



Varietal Response to Organic and Inorganic Fertilizers on Growth, Bulb Yield and Quality of Onion (*Allium cepa* L.)

Vikas Raa ^a, Satya Pal Singh ^{b++*}, D.S. Duhan ^{c++},
V.S. Mor ^{d#}, Sidharth ^e and Ankit Saini ^e

^a College of Horticulture, Maharana Partap Horticultural University, Karnal, Haryana (132001), India.

^b Vegetable Science, Maharana Partap Horticultural University, Karnal, Haryana (132001), India.

^c Vegetable Science, Chaudhary Charan Singh Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar (125004), India.

^d Department of Vegetable Science, Chaudhary Charan Singh Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar (125004), India.

^e College of Agriculture, Chaudhary Charan Singh Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar (125004), India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/IJPSS/2024/v36i54573

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/114491>

Original Research Article

Received: 25/01/2024

Accepted: 28/03/2024

Published: 08/04/2024

ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted in the *Rabi* season of 2021-22 at the research farm of the Regional Research Center, Raiya (Jhajjar) of Maharana Pratap Horticultural University, Karnal, Haryana. The study aimed to examine the impact of organic manures and inorganic fertilizers on the growth, bulb yield and quality of two local varieties of onion. The experiment consists of two

⁺⁺ Assistant Scientist;

[#] Senior Scientist cum HOD;

*Corresponding author: E-mail: satyapalsalengia@gmail.com;

factors viz. different combinations of organic and inorganic nutrient sources (T₁: RDF (125:50:25 kg/ha), T₂: RDN supplied through FYM, T₃: RDN supplied through Vermi-compost, T₄: RDN supplied through Poultry manure, T₅: 50% Recommended dose of NPK + 50% RDN supplied through FYM, T₆: 50% Recommended dose of NPK + 50% RDN supplied through Vermi-compost, T₇: 50% Recommended dose of NPK + 50% RDN supplied through poultry manure, T₈: control) that were laid out in a randomized block design (factorial) with four replications and two varieties namely Hisar Onion-2 and Hisar Onion-4. The outcomes of the study revealed that the leaf length (52.72 cm), number of leaves (10.28), equatorial diameter (6.09 cm), polar diameter (5.16 cm), bulb yield and yield related parameters such as average fresh weight of bulbs (82.39 g), yield per plot (26.74 kg), yield per hectare (29.71 t) and A grade bulbs (73.55%) were recorded maximum, while bolting percentage (2.28%) and twin bulbs percentage (3.16%) was recorded minimum under the treatment T₆ Hisar Onion-4 exhibited superiority in almost all growth and bulb yield parameters except number of leaves, which was noted higher in Hisar Onion-2.

Keywords: Onion; organic; inorganic; manures; fertilizers; yield and variety.

1. INTRODUCTION

Onion (*Allium cepa* L.) holds significant importance as a key commercial bulb vegetable and spice crop, extensively cultivated in India as well as globally. It is one of the most important monocotyledonous, cross-pollinated and cool season vegetable crops. It belongs to the family Alliaceae and genus *Allium*, which is an extensive genus comprising over 500 species, primarily consisting of bulbous perennial plants. It is highly productive crop and usually finds a place as "King of kitchen". The primary edible component of the onion is its bulb, a modified organ comprising thickened, fleshy scale leaves and a stem plate. This bulb serves as a rich source of carbohydrates, proteins, vitamin C, and minerals such as phosphorus, calcium, and sulphur. The distinct flavor and pungency of the onion are attributed to the presence of a volatile organic compound, 'allyl propyl disulphide,' which is rich in sulphur. It is used in almost every household as cooked vegetable, salad and in preparation of sauce, soups, pickles etc.

