



ISSN (E): 2277-7695  
ISSN (P): 2349-8242  
NAAS Rating: 5.23  
TPI 2022; 11(6): 1784-1787  
© 2022 TPI

[www.thepharmajournal.com](http://www.thepharmajournal.com)

Received: 02-02-2022

Accepted: 06-05-2022

**Kamlesh Kumar**

1. Division of Agronomy, ICAR-  
Indian Agricultural Research  
Institute, New Delhi, India  
2. ICAR-Indian Institute of  
Farming System Research,  
Modipuram, Meerut, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

**Ashok Kumar**

ICAR-Krishi Anusandhan  
Bhavan II, New Delhi, India

**Hari Singh Meena**

ICAR-Indian Grassland and  
Fodder Research Institute,  
Western Regional Research  
Station, Avikanagar, Tonk,  
Rajasthan, India

**B Raghavendra Goud**

Crop Production Division,  
ICAR-NRRI, Cuttack, Odisha,  
India

**Vinod Kumar**

M.Sc., Scholar, MPUAT,  
Udaipur, Rajasthan, India

**Radheshyam**

Division of Agronomy, ICAR-  
Indian Agricultural Research  
Institute, New Delhi, India

**Corresponding Author:**

**Kamlesh Kumar**

1. Division of Agronomy, ICAR-  
Indian Agricultural Research  
Institute, New Delhi, India  
2. ICAR-Indian Institute of  
Farming System Research,  
Modipuram, Meerut, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

## Nitrogen dynamics in soil, nutrient uptake and nitrogen use efficiency of maize under different nitrification inhibitors and varying nitrogen doses

**Kamlesh Kumar, Ashok Kumar, Hari Singh Meena B Raghavendra Goud, Vinod Kumar and Radheshyam**

### Abstract

Rapid nitrification is one of the key factors of inefficient nitrogen use in maize and use of neem oil-coated urea holds immense promise to use fertilizer nitrogen efficiently. Therefore, a field experiment was conducted at the Research Farm of Division of Agronomy, ICAR-Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi to get insights on effect of the different doses of nitrification inhibitors and varying levels of nitrogen on the  $\text{NH}_4^+$  and  $\text{NO}_3^-$ -nitrogen content in soil, nutrients uptake and nitrogen use efficiency of maize. The treatment consisted of three nitrification inhibitors (Dicynadamide, neem oil and meliacin) each with two different concentrations (350 and 700 ppm of neem oil and meliacin and 5% and 10% of Dicynadamide) and two levels of nitrogen (135 and 180 kg N/ha). Result showed that different parameters viz. grain yield, stover yield and harvest index were significantly influenced by levels of nitrogen and nitrification inhibitors. The meliacin coated urea (MCU) at 350 ppm @  $\text{N}_{180}$  recorded maximum grain yield and stover yield which was comparable with  $\text{MCU}_{700}@\text{N}_{180}$ . Uptake of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium by grain, straw and total uptake was significantly higher with  $\text{MCU}_{350}@\text{N}_{180}$ . Highest agronomic efficiency and physiological efficiency were recorded with the application of  $\text{MCU}_{350}@\text{N}_{180}$  and highest nitrogen harvest index (NHI) was obtained with  $\text{MCU}_{700}@\text{N}_{135}$ . Maximum concentration of  $\text{NH}_4^+$ -N in soil was recorded with application of  $\text{MCU}_{700}@\text{N}_{180}$  and it was significantly higher over all other levels of nitrogen and nitrification inhibitors. The higher amount of soil  $\text{NH}_4^+$ -N for longer period with  $\text{MCU}_{350}@\text{N}_{180}$  indicated that this treatment had the most durable effect on nitrification inhibition. It was concluded that the coating of urea with meliacin @ 350 ppm is effective in enhancing the nutrient uptake, nutrient use efficiency and yield of *kharif* maize.

