N (262.00 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), medium in available phosphorus (39.25 kg  $P_2O_5$  ha<sup>-1</sup>) and medium in available potassium (307.00 kg K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup>). DTPA extractable zinc (0.67 ppm) and DTPA extractable iron (3.92 ppm). The data was statistically analysed as per the procedure given by Gomez and Gomez (1984)<sup>[4]</sup>.

#### **Results and discussion**

# **1.** Effect of agronomic fortification with zinc and iron on grain yield, stover yield and harvest index

In the present investigation all three genotypes were found non-significant with respect to the yield. With respect to the micronutrients application significantly higher grain yield, stover yield and harvest index (2272 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, 9298 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and 19.63 %, respectively) was recorded with M<sub>7</sub>: RDF + Soil application of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> @ 15 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> & FeSO<sub>4</sub> @ 10 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> + Foliar application of 0.5% ZnSO<sub>4</sub> and FeSO<sub>4</sub> each 30 DAS which was on par with  $M_6$ : RDF + Seed treatment with 0.5% ZnSO<sub>4</sub> & FeSO<sub>4</sub> each + Foliar application of 0.5% ZnSO<sub>4</sub> and FeSO<sub>4</sub> each at 30 DAS (2223 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, 9274 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and 19.32 %, respectively). In interaction  $G_3$ : Sia-2644 and  $M_7$ : RDF + Soil application of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> @ 15 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> & FeSO<sub>4</sub> @ 10 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> + Foliar application of 0.5% ZnSO4 and FeSO4 each 30 DAS recorded significantly higher grain yield, stover yield and harvest index (4.32, 25.73 cm, 11.49 g, 2321 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, 9363 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and 19.85 %, respectively) (Table 1.). The increase in the yield could be due to continuous supply of micronutrients (Zn and Fe) to the crop at different intervals through the soil application, seed treatment, foliar application and their combinations. Zn and Fe are part of the photosynthesis, assimilation and translocation of photosynthates from source (leaves) to sink (ear head) (Singh et al., 1995)<sup>[10]</sup>. The results are in conformity with the findings of Adsul et al. (2011)<sup>[1]</sup>, Dhaliwal et al. (2012)<sup>[3]</sup>, Debroy et al. (2013)<sup>[2]</sup>, Olusengun et al. (2014)<sup>[8]</sup> and Mosanna and Ebrahim  $(2015)^{[7]}$ .

 Table 1: Grain yield (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), stover yield (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and harvest index (%) of foxtail millet as influenced by genotypes and agronomic fortification

| Grain yield (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) |       |      |              |      |       | Stover yie | ld (kg ha <sup>-</sup> | <sup>1</sup> ) | Harvest index (%) |       |              |       |  |
|------------------------------------|-------|------|--------------|------|-------|------------|------------------------|----------------|-------------------|-------|--------------|-------|--|
|                                    | G1    | G2   | G3           | Mean | G1    | G2         | G3                     | Mean           | G1                | G2    | G3           | Mean  |  |
| M1                                 | 1732  | 1724 | 1846         | 1767 | 8464  | 8549       | 8699                   | 8571           | 16.97             | 16.79 | 17.49        | 17.08 |  |
| M2                                 | 1835  | 1872 | 1896         | 1868 | 8867  | 8916       | 8886                   | 8890           | 17.13             | 17.35 | 17.57        | 17.35 |  |
| M3                                 | 1874  | 1935 | 2148         | 1986 | 8883  | 8837       | 9083                   | 8934           | 17.41             | 17.96 | 19.12        | 18.16 |  |
| M4                                 | 1953  | 1944 | 2150         | 2015 | 8980  | 8934       | 9109                   | 9008           | 17.86             | 17.87 | 19.09        | 18.27 |  |
| M5                                 | 2117  | 2134 | 2035         | 2095 | 9165  | 9196       | 9057                   | 9139           | 18.76             | 18.83 | 18.34        | 18.64 |  |
| M6                                 | 2285  | 2309 | 2076         | 2223 | 9313  | 9358       | 9149                   | 9274           | 19.69             | 19.78 | 18.49        | 19.32 |  |
| M7                                 | 2256  | 2239 | 2321         | 2272 | 9274  | 9255       | 9363                   | 9298           | 19.56             | 19.47 | 19.85        | 19.63 |  |
| Mean                               | 2007  | 2022 | 2067         | 2032 | 8993  | 9006       | 9049                   | 9016           | 18.20             | 18.29 | 18.56        | 18.35 |  |
|                                    | S.Em± |      | C D (P=0.05) |      | S.Em± |            | C D (P=0.05)           |                | S.Em±             |       | C D (P=0.05) |       |  |
| Main plot                          | 18    |      | NS           |      | 28    |            | NS                     |                | 0.12              |       | NS           |       |  |
| Sub plot                           | 38    |      | 108          |      | 26    |            | 76                     |                | 0.29              |       | 0.84         |       |  |
| Interaction                        | 65    |      | 1            | 182  |       | 46         |                        | 128            |                   | 0.50  |              | NS    |  |