Onion at edible stage is rich in medicinal properties like antibacterial values, promotes bile production and reduces blood sugar. Phenolic compound like Catechol's present in onion possess antifungal properties. It can also be used to cure heart diseases, slow down strokes and stimulate the immune system. The essential oil extracted from onion seed is an antihelminthic, expectorant, balsamic, rubefacient, pain killing and has anticoagulant qualities. It contains various anticancer agents that have been reported to have cancer-preventive properties in animals. India occupies second place in the production of onion after China and third in export after Netherlands and China. The major onion growing countries are China, USA, India,

Iran, Turkey, Egypt, Russia and Pakistan. India ranks first in area (1.29 million ha) and second in production (24.45 million tonnes) of onion bulbs in the world [1]. India accounts 19.90% of the total world production in onion and ranks second after China (26.99%). In India, onion is grown in most of states like, Maharashtra, Karnataka, Gujarat, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Andhra Pradesh and Haryana (Anonymous, 2019-2020b). Haryana ranks eighth position in production (2.27%) of onion bulb in India [2].

According to Brewster [3], this bulb crop is more susceptible to nutrient deficiencies because of their unbranched and shallow root system, therefore shows significant response to additional dose of organic and inorganic fertilizers. To achieve a higher bulb yield, excessive amounts of inorganic fertilizers are often applied. Heavy, imbalanced and continuous application of inorganic fertilizers without organic supplements causes several lethal effects on the soil. It not only harms environment and human health but also causes deficiency of micronutrients and leads to unsustainable crop production. Therefore, nutrients required by onion crop are supplied through the application of inorganic fertilizers and organic manures. Historically, the application of organic manures has been documented to enhance the physical, chemical, and biological properties of soil.

However, due to slow release of nutrients, these organic manures alone may not fully meet the nutritional needs of high-yielding cultivars. Thus, there is a need to supplement their use with inorganic fertilizers. The judicious application of inorganic fertilizers in onion cultivation contributes to improved growth, bulb development and overall bulb yield. The combined use of fertilizers along with organic

manures results in a higher yield compared to the use of inorganic fertilizers alone [4].

The use of organic manure to fulfill crop nutrient requirements is anticipated to become an essential practice in the future for sustainable agriculture. Organic manure plays a crucial role in enhancing the physical, chemical, and biological properties of soil, while also conserving its moisture-holding capacity and thus, resulting in enhanced crop productivity. Organic manures positively impact root growth by enhancing root rhizosphere conditions including soil structure and moisture levels. Additionally, they stimulate plant growth by increasing the population of beneficial microorganisms [5]. Farmyard manure serves as a prominent organic component within an integrated nutrient supply system contributing to improved soil health, increased productivity and releases macro and micronutrients. Vermicompost is a nutrient-rich source containing essential macro and micronutrients, as well as vitamins and growth hormones [6]. Compost plays a crucial role in enhancing topsoil fertility and increasing crop productivity. It was earlier reported that the application of compost has led to improvements in the quality of onions and their storage longevity [7]. The synergistic use of both organic manure and inorganic fertilizers presents excellent opportunities to address nutrient imbalances, improve soil health and enhance crop production. This approach optimizes the benefits derived from various sources of plant nutrients in an integrated manner.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The proposed field experiment conducted during the *Rabi* season 2021-22 in the research farm of the Regional Research Center, Raiya (Jhajjar) of

Maharana Pratap Horticultural University, Karnal, Haryana. It is situated between 28°33' to 28°55' North latitude and 76°36' to 76°61' East longitude with an elevation of 222 m above the mean sea level. The area is characterized by a typical semi-arid climate, featuring hot and dry summers and extremely cold winters. The region experiences an average rainfall of 456 mm. The experimental site has a uniform topography with a flat and leveled field. The soil composition was sandy loam and characterized by a moderate water-holding capacity. Experimental material consists of eight treatments of different nutrient status and two different varieties of onion *i.e.*, Hisar Onion-2 and Hisar Onion-4 which have been released and notified for Haryana conditions. The experimental design employed for the study was a Factorial Randomized Block Design, comprising of four replications including one absolute control and one recommended dose of fertilizers (125:50:25 kg NPK/ha). Half of the recommended doses of nitrogen and entire doses of phosphorus and potash were applied at the time of transplanting. Remaining nitrogen dose's were given in two equal split doses, at 30 and 45 days after transplanting, while organic manures, namely farmyard manure, poultry manure and vermicompost were applied as per treatment during field preparation and mixed thoroughly in upper 15 cm of soil. The various treatment combinations with their symbols are presented in Table 1. Eight week old onion seedlings were immersed in a solution of phosphorous-solubilizing bacteria for 30 minutes as per the treatment excluding the control. Subsequently, these treated seedlings were transplanted into flat beds measuring 3 m x 3 m with spacing of 15 cm x 10 cm. The observations were systematically recorded for growth, bulb yield quality characteristics by selecting and tagging five plants at random for each treatment

