

Effect of irrigation based on IW/CPE ratio and sulphur levels on yield and quality of gram (*Cicer arietinum* L.)

D.V. Srinivasulu*, R.M. Solanki, N. Naveen Kumar¹, M. Bhanuprakash² and A. Vemaraju³

Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture,
Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh-362 001, India.

Received: 25-03-2014

Accepted: 21-07-2014

DOI:10.18805/lr.v0iOF.9431

ABSTRACT

A field experiment was carried out during *rabi* 2010-11 to study the growth, yield and quality of gram as influenced by irrigation and sulphur levels. Irrigation and sulphur have shown significant influence on growth, yield, quality, moisture extraction pattern and water use efficiency. Among four irrigation schedules, irrigation scheduled at 0.9 IW/CPE ratio recorded higher values for all the growth parameters at various stages, yield attributes, grain and stover yield, quality parameters as well as net return and BCR while, 0.7 IW/CPE ratio remained on par. Amount of moisture extracted from surface layers was more irrespective of irrigation treatment. Depletion of soil moisture increased and water use efficiency decreased with increasing frequency of irrigation. Application of 40 kg S ha⁻¹ recorded higher grain yield, protein content and protein yield, net return and BCR and remained on par with 20 kg S ha⁻¹. However interaction between sulphur and irrigation levels, 20 kg S ha⁻¹ and 0.7 IW/CPE has reported higher seed yield, net returns and BCR.

Key words: BCR, Gram, Irrigation, IW/CPE ratio, Sulphur, Water use efficiency.

INTRODUCTION

Gram (*Cicer arietinum* L.) is the most important pulse crop of India accounting 34.6% area and 48.4% production of total pulses with a productivity of 841 kg ha⁻¹. Gujarat occupied 2.46% of gram area and 2.80% of production of the country, respectively with an average productivity of 977 kg ha⁻¹. Since many years farmers were following the same irrigation schedule irrespective of the varieties cultivated without knowing its feasibility under today's climatic conditions. Hence, today's limited water resources along with changing cropping patterns calls for urgent need for application of water at an appropriate intervals for ensuring better water use efficiency. In spite of this, recent studies on soil fertility across the country reported sulphur deficiency in most of the states including Saurashtra region of Gujarat and further, sulphur was known to increase yield and quality in gram. Precise information regarding appropriate irrigation interval and suitable sulphur dose for gram crop in recent years is very limited in Saurashtra region thus, the present investigation was carried out.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The field experiment on yield and quality of gram as influenced by irrigation and sulphur levels was conducted at the Instructional Farm, Department of Agronomy, College

of Agriculture, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh during *rabi* 2010-11. The soil was clayey in texture, slightly alkaline (pH-7.9) in reaction, rich in organic carbon with 0.76%, low in available nitrogen (178.75 kg ha⁻¹), K₂O (112.90 kg ha⁻¹) and sulphur (8.15 ppm) and medium in available P₂O₅ (38.40 kg ha⁻¹). The bulk density of the soil is 1.36 Mg m⁻³ with field capacity 28.4% and permanent wilting point 12.8%. Further, no rainfall was received throughout the crop period.

The experiment was laid out in split plot design comprising four levels of irrigation based on IW/CPE ratios [I₁=0.5, I₂=0.7, I₃=0.9 and I₄=farmer's practice (1st irrigation immediately after sowing, 2nd irrigation at 10-12 DAS and rest of three at an interval of 18-20 days)] as main plot and three levels of sulphur (S₁=0, S₂=20 and S₃=40 kg S ha⁻¹) as sub plot treatments replicating thrice in 36 plots each of size 5.0 m X 3.6 m. Sowing of gram (JG-16) using 60 kg seed ha⁻¹ was done at a spacing of 45 cm X 10 cm. One intercultivation followed by a hand weeding was done at 40 DAS. Immediately after sowing and at 12 DAS light irrigations of 50mm depth were given for proper germination and ensuring better establishment of the crop irrespective of cumulative pan evaporation readings. Afterwards irrigation of 50 mm depth was provided as per treatments based on

*Corresponding author's e-mail: d.v.seenujnv20@gmail.com and address: S.V. Agricultural College, Thiupati-517 502.