Main plot: Genotypes (G)

G<sub>1</sub>: HN-7 (low in Fe and Zn)

G<sub>2</sub>: HN-46 (medium in Fe and high in Zn)

G<sub>3</sub>: Sia-2644 (high in Fe and medium in Zn)

Sub plot: Micro nutrients application (M)

M1: RDF (control)

 $M_2: RDF + Seed \ treatment \ with \ 0.5 \ \% \ ZnSO_4 \ \& \ FeSO_4 \ each$ 

M\_3: RDF + Soil application of ZnSO4 @ 15 kg ha^1 and FeSO4 @ 10 kg ha^1

M4: RDF + Foliar application of 0.5 % ZnSO4 and FeSO4 each at 30 DAS

 $M_5$ : RDF + Seed treatment + Soil application ( $M_2 + M_3$ )

 $M_6$ : RDF + Seed treatment + Foliar application ( $M_2 + M_4$ )

 $M_7$ : RDF + Soil application + Foliar application ( $M_3 + M_4$ )

RDF: (30:15:15 kg N, P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> and K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> + FYM @ 2.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>

# **2.** Effect of agronomic fortification with zinc and iron on growth parameters

The genotypes recorded non-significant difference with respect to the growth parameters. Among the micronutrients application the treatment  $M_7$ : RDF + Soil application of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> @ 15 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> & FeSO<sub>4</sub> @ 10 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> + Foliar

application of 0.5% ZnSO<sub>4</sub> and FeSO<sub>4</sub> each 30 DAS recorded significantly higher number of tillers plant<sup>-1</sup> (4.21), leaf area (41.26, 83.47 and 27.82 cm<sup>2</sup> plant<sup>-1</sup> at 30, 60 and at harvest, respectively) and total dry matter accumulation (2.53, 11.01 and 29.69 g plant<sup>-1</sup> at 30, 60 and at harvest, respectively) which was at par with M<sub>6</sub>: RDF + Seed treatment with 0.5%

ZnSO<sub>4</sub> & FeSO<sub>4</sub> each + Foliar application of 0.5% ZnSO<sub>4</sub> and FeSO<sub>4</sub> each at 30 DAS with respect to number of tillers plant<sup>-1</sup> (4.06), leaf area (40.37, 82.22 and 26.51 cm<sup>2</sup> plant<sup>-1</sup> at 30, 60 and at harvest, respectively) and total dry matter accumulation (2.30, 10.77 and 28.69 g plant<sup>-1</sup> at 30, 60 and at harvest, respectively). In interaction G<sub>3</sub>: Sia-2644 and M<sub>7</sub>: RDF + Soil application of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> @ 15 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> & FeSO<sub>4</sub> @ 10 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> + Foliar application of 0.5% ZnSO<sub>4</sub> and FeSO<sub>4</sub> each 30 DAS recorded significantly higher number of tillers plant<sup>-1</sup> (4.32), leaf area (41.26, 83.47 and 27.82 cm<sup>2</sup> plant<sup>-1</sup> at 30, 60 and at