Table 1. Treatments detail of various organic and inorganic fertilizers and their combination

| Treatment symbols | Treatment details |
|-------------------|---|
| T1 | Recommended dose of fertilizer (125:50:25 kg/ha) |
| T2 | Recommended dose of nitrogen supplied through farmyard manure |
| T3 | Recommended dose of N supplied through vermicompost |
| T4 | Recommended dose of N supplied through poultry manure |
| T5 | 50% Recommended dose of NPK + 50% Recommended dose of N supplied through FYM |
| T6 | 50% Recommended dose of NPK + 50% Recommended dose of N supplied through vermicompost |
| T7 | 50% Recommended dose of NPK + 50% Recommended dose of N supplied through poultry manure |
| T8 | Control (Without any fertilizers) |

within each plot in every replication. The parameters for growth such as leaf length at final harvest (cm), number of leaves at final harvest, neck diameter, days to maturity, bolting (%), twin bulb (Doubles) (%), polar diameter of bulbs (cm), equatorial diameter of bulbs (cm) and for yield parameters it includes average weight of fresh bulb (g), number of bulbs per kg, yield per plot (kg), yield per hectare (tonnes), grading of bulbs (%) (on weight basis such as A>65 g, B=45-65 g, C<45 g). The data concerning various parameters were subjected to statistical analysis using the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) technique as outlined by Panse and Sukhatme [8].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data providing to leaf length and number of leaves per plant at final harvest was noted maximum in treatment (50% RDF through NPK + 50% RDN through VC), which were 52.72 cm and 10.28, as compared to control (33.55 cm) and (7.56), respectively at final harvest. The observed increase in leaf length and the number of leaves could be attributed to a continuous and sustained supply of nutrients to the plants throughout the entire growth period. The outcomes of the current study are supported by the results recorded by Singh et al. (2020). Regarding response of onion varieties, Hisar Onion-2 recorded higher number of leaves (9.44) as compared to Hisar Onion-4 (9.18) at harvest while in case of leaf length effect of varieties was found non-significant. The neck thickness recorded significantly narrow (6.52 mm) in control treatment whereas more neck diameter (9.66 mm) was observed in treatment RDF. The observed increase in neck diameter can be attributed to the significant impact of nitrogen on vegetative growth. Kumar et al. [9] also recorded less neck diameter at absolute control. Yogita and Ram [10] also reported the maximum neck thickness with the application of (NPK 100%). When varietal mean was compared, non-significant difference was obtained in neck diameter.

The plot receiving no manure and fertilizer, *i.e.*, T8 resulted in the minimum bolting percentage (2.17%) which was statistically at par with application of 50% RDF through NPK + 50% RDN through VC and PM, *i.e.*, T6 (2.28%) and T7 (2.44%) whereas, the maximum bolting percentage (4.00%) was recorded in treatment T1 (RDF). These results contradict the findings of Diaz-Perez et al. [11], who reported a steady decline in bolting incidence with increasing

nitrogen fertilization rates up to 197 kg/ha N. The effect of different varieties and their interaction on bolting percentage was observed to be non-significant.