¹College of Agriculture (JAU), Junagadh. ²College of Agriculture (ANGRAU), Mahanandi. ³College of Horticulture, Thrissur, Kerala-680656.

cumulative pan evaporation readings. Amount of water to be irrigated was measured using parshall flume of 7.5 mm throat placed at the head irrigation channel. After initial two common irrigations, a total of three (41, 62 and 82 DAS), four (33, 50, 65 and 79 DAS), five (29, 44, 54, 66 and 77 DAS) and three (29, 47 and 68 DAS) irrigations were received by I_1 , I_2 , I_3 and I_4 treatments, respectively. The quantity of water received by I_1 , I_2 , I_3 and I_4 treatments is 250mm, 300mm, 350mm and 250mm, respectively. Sulphur was applied in soil as per treatments 10 days prior to sowing in elemental form. Recommended dose of both nitrogen (25 kg ha⁻¹) and phosphorus (50 kg ha⁻¹) was supplied through Urea and DAP, respectively at the time of sowing.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Growth parameters: Giving five irrigations to gram (after initial two common irrigations) at an IW/CPE ratio of 0.9 resulted in significantly higher plant height, plant spread and dry matter accumulation at 60 DAS and at harvest, branches per plant, nodules and nodule dry weight per plant and was at par with 0.7 IW/CPE ratio (Table.1). This was due to the adequate availability of moisture at all critical stages of growth and development contributing to luxurious uptake of nutrients, favourable physiological processes and active cell division. The results obtained by Dixit *et al.* (1993a) are in corroborative with the above results. Further, irrigation at 0.9 IW/CPE ratio delayed the flowering and maturity due to prolonged vegetative growth compared to farmer's practice.

Application of 20 kg S ha⁻¹ recorded significantly higher plant height at harvest, higher plant spread and dry matter accumulation at 60 DAS being at par with 40 kg S ha⁻¹. But plant height at 60 DAS, plant spread and dry matter accumulation at harvest, number of nodules and nodule dry weight per plant were significantly higher with the application of 40 kg S ha⁻¹ which was at par with 20 kg S ha⁻¹ (Table.1).

Increase in growth parameters with increased levels of sulphur may be due to its higher availability and uptake as well as its active involvement in synthesis of amino acids, regulation of various metabolic and enzymatic processes along with enhanced nitrogen fixation. Singh *et al.* (2004) reported the similar results.

Yield attributes: Scheduling irrigation to gram at 0.9 IW/CPE ratio recorded significantly maximum number of pods per plant, seeds per pod, test weight, grain and stover yield per plant followed by 0.7 IW/CPE ratio (Table.1&2). The irrigation intervals at 0.9 IW/CPE ratio were nearly coincided with that of farmer's practice and further provided two more irrigations one at peak vegetative stage and another at maturity stage. Thus it may provide higher vegetative growth and synthesis of more photosynthates coupled with better translocation and partitioning from source to sink resulting in more number of well filled pods with more number of seeds. This finally resulted in higher grain and stover yield per plant as well as test weight. These results are in close conformity with Reddy and Ahlawat (1998). Significantly maximum values in test weight, grain and stover yield per plant were recorded with 20 kg S ha⁻¹ followed by 40 kg S ha⁻¹ (Table.1&2). Influence of sulphur on yield attributes was due to its vital role in improving the vegetative structures and strong sink strength through the development of reproductive structures as well as production of assimilates to fill economically important sink (Ashok Kumar *et al.*, 2006).

Yield: The extent of increase in grain and stover yields of gram at 0.9 IW/CPE ratio was to the tune of 16.88 and 30.68% over farmer's practice, respectively. And it remained at par with 0.7 IW/CPE ratio. The potential increase in grain and stover yields with increasing frequency of irrigation was due to contribution of growth and yield attributes to the yields. These results are in complete agreement with those obtained by Chandrasekhar and Saraf (2005).