harvest, respectively) and total dry matter accumulation (2.48, 11.28 and 30.52 g plant<sup>-1</sup> at 30, 60 and at harvest, respectively) (Table 2 & 3.). The results are akin to Sharanappa (2017)<sup>[9]</sup>. Further foliar spray helps to rapid absorption of Zn and Fe nutrients through leaf this results increase in cell division and elongation, chlorophyll content, and photosynthesis. Foliar application of micronutrients might enhance translocation of photosynthates from store part to sink parts.

 Table 2: Number of tillers plant<sup>-1</sup> at harvest and leaf area (cm<sup>2</sup> plant<sup>-1</sup>) of foxtail millet at different growth stages as influenced by genotypes and agronomic fortification

| Number of tillers plant <sup>-1</sup> |           |      |       |         | 30 DAS      |       |              |       | 60 DAS |       |              |       | At harvest |       |              |       |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|------|-------|---------|-------------|-------|--------------|-------|--------|-------|--------------|-------|------------|-------|--------------|-------|
|                                       | G1        | G2   | G3    | Mean    | G1          | G2    | G3           | Mean  | G1     | G2    | G3           | Mean  | G1         | G2    | G3           | Mean  |
| M1                                    | 2.47      | 2.37 | 2.45  | 2.43    | 34.84       | 35.86 | 35.92        | 35.54 | 63.95  | 64.85 | 66.85        | 65.22 | 16.11      | 16.53 | 18.07        | 16.90 |
| M2                                    | 2.70      | 2.68 | 2.83  | 2.74    | 38.00       | 37.90 | 37.99        | 37.96 | 69.94  | 69.15 | 70.10        | 69.73 | 19.05      | 18.15 | 19.52        | 18.91 |
| M3                                    | 3.13      | 3.03 | 3.40  | 3.19    | 40.04       | 41.37 | 41.48        | 40.96 | 73.51  | 71.12 | 75.70        | 73.44 | 21.01      | 19.78 | 24.39        | 21.73 |
| M4                                    | 3.15      | 3.12 | 3.87  | 3.38    | 35.89       | 33.59 | 39.65        | 36.38 | 72.41  | 74.89 | 75.85        | 74.38 | 21.43      | 21.05 | 24.53        | 22.34 |
| M5                                    | 3.81      | 3.92 | 3.20  | 3.64    | 41.03       | 42.33 | 37.71        | 40.36 | 80.15  | 80.59 | 75.93        | 78.89 | 25.23      | 25.78 | 21.08        | 24.03 |
| M6                                    | 4.22      | 4.26 | 3.71  | 4.06    | 41.01       | 41.16 | 38.95        | 40.37 | 83.25  | 84.97 | 78.43        | 82.22 | 27.86      | 28.43 | 23.25        | 26.51 |
| M7                                    | 4.18      | 4.15 | 4.32  | 4.21    | 41.07       | 40.96 | 41.75        | 41.26 | 82.85  | 82.32 | 85.23        | 83.47 | 26.92      | 26.34 | 30.19        | 27.82 |
| Mean                                  | 3.38      | 3.36 | 3.40  | 3.38    | 38.84       | 39.02 | 39.06        | 38.98 | 75.15  | 75.41 | 75.44        | 75.34 | 22.52      | 22.29 | 23.00        | 22.61 |
|                                       | S.Em± C D |      | C D(I | P=0.05) | 0.05) S.Em± |       | C D (P=0.05) |       | S.Em±  |       | C D (P=0.05) |       | S.Em±      |       | C D (P=0.05) |       |
| Main plot                             | 0.06      |      | 1     | NS      | 0.47        |       | NS           |       | 0.52   |       | NS           |       | 0.63       |       | NS           |       |
| Sub plot                              | 0.07 0.21 |      | .21   | 0.90    |             | 2.58  |              | 0.92  |        | 2.63  |              | 0.88  |            | 2.53  |              |       |
| Interaction                           | 0.13 0    |      | .35   | 1.56    |             | NS    |              | 1.59  |        | 4.44  |              | 1.53  |            | 4.28  |              |       |