The Table 3 shows that the minimum twin bulb percentage (2.99%) was recorded in T8 (control), which was statistically at par with 50% RDF through NPK + 50% RDN through VC (3.16%) and 50% RDF through NPK + 50% RDN through PM (3.20%) whereas the maximum twin bulb percentage (4.88%) was observed in T1 (RDF). The production of twin bulbs could be attributed to the activation of multiple growth centers in the basal plate of the bulb leading to the formation of a greater number of smaller plates. These results are supported by study carried out by Bhujbal [12] and Birajdar [13]. In case of onion varieties the lowest twin bulb percentage was observed in Hisar Onion-4 (3.82%) in comparison to Hisar Onion-2 (4.02%). Among different treatments, early maturity (114.37 days) was reported in control. Treatment consisting 100% RDN through FYM, which was statistically at par with treatment control recorded maturity of 115.37 days. Probable reasons for this occurrence can be attributed to the inherent genetic makeup of the onion genotypes. or slow and continuous release of nutrient by organic and inorganic treatment combinations for long period. As a consequence, the plant remained in the vegetative phase, leading to an imbalance in the C:N ratio and subsequently causing delayed maturity at higher nutrient levels. These findings are also found identical to the findings of Dhakad et al. [14]. Among the varieties, Hisar Onion-4 (117.90 days) matured earlier than Hisar Onion-2 (119.15 days).

It was reported that polar diameter and equatorial diameter were observed maximum in T6 (50% RDF through NPK + 50% RDN through VC), which were 5.16 and 6.09 cm, respectively and reported statistically at par with 50% RDF through NPK + 50% RDN through PM (5.07 and 5.98 cm) and RDF (4.95 and 5.88 cm) as compared to control treatment 3.81 and 4.49 cm at harvest. Gebremichael et al. [15] findings indicate that the application of 5 t ha⁻¹ of Vermicompost along with 50% nitrogen resulted in approximately a 58% increase in bulb diameter compared to the control treatment. Regarding the effect of varieties, Hisar Onion-4 recorded maximum polar diameter (4.79 cm) and equatorial diameter (5.67 cm) as well in comparison to Hisar Onion-2 (4.66 and 5.51 cm) at harvest.

Table 2. Effect of organic manures and inorganic fertilizers on growth characteristics of onion

| Treatments | Leaf length (cm) | | | No. of leaves per plant | | | Neck Diameter (mm) | | | Bolting (%) | | |
|------------|------------------|------------|----------------|-------------------------|------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------|----------------|
| | Varieties | | Mean | Varieties | | Mean | Varieties | | Mean | Varieties | | Mean |
| | HO-2 | HO-4 | | HO-2 | HO-4 | | HO-2 | HO-4 | | HO-2 | HO-4 | |
| T1 | 50.67 | 51.20 | 50.94 | 10.22 | 9.94 | 10.08 | 9.58 | 9.75 | 9.66 | 4.15 | 3.86 | 4.00 |
| T2 | 43.72 | 44.77 | 44.24 | 8.89 | 8.63 | 8.76 | 8.7 | 8.73 | 8.71 | 3.82 | 3.62 | 3.72 |
| T3 | 45.05 | 45.4 | 45.22 | 9.04 | 8.74 | 8.89 | 8.38 | 8.56 | 8.47 | 3.21 | 3.12 | 3.16 |
| T4 | 44.79 | 45.12 | 44.95 | 8.92 | 8.72 | 8.82 | 8.53 | 8.75 | 8.64 | 3.36 | 3.18 | 3.27 |
| T5 | 49.38 | 50.38 | 49.88 | 10.04 | 9.78 | 9.91 | 7.50 | 7.69 | 7.59 | 2.95 | 2.81 | 2.88 |
| T6 | 52.31 | 53.13 | 52.72 | 10.42 | 10.13 | 10.28 | 7.23 | 7.4 | 7.31 | 2.33 | 2.23 | 2.28 |
| T7 | 51.08 | 52.64 | 51.86 | 10.32 | 10.03 | 10.17 | 7.34 | 7.54 | 7.44 | 2.54 | 2.33 | 2.44 |
| T8 | 33.03 | 34.08 | 33.55 | 7.68 | 7.44 | 7.56 | 6.43 | 6.62 | 6.52 | 2.21 | 2.14 | 2.17 |
| Mean | 46.25 | 47.09 | | 9.44 | 9.18 | | 7.96 | 8.13 | | 3.07 | 2.91 | |
| Factors | Factor (T) | Factor (V) | Factor (T X V) | Factor (T) | Factor (V) | Factor (T X V) | Factor (T) | Factor (V) | Factor (T X V) | Factor (T) | Factor (V) | Factor (T X V) |
| C.D. at 5% | 1.83 | NS | NS | 0.46 | 0.23 | NS | 0.52 | NS | NS | 0.34 | NS | NS |