**Keywords:** Dicynadamide, meliacin, neem oil, nitrogen harvest index, nitrogen use efficiency

### Introduction

Maize (*Zea mays* L.) assumes worldwide significance due to its versatile nature having wider adaptability under varied agro-climatic conditions. Maize is one of the most important crops of India after rice and wheat that has been cultivated over 9.6 m ha area with average productivity of 3.0 tonnes/ha compared to the world average of 5.8 tonnes/ha.

Maize is an exhaustive feeder of nutrients and balanced and adequate application of fertilizer nutrients is needed not only for improving the current yield level but also for sustaining the profitability of the farm. Among the different nutrients, the role of nitrogen has been very important in increasing maize production as it plays an important role in plant metabolism such as protein synthesis thus, strongly influencing both protein content and yield. Fertilizer nitrogen has contributed an estimated 40% to the increase in per capita food production over the past 50 years (Mosier *et al.*, 2004) [8]. But the excessive use of nitrogen fertilizers has raised various global concerns mainly due to the low efficiency of nitrogen fertilizers, resulting in negative impact on atmosphere, ground water pollution and hazardous effects on other components of ecosystem. On an average recovery of fertilizer nitrogen in India ranges from 20-50% (Prasad, 1998). The unaccounted 67% fertilizer nitrogen escapes through different routes and may contribute to contamination of water bodies and the atmosphere (Shoji *et al.*, 2001) [10]. There are a variety of new management practices and technologies that can promote nitrogen use efficiency and alleviate environmental pollution. One of the mitigation technologies that has proved to be highly effective in reducing fertilizer nitrogen losses and increasing nitrogen use efficiency and yield in a few cropping systems is the application of nitrification inhibitors (Majumdar *et al.*, 2002; Zaman *et al.*, 2009; Cui *et al.*, 2011;

Moir *et al.*, 2012) [6, 12, 3, 7]. The positively charged ammonium nitrogen cations are retained by negatively charged soil colloids and are less subject to leaching and denitrification losses. One of the most promising approaches of maintaining nitrogen in the soil as ammonium is to add a nitrification inhibitor with the fertilizers.

Globally, many nitrification inhibitors have been useful in increasing the nitrogen use efficiency and crop yields. However, most of the nitrification inhibitors such as nitrapyrin, A.M. (2-amino-4-chloro-6-methylpyridine), dicyandiamide and ammonium thiosulphate remain still unpopular with most Asian farmers due to their higher costs and limited availability. Hence, a need is being increasingly felt to identify and use some new indigenous nitrification inhibitors for increased nitrogen use efficiency in maize. In this direction, use of neem-cake or neem oil-coated urea holds immense promise. Afterwards, several studies at the Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, have indicated an increase in nitrogen use efficiency and yields of rice by using neem cake or neem oil emulsion-coated urea (Kumar *et al.*, 2012) [4]. However, limited information is available on the use of nitrification inhibitors in maize and there is a need to identify and evaluate some new indigenous nitrification inhibitor for increase nitrogen use efficiency in maize. Therefore, present study was conducted to assess the changes in nitrogen content in soil and different nitrogen use efficiencies of maize under different nitrification inhibitors and varying levels of nitrogen.

## Materials and Methods

A field experiment was conducted at the research farm of Division of Agronomy, Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, situated at 28.4° N latitude and 77.18° E longitude with an altitude of 228 meters above the mean sea level. New Delhi has semi-arid and sub-tropical climate characterized by hot dry summer and cold winter. The daily maximum and minimum temperature ranged from 26 to 44.5°C and 7.7 to 29.8°C respectively and the total rainfall of 494 mm was received during the crop period. The soil of experimental field was sandy loam in texture, low in organic carbon and available N and medium in available P and K with pH 7.7. The experimental farm used in the present study was under a