Table 1: Effect of irrigation and sulphur levels on growth and yield parameters of gram

| Treatments | Plant height (cm) at | | Plant spread (cm) | | Branches/ plant | Dry matter accumulation (g) | | Days to 50% flowering | Days to maturity | Nodules / plant | Nodule dry weight/ plant (g) | No. of pods/ plant | No. of seeds/ pod |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|---------|-------------------|---------|--------------------|-----------------------------|---------|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| | 60 DAS | Harvest | 60 DAS | Harvest | | 60 DAS | Harvest | | | | | | |
| Irrigation: (IW/CPE ratios) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| I ₁ : 0.5 | 29.6 | 33.5 | 26.5 | 18.8 | 6.4 | 3.7 | 14.8 | 52.8 | 86.4 | 20.8 | 0.197 | 53.1 | 1.27 |
| I ₂ : 0.7 | 32.3 | 38.2 | 30.3 | 22.8 | 7.1 | 5.3 | 19.7 | 55.4 | 93.3 | 26.6 | 0.303 | 58.4 | 1.25 |
| I ₃ : 0.9 | 34.0 | 42.2 | 32.1 | 23.4 | 7.9 | 5.7 | 20.9 | 57.4 | 95.9 | 31.1 | 0.342 | 61.0 | 1.37 |
| I ₄ : Farmer's practice | 31.5 | 34.7 | 29.8 | 18.5 | 7.4 | 4.2 | 16.3 | 50.9 | 85.8 | 22.9 | 0.214 | 54.9 | 1.19 |
| S.Em.± | 0.84 | 1.02 | 1.05 | 0.94 | 0.28 | 0.21 | 0.88 | 0.15 | 0.23 | 1.23 | 0.015 | 1.34 | 0.03 |
| C.D. at 5% | 2.91 | 3.53 | 3.62 | 3.24 | 0.97 | 0.73 | 3.06 | 0.51 | 0.81 | 4.25 | 0.053 | 4.63 | 0.10 |
| Sulphur levels (kg ha ⁻¹) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S ₁ : 0 | 30.9 | 35.7 | 28.6 | 19.63 | 6.6 | 4.2 | 16.7 | 54.2 | 90.3 | 22.6 | 0.244 | 52.5 | 1.26 |
| S ₂ : 20 | 32.1 | 38.3 | 30.3 | 21.45 | 7.4 | 5.0 | 18.2 | 54.0 | 90.5 | 25.2 | 0.263 | 58.0 | 1.29 |
| S ₃ : 40 | 32.5 | 37.5 | 30.1 | 21.52 | 7.7 | 5.0 | 18.8 | 54.3 | 90.3 | 28.3 | 0.286 | 60.1 | 1.25 |
| S.Em.± | 0.50 | 0.61 | 0.36 | 0.42 | 0.24 | 0.16 | 0.51 | 0.25 | 0.26 | 0.91 | 0.009 | 0.93 | 0.02 |
| C.D. at 5% | NS | 1.84 | 1.09 | 1.25 | 0.71 | 0.50 | 1.52 | NS | NS | 2.74 | 0.028 | 2.79 | NS |
| Interaction (I X S) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S.Em.± | 1.00 | 1.23 | 0.73 | 0.84 | 0.48 | 0.34 | 1.02 | 0.51 | 0.53 | 1.83 | 0.019 | 1.86 | 0.04 |
| C.D. at 5% | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | 5.48 | NS | 5.57 | NS |

Table 2: Effect of irrigation and sulphur levels on yield parameters and yield, quality, water use and production economics of gram