T1: RDF, T2: RDN through FYM, T3: RDN through VC, T4: RDN through PM, T5: 50% RDF through NPK + 50% RDN through FYM, T6: 50% RDF through NPK + 50% RDN through VC, T7: 50% RDF through NPK + 50% RDN through PM, T8: Control

Table 3. Effect of organic manures and inorganic fertilizers on growth characteristics and maturity period of onion

| Treatments | Twin bulbs (%) | | | Polar Diameter (cm) | | | Equatorial Diameter (cm) | | | Days to maturity (days) | | |
|------------|----------------|------------|----------------|---------------------|------------|----------------|--------------------------|------------|----------------|-------------------------|------------|----------------|
| | Varieties | | Mean | Varieties | | Mean | Varieties | | Mean | Varieties | | Mean |
| | HO-2 | HO-4 | | HO-2 | HO-4 | | HO-2 | HO-4 | | HO-2 | HO-4 | |
| T1 | 5.08 | 4.67 | 4.88 | 4.88 | 5.02 | 4.95 | 5.72 | 6.04 | 5.88 | 121.25 | 119.75 | 120.50 |
| T2 | 4.81 | 4.42 | 4.61 | 4.53 | 4.66 | 4.59 | 5.42 | 5.47 | 5.45 | 116.5 | 114.25 | 115.37 |
| T3 | 4.55 | 4.32 | 4.44 | 4.59 | 4.76 | 4.67 | 5.51 | 5.64 | 5.58 | 118.00 | 117.50 | 117.75 |
| T4 | 4.65 | 4.4 | 4.53 | 4.64 | 4.70 | 4.67 | 5.53 | 5.61 | 5.57 | 117.00 | 115.75 | 116.37 |
| T5 | 3.63 | 3.52 | 3.58 | 4.8 | 4.95 | 4.88 | 5.67 | 5.75 | 5.71 | 119.75 | 119.50 | 119.62 |
| T6 | 3.19 | 3.14 | 3.16 | 5.07 | 5.26 | 5.16 | 5.95 | 6.23 | 6.09 | 123.25 | 121.75 | 122.50 |
| T7 | 3.25 | 3.15 | 3.2 | 5.00 | 5.14 | 5.07 | 5.85 | 6.12 | 5.98 | 122.75 | 120.75 | 121.75 |
| T8 | 3.04 | 2.94 | 2.99 | 3.75 | 3.87 | 3.81 | 4.46 | 4.52 | 4.49 | 114.75 | 114.00 | 114.37 |
| Mean | 4.02 | 3.82 | | 4.66 | 4.79 | | 5.51 | 5.67 | | 119.15 | 117.9 | |
| Factors | Factor (T) | Factor (V) | Factor (T X V) | Factor (T) | Factor (V) | Factor (T X V) | Factor (T) | Factor (V) | Factor (T X V) | Factor (T) | Factor (V) | Factor (T X V) |
| C.D. at 5% | 0.3 | 0.15 | NS | 0.24 | 0.12 | NS | 0.27 | 0.13 | NS | 1.88 | 0.94 | NS |

T1: RDF, T2: RDN through FYM, T3: RDN through VC, T4: RDN through PM, T5: 50% RDF through NPK + 50% RDN through FYM, T6: 50% RDF through NPK + 50% RDN through VC, T7: 50% RDF through NPK + 50% RDN through PM, T8: Control