maize-wheat cropping system for the last three years having even topography and a good drainage facility. The field experiment consisted of fourteen treatments with three nitrification inhibitors (Dicyandiamide, neem oil and meliadin) each with two different concentrations (Prilled urea coated with DCD @5% and @10% weight by weight and 350 and 700 ppm for neem oil and meliadin, respectively) and two levels of nitrogen (135 and 180 kg/ha) was laid out in randomized block design having three replications. 'PMH-3' is a late maturing hybrid released in 2008 at Punjab Agricultural University (PAU), Ludhiana, was planted on ridges made at 75 cm and intra row spacing of 20 cm. The per hectare recommended dose of P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> (60 kg) and K<sub>2</sub>O (50 kg) were applied to the crop in the form of single super phosphate (16% P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>) and muriate of potash (60% K<sub>2</sub>O) respectively, as basal. One third of nitrogen as per treatments was applied as basal and remaining amount of nitrogen was applied in two equal splits at knee height and pre-tasseling stages as per the treatments. The uptake of nutrient in grain and stover was computed by multiplying nutrient content to yield and dividing by 100. Different nitrogen use efficiencies were computed by formula suggested by Kumar *et al.*, (2011) [5].

## Results and Discussion

### Nutrient uptake by grain and stover of maize

Significant variations in N, P and K uptakes were found due to different nitrification inhibitors and level of nitrogen (Table 1). Application of meliadin coated urea at 350 ppm concentration and 180 kg N/ha application rate resulted in the highest values of N, P and K uptakes by grain, stover and total plant. These values were significantly superior to all the remaining treatments except N uptake in grain, stover and total plant; and P uptake in grain and total plant at neem oil coated urea application with 700 ppm concentration at 180 kg N/ha, where both of these treatments remained statistically similar. The nutrient uptake is the function of their concentration and dry matter production therefore, higher values of dry matter at higher concentration of nutrient with MCU<sub>350</sub>@N<sub>180</sub> treatment resulted in higher uptake with this treatment. Bender *et al.* (2013) [2] also reported similar results in their research experiment.

**Table 1:** Grain yield and macronutrient uptake (kg/ha) in grain and straw of maize as influenced by different nitrification inhibitors at varying concentration and N levels.

|                                       | N uptake |        | P uptake |        | K uptake |        | Grain yield (t/ha) |
|---------------------------------------|----------|--------|----------|--------|----------|--------|--------------------|
|                                       | Grain    | Stover | Grain    | Stover | Grain    | Stover |                    |
| Control                               | 39.01    | 12.56  | 7.99     | 4.12   | 10.27    | 47.64  | 3.80               |
| Urea @N <sub>180</sub>                | 71.60    | 18.19  | 14.40    | 7.18   | 18.79    | 59.59  | 6.26               |
| NOCU <sub>350</sub> @N <sub>135</sub> | 63.26    | 16.02  | 12.50    | 6.27   | 16.66    | 56.45  | 5.68               |
| NOCU <sub>350</sub> @N <sub>180</sub> | 79.19    | 20.00  | 15.15    | 6.98   | 19.83    | 60.45  | 6.68               |
| NOCU <sub>700</sub> @N <sub>135</sub> | 70.88    | 15.24  | 13.72    | 6.25   | 18.03    | 54.66  | 6.15               |
| NOCU <sub>700</sub> @N <sub>180</sub> | 85.91    | 20.25  | 16.74    | 7.41   | 20.92    | 61.73  | 6.98               |
| MCU <sub>350</sub> @N <sub>135</sub>  | 73.02    | 17.03  | 13.73    | 6.56   | 18.11    | 59.56  | 6.24               |
| MCU <sub>350</sub> @N <sub>180</sub>  | 89.82    | 22.48  | 17.39    | 8.72   | 22.46    | 66.58  | 7.25               |
| MCU <sub>700</sub> @N <sub>135</sub>  | 70.17    | 14.69  | 13.42    | 5.59   | 17.69    | 50.70  | 6.10               |
| MCU <sub>700</sub> @N <sub>180</sub>  | 88.23    | 23.33  | 16.41    | 7.95   | 22.12    | 66.28  | 7.14               |
| DCD <sub>5%</sub> @N <sub>135</sub>   | 71.56    | 15.65  | 12.96    | 5.62   | 18.51    | 57.33  | 6.17               |
| DCD <sub>5%</sub> @N <sub>180</sub>   | 80.38    | 19.36  | 15.85    | 8.00   | 20.47    | 61.07  | 6.61               |
| DCD <sub>10%</sub> @N <sub>135</sub>  | 62.10    | 15.69  | 11.29    | 6.63   | 15.11    | 54.12  | 5.46               |
| DCD <sub>10%</sub> @N <sub>180</sub>  | 76.42    | 19.06  | 14.60    | 7.97   | 19.67    | 60.34  | 6.35               |
| SEm +                                 | 3.5      | 0.8    | 0.4      | 0.5    | 0.4      | 0.7    | 0.2                |
| LSD (P=0.05)                          | 10.1     | 2.4    | 1.1      | 1.3    | 1.2      | 2.1    | 0.57               |