| Treatments | Yield parameters | | | Yield | | Harvest index (%) | Quality of grain | | Water use | | Production economics | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------|---|--------------------------|------------------------|------|
| | Test weight (g) | Grain yield/Plant(g) | Stover yield/plant(g) | Grain yield/ha (kg) | Stover yield/ha (kg) | | Protein content (%) | Protein yield (kg/ha) | CUW* (mm) | WUE** (kg ha ⁻¹ mm ⁻¹) | Gross realization (₹/ha) | Net realization (₹/ha) | BCR |
| Irrigation: (IW/CPE ratios) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| I ₁ : 0.5 | 17.05 | 9.2 | 13.8 | 1744 | 2503 | 41.28 | 18.80 | 326 | 211 | 6.98 | 40241 | 14483 | 1.56 |
| I ₂ : 0.7 | 17.74 | 11.8 | 17.5 | 2199 | 3472 | 38.69 | 20.57 | 455 | 248 | 7.33 | 50866 | 24826 | 1.95 |
| I ₃ : 0.9 | 19.03 | 13.2 | 18.7 | 2243 | 3791 | 37.27 | 22.10 | 496 | 282 | 6.41 | 51984 | 25661 | 1.97 |
| I ₄ : Farmer's practice | 16.45 | 10.4 | 15.4 | 1919 | 2901 | 40.02 | 20.58 | 396 | 224 | 7.67 | 44338 | 18580 | 1.72 |
| S.E.m.± | 0.28 | 0.47 | 0.86 | 103.20 | 209.47 | 1.24 | 0.28 | 20.94 | 6.26 | 0.41 | | | |
| C.D. at 5% | 0.95 | 1.64 | 2.97 | 357.15 | 724.88 | NS | 0.98 | 72.48 | 21.66 | NS | | | |
| Sulphur levels (kg ha ⁻¹) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S ₁ : 0 | 16.62 | 9.4 | 15.6 | 1919 | 2965 | 39.65 | 19.46 | 374 | 238 | 6.75 | 44364 | 19349 | 1.77 |
| S ₂ : 20 | 18.65 | 12.6 | 17.1 | 2035 | 3291 | 38.28 | 20.92 | 429 | 239 | 7.10 | 47104 | 21134 | 1.81 |
| S ₃ : 40 | 17.44 | 11.4 | 16.4 | 2124 | 3245 | 40.00 | 21.16 | 451 | 246 | 7.44 | 49088 | 22165 | 1.82 |
| S.E.m.± | 0.18 | 0.32 | 0.31 | 46 | 71 | 1.0 | 0.23 | 11 | 6.76 | 0.16 | | | |
| C.D. at 5% | 0.53 | 0.95 | 0.94 | 137 | 212 | NS | 0.70 | 32 | NS | 0.49 | | | |
| Interaction (I X S) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S.E.m.± | 0.35 | 0.63 | 0.62 | 91.51 | 141.74 | 1.62 | 0.47 | 21.67 | 13.52 | 0.32 | | | |
| C.D. at 5% | 1.05 | 1.90 | NS | 274.37 | NS | NS | 1.40 | 64.96 | NS | 0.97 | | | |

*CUE – Consumptive use of water

**WUE – Water use efficiency

Sulphur @ 40 kg ha⁻¹ recorded significantly higher grain yield and was at par with 20 kg S ha⁻¹. Whereas, maximum stover yield was obtained with 20 kg S ha⁻¹ and was at par with 40 kg S ha⁻¹. This potential increase of grain and stover yields with the application of sulphur might be due to its key role in photosynthetic rate and translocation as well as transformation of assimilates into yields. Shrikrishna *et al.*, (2004) reported significant increase in grain and stover yields with increasing levels of sulphur in gram.

But interaction of irrigation scheduled at 0.7 IW/CPE ratio with application of 20 kg S ha⁻¹ (I₂S₂) recorded 32% higher grain yield over farmer's practice (I₄S₁) followed by I₂S₃ and I₃S₃ (Table.4).

Quality characters: Increasing frequency of irrigation significantly increased the protein content and protein yield and was recorded higher at 0.9 IW/CPE ratio. It was due to increased availability and uptake of nutrients under high moisture conditions which boosted the synthesis of amino acids and proteins (Dixit *et al.*, 1993a and Reddy and Ahlawat, 1998).

Increased application of sulphur significantly increased the protein content and protein yield in gram and was recorded maximum when fertilized with 40 kg S ha⁻¹. This was due to the synthesis of more sulphur containing amino acids. Narendra Kumar *et al.*, (2003) also reported increase in protein content with the application of sulphur in gram.