Table 4. Effect of organic manures and inorganic fertilizers on yield characteristics of onion

| Treatments | Average fresh weight of bulb (g) | | | Yield per plot (kg) | | | Yield per hectare (t) | | |
|------------|----------------------------------|------------|----------------|---------------------|------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------|----------------|
| | Varieties | | Mean | Varieties | | Mean | Varieties | | Mean |
| | HO-2 | HO-4 | | HO-2 | HO-4 | | HO-2 | HO-4 | |
| T1 | 78.96 | 80.99 | 79.98 | 25.11 | 26.04 | 25.57 | 27.9 | 28.93 | 28.42 |
| T2 | 67.03 | 68.06 | 67.55 | 21.87 | 22.9 | 22.38 | 24.3 | 25.44 | 24.87 |
| T3 | 69.27 | 71.12 | 70.19 | 22.69 | 23.76 | 23.23 | 25.27 | 26.65 | 25.96 |
| T4 | 68.39 | 70.22 | 69.3 | 22.3 | 23.35 | 22.82 | 24.78 | 25.94 | 25.36 |
| T5 | 76.22 | 78.02 | 77.12 | 24.64 | 25.65 | 25.15 | 27.38 | 28.5 | 27.94 |
| T6 | 81.52 | 83.27 | 82.39 | 26.02 | 27.46 | 26.74 | 28.91 | 30.51 | 29.71 |
| T7 | 79.18 | 81.58 | 80.38 | 25.62 | 26.77 | 26.2 | 28.47 | 29.75 | 29.11 |
| T8 | 53.68 | 55.58 | 54.63 | 16.36 | 17.53 | 16.95 | 16.69 | 17.77 | 17.23 |
| Mean | 71.78 | 73.6 | | 23.08 | 24.18 | | 25.46 | 26.68 | |
| Factors | Factor (T) | Factor (V) | Factor (T X V) | Factor (T) | Factor (V) | Factor (T X V) | Factor (T) | Factor (V) | Factor (T X V) |
| C.D. at 5% | 3.25 | 1.63 | NS | 1.54 | 0.77 | NS | 1.71 | 0.85 | NS |

T1: RDF, T2: RDN through FYM, T3: RDN through VC, T4: RDN through PM, T5: 50% RDF through NPK + 50% RDN through FYM, T6: 50% RDF through NPK + 50% RDN through VC, T7: 50% RDF through NPK + 50% RDN through PM, T8: Control

Table 5. Effect of organic manures and inorganic fertilizers on grading of onion bulbs

| Treatments | A grade bulb (>60 g) | | | B grade bulbs (45-60 g) | | | C grade bulbs (<45 g) | | |
|------------|----------------------|------------|----------------|-------------------------|------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------|----------------|
| | Varieties | | Mean | Varieties | | Mean | Varieties | | Mean |
| | HO-2 | HO-4 | | HO-2 | HO-4 | | HO-2 | HO-4 | |
| T1 | 71.01 | 71.88 | 71.44 | 15.49 | 16.77 | 16.13 | 13.5 | 11.35 | 12.43 |
| T2 | 60.11 | 61.22 | 60.67 | 19.88 | 21.21 | 20.54 | 20.02 | 17.57 | 18.8 |
| T3 | 62.32 | 63.17 | 62.74 | 18.84 | 20.11 | 19.48 | 18.84 | 16.72 | 17.78 |
| T4 | 61.34 | 62.38 | 61.86 | 19.16 | 19.78 | 19.47 | 19.50 | 16.84 | 18.17 |
| T5 | 68.91 | 69.8 | 69.36 | 15.84 | 16.11 | 15.97 | 15.25 | 14.09 | 14.67 |
| T6 | 72.7 | 74.41 | 73.55 | 13.27 | 14.41 | 13.84 | 14.03 | 11.18 | 12.61 |
| T7 | 71.54 | 72.73 | 72.13 | 14.27 | 15.64 | 14.96 | 14.19 | 11.63 | 12.91 |
| T8 | 33.95 | 36.64 | 35.30 | 31.13 | 32.34 | 31.74 | 34.92 | 31.02 | 32.97 |
| Mean | 62.73 | 64.03 | | 18.49 | 19.55 | | 18.78 | 16.30 | |
| Factors | Factor (T) | Factor (V) | Factor (T X V) | Factor (T) | Factor (V) | Factor (T X V) | Factor (T) | Factor (V) | Factor (T X V) |
| C.D. at 5% | 2.892 | NS | NS | 2.266 | NS | NS | 1.605 | 0.802 | NS |