Effect of different nitrification inhibitors and nitrogen levels on yield

The different doses of nitrification inhibitors and levels of nitrogen demonstrated significant effect on grain yield, stover yield and harvest index (Table 1). Highest grain yield (7.25 t/ha) and stover yield (7.93 t/ha) were obtained with MCU<sub>350</sub>@N<sub>180</sub> followed by MCU<sub>700</sub>@N<sub>180</sub>. These increases in grain yield was 15.81% over 180 kg N/ha through urea without any nitrification inhibitor. The remarkable improvement in growth and yield attributes with MCU<sub>700</sub>@N<sub>180</sub> may have caused a significant increase in grain

yield, which was significantly higher than urea without any nitrification inhibitor. There was an improvement in grain yield with the application of MCU<sub>350</sub>@N<sub>180</sub> over MCU<sub>700</sub>@N<sub>180</sub> probably due to fact that increased coating thickness of meliaccin might have reduced NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> -nitrogen availability. Higher dry matter accumulation with the application of MCU<sub>350</sub>@N<sub>180</sub> was the reason for higher yield. Similar results were also reported by Kumar *et al*, 2011 [5].

**Table 2:** The NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> and NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> -nitrogen content in soil (mg/kg) at different growth stages of maize (0-30 cm) and nutrient use efficiency as influenced by different nitrification inhibitors at varying coincentration and N levels.