Main plot: Genotypes (G)

G<sub>1</sub>: HN-7 (low in Fe and Zn)

G<sub>2</sub>: HN-46 (medium in Fe and high in Zn)

G3: Sia-2644 (high in Fe and medium in Zn)

Sub plot: Micro nutrients application (M)

M1: RDF (control)

M<sub>2</sub>: RDF + Seed treatment with 0.5 % ZnSO<sub>4</sub> & FeSO<sub>4</sub> each

M<sub>3</sub>: RDF + Soil application of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> @ 15 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and FeSO<sub>4</sub> @ 10 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>

M4: RDF + Foliar application of 0.5 % ZnSO4 and FeSO4 each at 30 DAS

 $M_5$ : RDF + Seed treatment + Soil application ( $M_2 + M_3$ )

 $M_6$ : RDF + Seed treatment + Foliar application ( $M_2 + M_4$ )

 $M_7$ : RDF + Soil application + Foliar application ( $M_3 + M_4$ )

RDF: (30:15:15 kg N,  $P_2O_5$  and  $K_2O\ ha^{-1}+FYM\ @\ 2.5\ t\ ha^{-1}$ 

**Table 3:** Total dry matter accumulation (g plant<sup>-1</sup>) in foxtail millet at different growth stages as influenced by genotypes and agronomic fortification

|             | 30    | DAS  |              |      |       | 60 ]  | DAS          |       | At harvest |       |              |       |  |
|-------------|-------|------|--------------|------|-------|-------|--------------|-------|------------|-------|--------------|-------|--|
|             | G1    | G2   | G3           | Mean | G1    | G2    | G3           | Mean  | G1         | G2    | G3           | Mean  |  |
| M1          | 1.75  | 1.82 | 1.78         | 1.78 | 6.12  | 6.20  | 6.89         | 6.40  | 17.62      | 18.62 | 20.38        | 18.88 |  |
| M2          | 2.09  | 2.00 | 2.27         | 2.12 | 7.13  | 7.32  | 7.53         | 7.32  | 20.73      | 20.38 | 21.01        | 20.70 |  |
| M3          | 2.36  | 2.37 | 2.65         | 2.46 | 8.44  | 8.28  | 9.15         | 8.62  | 22.17      | 22.39 | 25.30        | 23.29 |  |
| M4          | 1.88  | 1.87 | 1.99         | 1.92 | 8.69  | 8.71  | 9.47         | 8.96  | 24.57      | 24.45 | 25.76        | 24.93 |  |
| M5          | 2.58  | 2.60 | 2.41         | 2.48 | 10.14 | 10.39 | 9.13         | 9.89  | 26.84      | 27.17 | 25.14        | 26.38 |  |
| M6          | 2.23  | 2.29 | 2.39         | 2.30 | 11.03 | 11.19 | 10.10        | 10.77 | 29.70      | 30.09 | 26.27        | 28.69 |  |
| M7          | 2.48  | 2.47 | 2.48         | 2.53 | 10.88 | 10.87 | 11.28        | 11.01 | 29.36      | 29.18 | 30.52        | 29.69 |  |
| Mean        | 2.20  | 2.20 | 2.28         | 2.23 | 8.92  | 8.99  | 9.08         | 9.00  | 24.43      | 24.61 | 24.91        | 24.65 |  |
|             | S.Em± |      | C D (P=0.05) |      | S.Em± |       | C D (P=0.05) |       | S.Em±      |       | C D (P=0.05) |       |  |
| Main plot   | 0.02  |      | NS           |      | 0.06  |       | NS           |       | 0.11       |       | NS           |       |  |
| Sub plot    | 0.05  |      | 0.13         |      | 0.08  |       | 0.24         |       | 0.35       |       | 0.99         |       |  |
| Interaction | 0.08  |      | NS           |      | 0.14  |       | 0.41         |       | 0.60       |       | 1.68         |       |  |