T1: RDF, T2: RDN through FYM, T3: RDN through VC, T4: RDN through PM, T5: 50% RDF through NPK + 50% RDN through FYM, T6: 50% RDF through NPK + 50% RDN through VC, T7: 50% RDF through NPK + 50% RDN through PM, T8: Control

Table 4 clearly indicates that application of 50% RDF through NPK + 50% RDN through VC significantly produced the maximum average fresh weight of bulb (82.39 g), which was observed statistically at par with the application of 50% RDF through NPK + 50% RDN through PM (80.38 g) and RDF (79.98 g). The control treatment produced the minimum average fresh weight of bulb (54.63 g). Within the varieties, Hisar Onion-4 (73.60 g) produced significantly higher fresh weight of bulb than Hisar Onion-2 (71.78 g). Application of 50% RDF through NPK + 50% RDN through VC produced significantly maximum yield per plot (26.74 kg) and yield per hectare (29.71 t), which was observed statistically at par with the application of 50% RDF through NPK + 50% RDN through PM (26.20 kg and 29.11 t) and RDF (25.57 kg and 28.42 t). The control treatment produced the minimum yield per plot and yield per hectare (16.95 kg and 17.23 t). Within the varieties, Hisar Onion-4 (24.18 kg and 26.68 t) produced significantly more yield per plot and yield per hectare than the Hisar Onion-2 (23.08 kg and 25.46 t).

The maximum number of A grade bulbs (73.55%) was recorded in treatment T6 (50% RDF through NPK + 50% RDN through VC). On the other hand, same treatment recorded the minimum number of grade B bulbs (13.84%) whereas maximum number of grade B and grade C bulbs were recorded in treatment control (T8), which is 31.74% and 32.97%, respectively. Treatment RDF (T1) noted the minimum number of grade C bulbs (12.43%) as presented in table 5. The increase in yield contributing characters as mentioned in Table. 3 are due to the fact that organic manures are advantageous to plants because they are source of many crucial macro and micronutrients. They are also rich in organic matter and enhance the availability and uptake of nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium. This stimulation positively influences photosynthesis and metabolic activities promoting plant cell division and elongation. Consequently, this will result in increase in size and fresh weight of bulbs which, ultimately contributes to an overall improvement in the yield of onion bulbs. Banjare, et al. [16], Kumar et al. [9] and Singh et al., [17] also have similar findings.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on study, it could be concluded that the maximum bulb yield (29.71 t) and quality of onion bulb was obtained when the nutrients were

applied through 50% of recommended dose of NPK + 50% of recommended dose of nitrogen supplied through vermicompost in each onion varieties Hisar Onion-2 and Hisar Onion-4. Adoption of combined use of organic manure and inorganic fertilizers saves cost incurred by chemical fertilizers and environmental pollution caused by them. Among onion varieties Hisar onion-4 was found outstanding in term of growth, bulb yield quality characters when grown under climatic condition of Haryana.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Satya Pal Singh (Assistant scientist, Vegetable science, MHU, Karnal) for their invaluable guidance, unwavering support, and insightful feedback throughout the course of this research. Their expertise and encouragement have been instrumental in shaping the direction of this study. I am also thankful to Dr. D.S. Duhan, Assistant scientist, Department of Vegetable science, HAU, Hisar for their valuable input and constructive guidance, which significantly contributed to the refinement of this research and special thanks go to Sidharth and Ankit Saini for their collaboration, insightful discussions, and moral support. Their diverse perspectives have enriched the depth and quality of this research.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Anonymous. Area and production of horticulture Crops: All India. National Horticulture Board, Ministry of Agriculture and Farmer Welfare, Government of India; 2019-20a. Available:<http://nhb.gov.in>
2. Anonymous. State-wise onion production in the country. In: Monthly report onion. June. Horticulture Statistics Division, Department of Agriculture, Cooperation and Farmer Welfare, Ministry of Agriculture and Farmer Welfare, Government of India New Delhi, India. 2019-20b; 2020. Available:<https://agricoop.nic.in>
3. Brewster JL. Onions and other vegetable Alliums. Centre for Agriculture and Bioscience International, Wallingford, UK. 1996;236.