| Treatment                             | Knee height                  |                              | Tasseling                    |                              | Grain filling                |                              | Harvesting                   |                              | Agronomic efficiency (kg grain increased/kg of N applied) | Apparent nitrogen recovery (%) | Physiological efficiency (kg grain increased per kg increase of N uptake) | Nitrogen harvest index (%) |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
|                                       | NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> | NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> | NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> | NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> | NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> | NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> | NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> | NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> |   |                                |   |                            |
| Control                               | 13.43                        | 9.30                         | 12.20                        | 9.52                         | 7.28                         | 12.58                        | 6.52                         | 10.30                        | -   | -                              | -   | 75.7                       |
| Urea @N <sub>180</sub>                | 17.22                        | 16.26                        | 15.99                        | 16.38                        | 11.14                        | 19.42                        | 8.38                         | 14.43                        | 14.1  | 24.5                           | 85.4  | 79.7                       |
| NOCU <sub>350</sub> @N <sub>135</sub> | 23.28                        | 11.43                        | 22.05                        | 11.25                        | 12.79                        | 15.26                        | 9.20                         | 13.43                        | 15.0  | 22.0                           | 87.9  | 79.7                       |
| NOCU <sub>350</sub> @N <sub>180</sub> | 23.60                        | 12.43                        | 22.37                        | 12.47                        | 11.20                        | 17.09                        | 7.36                         | 14.29                        | 14.8  | 26.5                           | 89.1  | 79.7                       |
| NOCU <sub>700</sub> @N <sub>135</sub> | 25.15                        | 10.20                        | 23.92                        | 10.21                        | 13.30                        | 14.24                        | 8.34                         | 12.60                        | 17.3  | 21.2                           | 84.9  | 82.2                       |
| NOCU <sub>700</sub> @N <sub>180</sub> | 25.64                        | 10.76                        | 24.41                        | 11.17                        | 14.09                        | 16.29                        | 8.69                         | 13.40                        | 16.6  | 32.3                           | 78.0  | 80.9                       |
| MCU <sub>350</sub> @N <sub>135</sub>  | 23.25                        | 13.42                        | 22.02                        | 13.79                        | 13.67                        | 15.66                        | 10.52                        | 13.52                        | 17.8  | 22.7                           | 91.8  | 81.1                       |
| MCU <sub>350</sub> @N <sub>180</sub>  | 25.34                        | 12.35                        | 24.40                        | 12.56                        | 12.70                        | 18.14                        | 9.68                         | 11.13                        | 19.5  | 30.7                           | 93.6  | 79.9                       |
| MCU <sub>700</sub> @N <sub>135</sub>  | 25.37                        | 11.54                        | 24.14                        | 11.71                        | 13.14                        | 15.00                        | 9.48                         | 12.52                        | 16.9  | 19.5                           | 76.1  | 82.7                       |
| MCU <sub>700</sub> @N <sub>180</sub>  | 26.39                        | 10.76                        | 25.16                        | 10.08                        | 14.30                        | 17.16                        | 10.71                        | 13.21                        | 18.0  | 32.7                           | 87.2  | 79.1                       |
| DCD <sub>5%</sub> @N <sub>135</sub>   | 22.70                        | 9.32                         | 21.47                        | 13.11                        | 12.29                        | 15.54                        | 8.61                         | 13.39                        | 18.3  | 22.1                           | 85.2  | 82.1                       |
| DCD <sub>5%</sub> @N <sub>180</sub>   | 22.81                        | 11.41                        | 21.58                        | 11.53                        | 10.93                        | 16.41                        | 7.43                         | 14.32                        | 17.2  | 28.5                           | 75.9  | 80.6                       |
| DCD <sub>10%</sub> @N <sub>135</sub>  | 25.08                        | 8.73                         | 23.85                        | 12.44                        | 12.51                        | 15.20                        | 8.63                         | 12.37                        | 14.7  | 16.5                           | 88.3  | 79.8                       |
| DCD <sub>10%</sub> @N <sub>180</sub>  | 25.63                        | 10.51                        | 23.34                        | 11.27                        | 13.51                        | 14.61                        | 10.68                        | 12.71                        | 15.1  | 23.8                           | 80.2  | 79.8                       |
| SEm +                                 | 0.156                        | 0.156                        | 0.156                        | 0.259                        | 0.325                        | 1.303                        | 0.221                        | 0.194                        | 0.8   | 0.7                            | 1.7   | 1.1                        |
| LSD (P=0.05)                          | 0.453                        | 0.453                        | 0.453                        | 0.752                        | 0.945                        | 3.787                        | 0.642                        | 0.565                        | 2.4   | 1.9                            | 4.8   | 3.2                        |

N Nitrogen use efficiency

The Nitrogen use efficiencies *viz.* agronomic efficiency, apparent nitrogen recovery and physiological efficiency of applied nitrogen and nitrogen harvest index showed significant differential behavior due to varying nitrification inhibitors, their concentration and different nitrogen levels (Table 3). MCU<sub>350</sub>@N<sub>180</sub> application presented the highest values of agronomic efficiency, apparent nitrogen recovery and physiological efficiency while, nitrogen harvest index remained highest with the application of MCU<sub>700</sub>@N<sub>135</sub>. Higher yield and nutrient uptake with these treatments caused the higher values of agronomic efficiency, apparent nitrogen recovery, physiological efficiency and nitrogen harvest index with the use of meliaccin coated urea at respective concentration and nitrogen level. Yoshida *et al*, (1981) [11] also reported similar type of findings in their experiment. Here, Agronomic efficiency, kg yield increase/kg N applied; Apparent nitrogen recovery, kg uptake increase/kg N applied; Physiological efficiency, kg yield increase/kg increase in N uptake; Nitrogen harvest index, kg uptake in grain/kg uptake in grain + stover.