Main plot: Genotypes (G)

G<sub>1</sub>: HN-7 (low in Fe and Zn)

G<sub>2</sub>: HN-46 (medium in Fe and high in Zn)

G3: Sia-2644 (high in Fe and medium in Zn)

Sub plot: Micro nutrients application (M)

 $M_1: RDF \ (control)$ 

M2: RDF + Seed treatment with 0.5 % ZnSO4 & FeSO4 each

 $M_3: RDF + Soil application of ZnSO_4 \ @ \ 15 \ kg \ ha^{-1} \ and \ FeSO_4 \ @ \ 10 \ kg \ ha^{-1}$ 

M4: RDF + Foliar application of 0.5 % ZnSO4 and FeSO4 each at 30 DAS

 $M_5 \hbox{: } RDF + Seed \ treatment + Soil \ application \ (M_2 + M_3)$ 

 $M_6: RDF + Seed \ treatment + Foliar \ application \ (M_2 + M_4)$ 

M<sub>7</sub>: RDF + Soil application + Foliar application  $(M_3 + M_4)$ 

RDF: (30:15:15 kg N, P2O5 and K2O ha-1 + FYM @ 2.5 t ha-1

### Conclusion

The investigation revealed that interaction of Genotype Sia-2644 significantly respond for the application of ZnSO<sub>4</sub> @ 15 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and FeSO<sub>4</sub> @ 10 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in soil at the time of sowing and Foliar application of 0.5% ZnSO<sub>4</sub> and FeSO<sub>4</sub> each at 30 days after sowing significantly increases yield and growth parameters. Combined application of zinc sulphate and iron sulphate applied in both soil and foliar spray significantly influenced the growth parameters and yield in foxtail millet.

### References

- 1. Adsul PB, Anuradha P, Ganesh G, Ajeet P, Shiekh SS. Uptake of N, P, K and yield of *kharif* sorghum as influence by soil and foliar application of micronutrients. Biob. Infolet. 2011; 11(2):578-582.
- Debroy P, Narwal RP, Malik RS, Narender. Impact of zinc application methods on greengram (*Vigna radiate* L.) productivity and grain zinc fortification. J Environ. Bio. 2013; 35:851-854.
- 3. Dhaliwal SS, Sadana US, Khurana MPS, Sidhu SS. Enrichment of wheat grains with Zn through ferti-fortification. Indian. J Fert. 2012; 8(7):48-55.
- Gomez KA, Gomez AA. Statistical Procedures for Agricultural Research, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. A wiley Inter.Sci. Publications, New York (USA), 1984.
- 5. Gopalan C, Ramasashtri BV, Balasubramanian SC. Nutritive Value of Indian Foods. National Institute of Nutrition, ICMR: Hyderabad, India, 2007, 47.
- Howarth EB, Welch RM. Biofortification-A Sustainable Agricultural Strategy for Reducing Micronutrient Malnutrition in the Global South. Crop sci. 2010; 50:20-32.
- 7. Mosanna R, Ebrahim KB. Morpho- physiological response of maize (*Zea mays* L.) to zinc nano-chelate foliar and soil application at different growth stages. J New Bio. Reports. 2015; 4(1):46-50.
- Olusengun A, Meki C. Soil application of zinc to maize and wheat grown on a Zambian Alfisol. African J Agril. Res. 2014; 9(11):963-970.
- 9. Sharanappa. Studies on identification and enrichment of pearlmillet (*Pennisetum glaucum* L.) genotypes with zinc and iron through agronomic biofortification. M. Sc (Agri) thesis submitted to university of agricultural sciences, Raichur, Karnataka, India, 2017.
- Singh D, Singh RN. Effect of potassium, zinc and sulphur on growth characters, yields attributes and yield of soybean (*Glycine max* L.). Indian J Agron. 1995; 40(2):223-227.