Moisture studies: Higher amount of moisture was extracted from surface layers irrespective of irrigation schedules. About 60-64% of moisture was extracted from 0-30 cm soil depth and around 90-95% moisture was extracted from 0-60 cm depth. With increasing frequency of irrigation from 0.5 to 0.9 IW/CPE ratio the per cent moisture extracted was also increased. It was further revealed that moisture extracted from deeper layers was higher in lower IW/CPE ratios. Dixit *et al.* (1993b) also reported the same trend in moisture extraction in gram (Table.3). The present study also revealed that scheduling irrigation from 0.5 to 0.9 IW/CPE ratio increased total consumptive use of water and decreased water use efficiency (Table.2). This was due to more consumption of water due to higher vegetative growth and comparatively

Table 3: Depth wise moisture extraction pattern (%) as influenced by irrigation and sulphur levels

| Treatments | Soil depth (cm) | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 0-15 | 15-30 | 30-45 | 45-60 | 60-75 |
| Irrigation: (IW/CPE ratios) | | | | | |
| I ₁ : 0.5 | 31.83 | 29.00 (60.83) | 16.73 (77.56) | 12.46 (90.02) | 9.98 (100.00) |
| I ₂ : 0.7 | 32.63 | 29.55 (62.18) | 18.74 (80.92) | 13.47 (94.39) | 5.61 (100.00) |
| I ₃ : 0.9 | 34.01 | 30.55 (64.56) | 21.20 (85.76) | 11.51 (97.27) | 2.73 (100.00) |
| I ₄ : Farmer's practice | 33.78 | 29.12 (62.90) | 17.88 (80.78) | 10.67 (91.45) | 8.55 (100.00) |
| Sulphur levels (kg ha⁻¹) | | | | | |
| S ₁ : 0 | 33.64 | 30.83 (64.47) | 18.59 (83.06) | 10.07 (93.13) | 6.87 (100.00) |
| S ₂ : 20 | 31.97 | 29.27 (61.24) | 18.86 (80.10) | 13.13 (93.23) | 6.77 (100.00) |
| S ₃ : 40 | 33.57 | 28.56 (62.13) | 18.47 (80.60) | 12.88 (93.48) | 6.52 (100.00) |

Note:- Data in parentheses indicates cumulative moisture extraction percentage up to that depth

Table 4: Interaction effect of irrigation and sulphur levels on number of nodules, yield, quality of grain and production economics of gram

| Treatment | No. of nodules /plant | Yield (kg ha ⁻¹) | | Protein content (%) | Protein yield (kg ha ⁻¹) | Gross realization (₹ ha ⁻¹) | Total expenditure (₹ ha ⁻¹) | Net realization (₹ ha ⁻¹) | BCR |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|--------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|------|
| | | Seed | Stover | | | | | | |
| I ₁ S ₁ | 18.9 | 1860 | 2338 | 17.7 | 328 | 42775 | 24804 | 17972 | 1.72 |
| I ₁ S ₂ | 19.8 | 1636 | 2639 | 18.5 | 300 | 37861 | 25758 | 12103 | 1.47 |
| I ₁ S ₃ | 23.9 | 1736 | 2531 | 20.2 | 351 | 40075 | 26711 | 13364 | 1.50 |
| I ₂ S ₁ | 22.7 | 1914 | 3272 | 18.8 | 359 | 44364 | 25086 | 19278 | 1.77 |
| I ₂ S ₂ | 23.4 | 2353 | 3657 | 22.2 | 523 | 54414 | 26041 | 28374 | 2.09 |
| I ₂ S ₃ | 33.6 | 2330 | 3488 | 20.7 | 484 | 53826 | 26993 | 26832 | 1.99 |
| I ₃ S ₁ | 27.0 | 2122 | 3457 | 21.6 | 457 | 49126 | 25369 | 23757 | 1.94 |
| I ₃ S ₂ | 35.0 | 2276 | 3904 | 22.0 | 500 | 52777 | 26323 | 26454 | 2.00 |
| I ₃ S ₃ | 31.5 | 2330 | 4012 | 22.8 | 531 | 54035 | 27276 | 26760 | 1.98 |
| I ₄ S ₁ | 21.8 | 1782 | 2793 | 19.8 | 352 | 41221 | 24804 | 16418 | 1.66 |
| I ₄ S ₂ | 22.5 | 1875 | 2963 | 21.0 | 395 | 43373 | 25758 | 17614 | 1.68 |
| I ₄ S ₃ | 24.2 | 2099 | 2948 | 20.9 | 440 | 48401 | 26711 | 21690 | 1.81 |

lower grain yield per unit quantity of water at higher IW/CPE ratios. Same trend in CUW and WUE were observed by Arya *et al.*, (2005).