**Nitrogen dynamics (NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> and NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> -Nitrogen content) in soil** NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> and NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> -nitrogen content in the upper layer of soil (0-30 cm) were influenced significantly at all the growth stages of maize (Table 4). Soil analysis carried out after fertilization showed an increase of ammonium and a reduction of nitrate content in the treatments with nitrification inhibitors. With advancement of crop, effects of nitrification inhibitors were diminished and nitrate content were increased. Maximum numerical value of NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>-N in soil was found with application of MCU<sub>700</sub>@N<sub>180</sub> at knee height stage (26.39 mg/kg), tasseling

stage (25.16 mg/kg) and at harvesting (10.71 mg/kg) and minimum with control followed by Urea@N<sub>180</sub> which shows durability of meliaccin in nitrification inhibition. In contrast to this, maximum NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> -N in soil was found in plots which received 180 kg N through urea and minimum under DCD<sub>10</sub>@N<sub>135</sub> at all the growth stages of maize. Here, higher concentration (700 ppm) of MCU reported higher amount of NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>-N in soil than 350 ppm MCU due to increased nitrification inhibition. The findings of Begum *et al*, (2007) [11] were in close conformity of the results.

## References

1. Begum M, Narayanasamy G, Rai RK, Biswas DR. Influence of integrated nutrient management on nitrogen and phosphorus in soil under wheat-mungbean-maize cropping system. *Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science*. 2007;55(2):175-183.
2. Bender RR, Haegele JW, Ruffo ML, Below FE. Nutrient uptake, partitioning, and remobilization in modern, transgenic insect-protected maize hybrids. *Agronomy Journal*. 2013;105(1):161-170.
3. Cui M, Sun XC, Hu CX, Di HJ, Tan QL, Zhao CS. Effective mitigation of nitrate leaching and nitrous oxide emissions in intensive vegetable production systems using a nitrification inhibitor, dicyandiamide. *J Soils Sediments*. 2011;11:722-730.
4. Kumar B, Chikkappa GK, Jat SL, Parihar CM, Yathish KR, Singh V, *et al*. Maize biology: An Introduction, Directorate of Maize Research, Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR), Technical Bulletin.

- 2012;2:32.
5. Kumar D, Devakumar C, Kumar R, Panneerselvama P, Das A, Shivay Y. Relative efficiency of prilled urea coated with major neem (*Azadirachta indica* A. Juss) oil components in lowland irrigated rice of the Indo-Gangetic plains. Archives of Agronomy and Soil Science. 2011;57(1):61-74.
  6. Majumdar D, Pathak H, Kumar S, Jain MC. Nitrous oxide emission from a sandy loam Inceptisol under irrigated wheat in India as influenced by different nitrification inhibitors. Agriculture Ecosystem and Environment. 2002;91(1-3):283-293.
  7. Moir JL, Malcolm BJ, Cameron KC, Di HJ. The effect of dicyandiamide on pasture nitrate concentration, yield and N off take under high N loading in winter and spring. Grass Forage Sci. 2012;67:391-402.
  8. Mosier AR, Syers JK, Freney JR. Nitrogen fertilizer: an essential component of increased food, feed, and fiber production. Agriculture and the nitrogen cycle: assessing the impacts of fertilizer use on food production and the environment. 2004;65:3-15.
  9. Prasad R, Singh S, Saxena VS, Devakumar C. Coating of prilled urea with neem (*Azadirachta indica* A. Juss.) oil for efficient use in rice. Naturwiss. 1999;86:53-539.
  10. Shoji S, Delegado J, Mosier AR, Minura Y. Controlled release fertilizers and nitrification inhibitors to increase nitrogen-use efficiency and to conserve air and water quality. Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis. 2001;32:1051-1071.
  11. Yoshida AS. Fundamentals of rice crop sciences. Los Banos, Philippines: IRRI, 1981.
  12. Zaman M, Saggar S, Blennerhassett JD, Singh J Effect of urease and nitrification inhibitors on N transformation, gaseous emissions of ammonia and nitrous oxide, pasture yield and N uptake in grazed pasture system. Soil Biol. Biochem. 2009;41:1270-1280.