4. Warade SD, Dasale SB, Shinde KG. Effect of organic, inorganic and biofertilizer on yield of onion bulbs cv. Basawant 780. Journal of Maharashtra Agriculture University. 1995;20(3):467-668.
5. Shaheen A, Fatma M, Rizk A, Singer SM. Growing onion plants without chemical fertilization; 2007.
6. Kale RD, Mallesh BC, Bano K, Bagyaras DJ. Influence of vermicompost application on the available micronutrients and selected microbial population. Soil Biology and Biochemistry. 1992;24(12):1317-1320.
7. Geries LSM, Abo-Dahab AMA, Karam SS. Response of onion production and storability to some sources, rates and times of application of nitrogen fertilizers. Alexandria Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2012;57(2):153-162.
8. Panse VG, Sukhatme PV. Statistical Methods for Agricultural Workers. Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi. Research Journal of Agriculture and Biological Sciences. 1985;3(2):95-104.
9. Kumar S, Garhwal OP, Sharma A. Effect of integrated nutrient management (INM) on growth and yield attributes of kharif onion (*Allium cepa* L.). International Journal Pure Applied Bioscience. 2017;5(3):854- 857.
10. Yogita, Ram RB. Effect of chemical and biofertilizers on quality of onion. Hortflora Research Spectrum. 2012;1(4):367-370.
11. Diaz-Perez JC, Purvis AC, Paulk JT. Bolting, yield and bulb decay of sweet onion as affected by nitrogen fertilization. Journal of the American Society for Horticultural Science. 2003;128(1):144-149.
12. Bhujbal PK. Effect of organic, inorganic and biofertilizers on growth, yield and storage quality of onion bulbs cv. N-2-4-1 (*Allium cepa* L.). M.Sc. (Agriculture) Thesis, MPKV, Rahuri; 1989.
13. Birajdar BG. Effect of inorganic, organic and biofertilizer and their combinations on growth, yield and storage of onion bulbs cv. N-2-4-1. M.Sc. (Agriculture) Thesis submitted to Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth, Rahuri (Maharashtra); 1991.
14. Dhakad RK, Chudasama VR, Verma J, Jalpa G, Dhakad MK. Effect of INM in onion (*Allium cepa* L.) with respect to growth and yield under North Gujarat conditions. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied sciences. 2019; 8(4):1618-1622.
15. Gebremichael Y, Woldetsadik, K., Chavhan A, Gedamu, F. Effect of integrated nutrient management on growth and bulb yield of onion (*Allium cepa* L.) under irrigation at Selekleka, Northern Ethiopia. International Journal of Life Sciences. 2017;5(2):151-160.
16. Banjare C, Shukla, N., Sharma, P.K., Patanwar, M. and Chandravanshi, D. Effect of organic substances on yield and quality of onion (*Allium cepa* L.). International Journal of Farm Sciences. 2015;5(1): 30-35.
17. Singh VV, Mauriya SK, Pal S, Ram RB, Yadav SP. Effect of bio-fertilizers on growth, yield and quality traits of onion (*Allium cepa* L.). International Research journal of Pure and Applied Chemistry. 2020;21(10):18-22.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/114491>