It was revealed that application of 40 kg S ha⁻¹ markedly increased the WUE in gram. Significant interaction between irrigation and sulphur was observed in number of nodules, pods and grain yield per plant, test weight, grain yield per ha, protein content and protein yield. Significant interaction between irrigation and sulphur was also reported by Patel and Patel (2005) in gram.

Economics: Irrigating gram at 0.9 IW/CPE ratio and fertilizing with 40 kg S ha⁻¹ recorded maximum net returns

and BCR individually (Table.2). But interaction of irrigation scheduled at 0.7 IW/CPE ratio with 20 kg S ha⁻¹ recorded higher net returns and BCR (Table.4). Arya *et al.*, (2005) and Pramanik *et al.*, (2009) also recorded higher net returns and higher BCR at higher IW/CPE ratios.

CONCLUSION

From the present investigation it was revealed that irrigating gram (cv JG-16) at an IW/CPE ratio of 0.7 along with the application of 20 kg S ha⁻¹ including recommended dose of fertilizers recorded higher yield, net realization and higher BCR under clayey soils of South Saurashtra agro-climatic zone.

REFERENCES

- Arya, K. L., Lalit Kumar, Singh, K. K., and Kushwaha, B. L. (2005). Effect of fertilizers and tillage management in rice (*Oryza sativa*)- chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) cropping system under varying irrigation schedules. *Indian J. of Agron.* **50**(4): 256-259.
- Ashok Kumar, Shambhu Prasad and Kumar, S. B. (2006). Effect of boron and sulphur on performance of gram (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *Indian J. of Agron.* **51**(1): 57-59.
- Chandrasekhar, K. and Saraf, C. S. (2005). Influence of irrigation and fertilizer levels on growth and yield of late sown chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *The Andhra Agricul. J.* **52** (3&4): 322-325.
- Dixit, J. P., Dubey, O. P. and Soni, N. P. (1993a). Effect of sowing date and irrigation on yield and nutrient uptake by chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) cultivars under Tawa Command area. *Indian J. of Agron.* **38**(2): 227-231.
- Dixit, J. P., Soni, N. K. and Namdeo, K. N. (1993b). Moisture use pattern and yield of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum*) in relation to planting date, variety and irrigation. *Indian J. Agron.* **38**(4): 573-577.
- Narendra Kumar, S. S., Khangarot and Raj Pal Meena. (2003). Effect of sulphur and plant growth regulators on yield and quality parameters of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *Annals of Agricul. Res.* New series **24**: 434-436.
- Patel, R. A. and Patel, R. H. (2005). Response of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum*) to irrigation, FYM and sulphur on a sandy clay loam soil. *International Chickpea and Pigeonpea Newsletter* (**12**): 22-24.
- Pramanik, S. C., Singh, N. B. and Singh, K. K. (2009). Yield, economics and water use efficiency of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) under various irrigation regimes on raised bed planting system. *Indian J. of Agron.* **54**(3): 315-318.
- Reddy, N. R. N. and Ahlawat, I. P. S. (1998). Response of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum*) genotypes to irrigation and fertilizers under late sown conditions. *Indian J. Agron.* **43**(1): 95-101.
- Shrikrishna, Sharma, A. P. and Chandra Bhushan. (2004). Nitrogen and sulphur nutrition of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum*) grown under semi arid conditions of central Uttar Pradesh. *Legume Res.* **27**(2): 146-148.
- Singh, S., Saini, S. S. and Singh, B. P. (2004). Effect of irrigation, sulphur and seed inoculation on growth, yield and sulphur uptake of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum*) under late sown conditions. *Indian J. Agron.* **49**(1): 57-59.